

written the situation is still, from a political as well as military point of view, precarious. Disorderliness continues, losses are heavy on both sides, frightful destruction has accumulated. A still graver fact is that an enormous bloody trench has been dug which we must attempt to fill without delay.

It is fitting first of all to keep constantly in mind that the Indo-chinese problem is only one of the aspects of a vaster problem, a problem of international ramifications.

We have to know [ask ourselves] whether Communism is going to rule Eastern Asia, a part of the world which is among the richest in men and in raw materials.

From now on we shall witness a general offensive which has the same origin and identical goals. It is being directed from Kharbin, the seat of the Asian Cominform. This offensive is being developed in Malaysia, Burma, Indonesia, Siam, the Philippines, Korea, Vietnam, and as far as Japan.

The problem is to ascertain whether this offensive will be strangled in time or whether, on the contrary, it will triumph. In the latter eventuality the whole of Asia will become a fief of Moscow; and Stalin, having made Ghengis Khan's dream his own, and on an even larger scale, will not be far from ruling the world. Once again it will be only the United States which is strong enough to bar the way to this colossus with clay feet.

62

The Oratory of President Sukarno

Apart from his being the national hero of the Revolution and President of the Republic of Indonesia from 1945 until 1967, Sukarno may be justly considered one of the great political orators of the twentieth century. In his blending of Western intellectual arguments with traditional Javanese folklore and mythology Sukarno has no peer. Presented here are typical examples of his oratory. The first document is an excerpt from his speech of June 1, 1945, in which he outlined the

five cardinal principles of the new Indonesian nation, the Pantja Sila. The second document is part of his address of August 17, 1959, subsequently known as the "Political Manifesto," in which Sukarno restated the principles and history of the Indonesian Revolution.

THE "PANTJA SILA"

Indonesian State: All for All

As I said a while ago, we are establishing an Indonesian state which *all of us* must support. *All for all*. Not the Christians for Indonesia, not the Islamic group for Indonesia, not Hadikusumo for Indonesia, not Van Eck for Indonesia, not rich Nitisemito for Indonesia, but the Indonesians for Indonesia—all for all! If I compress what was five into three, and what was three into one, then I have a genuine Indonesian term, *gotong-rojong*, mutual co-operation. The State of Indonesia which we are to establish must be a *gotong-rojong* state. How wonderful that is: *a Gotong-Rojong State!*

Gotong-rojong is a dynamic concept, more dynamic than the family principle, friends. The family principle is a static concept, but gotong-rojong portrays one endeavour, one act of service, one task, what was called by Mr. Sukardjo one *karyo* [work], one *gawé* [task]. Let us complete this "karyo," this "gawé," this task, this act of service, together. Gotong-rojong means toiling hard together, sweating hard together, joint struggle to help one another. Acts of service by all for the interest of all. *Ho-lopis-kuntul-baris—One, two, three, heave!* for the common interest. That is gotong-rojong! (Loud applause on all sides.)

The principle of gotong-rojong between the rich and the poor, between the Moslem and the Christian, between the non-Indonesians and those of foreign descent who became Indonesians. This, Brothers and Sisters, is what I propose to you. . . .

Pantjasila becomes *Trisila* [three principles], *Trisila* becomes

Sukarno, *Toward Freedom and the Dignity of Man* (Djakarta: Republic of Indonesia, Department of Foreign Affairs, 1961), pp. 19–21, 59–62.

Ekasila, one principle. But it is up to you, gentlemen, which you choose: *trisila*, *ekasila* or *pantjasila*? I have explained the content to you all.

Pantja Sila: Enduring and Age-Long Foundation

Principles such as I have proposed to you are the principles for an Indonesia Merdeka [Free Indonesia] which will endure. For decades my heart has burned fiercely with these principles.

But do not forget that we live in a time of war, friends. It is during this time of war that we are going to establish the state of Indonesia—in the midst of war's thunder. I even utter thanks to God that we are going to establish an Indonesian state not under a clear sky, but with the sound of the drums of war and in the fire of warfare. Indonesia Merdeka shall emerge a tempered Indonesia, an Indonesia Merdeka tempered in the fire of war. Such an Indonesia Merdeka is an Indonesian state which is strong, not an Indonesian state which would gradually collapse. It is because of that I thank God Almighty.

In this connection, it is perhaps necessary to make emergency regulations, as proposed by several speakers, regulations which are temporary in character. But its principles, the content of an Indonesia Merdeka which is enduring and age-long, must, in my opinion be Pantja Sila.

As I said a while ago, this is what must be our *Weltanschauung*. I do not know whether you agree with me or not, but I have struggled since 1918 up to this present 1945 for that *Weltanschauung*, for the setting up of a nationalistic Indonesia, for Indonesian nationalism, for the Indonesian nationalism which lives within *perikemanusiaan* [humanity], for the system of *mufakat* [consensus], for social justice, for belief in God. Pantja Sila! That is what has always burned in my heart for decades past. But friends, it is up to you whether it is accepted or not.

Condition for Realization of Pantja Sila: Struggle!

However, I myself fully understand that there is not one *Weltanschauung* which can materialise by itself, become a reality

automatically. There is not one *Weltanschauung* which can become a fact, can become a reality, if not through struggle! Let alone the *Weltanschauung* made by men, let alone that made by Hitler, or by Stalin, or by Lenin, or by Sun Yat Sen. *De Mensch*, mankind, must fight for it; without that struggle it can never become reality.

Leninism could never have become a reality without the struggle of the whole Russian people. San Min Chu I could never have become a fact without the struggle of the Chinese people, friends, never! I will even say more than that: without the struggle of human beings, there is not one matter of religion, not one religious ideal, which can become a reality. Let alone the deeds of men, not even the commands of God, written down, black on white, in the Qur'an, can be translated into reality without the struggle of those who are called followers of Islam. The same applies to the words written in the Bible, the ideals contained therein can not come into being without the struggle of the followers of Christianity.

Hence, if the people of Indonesia desire that the Pantja Sila I propose become a reality, that is, if we wish to live as one nation, one independent nationality, if we wish to live as a member of a free world imbued with *perikemanusiaan*, humanity, desire to live upon the basis of *permusjawaratan*, unanimity arising out of deliberation, desire to live a life perfected by social justice, desire to live in comfort and peace, in the widest and most perfect belief in God—do not forget the condition for the realization of this, and that is struggle, struggle and once again struggle!

Do not imagine that with the setting up of the state of Indonesia Merdeka, our struggle is at an end. No! I even say: *within* that Indonesia Merdeka *our struggle must continue*, only its character will be different to that of the present struggle, its characteristics will be different. Together, as a united people, we shall continue our struggle to realize our ideals contained in Pantja Sila.

And, primarily in this time of war, be sure, realise, implant it in your hearts, that Indonesia Merdeka can not come if the

people of Indonesia do not dare take a risk, do not dare dive for pearls into the depths of the ocean. If the people of Indonesia are not united, and are not determined to death to win independence, the independence of Indonesia will never be the possession of the Indonesian people, never, until the end of time! Independence can only be achieved and owned by a people whose soul is aflame with the determination of *Merdeka, Independence—or death!*

THE "POLITICAL MANIFESTO"

The Rails of the Revolution

Indeed that political-economic-social ordering is at bottom the *essence* of our Revolution, the *soul* of our Revolution. It constitutes the main pillar that supports our Revolution. Without this main pillar, our Revolution cannot possibly achieve its objective, and more than that: Our Revolution will collapse in the middle of the road. "A Revolution is an outburst of the *collective* will of a people," as was said by a scholar. And how would our Revolution be able to continue and attain its purpose, if that *collective* will has been made faint by liberalism, individualism, "suku"-ism [familism], group-ism, and others of the like?

Thus the political-economic-social ordering is actually the main power—the *highest holder of power*—of our national life. Every person, every citizen, every group, yes, everything that lives on the soil of Indonesia, should be subordinated to the authority of this highest power. The highest authority in our National life, the Tjakrawati authority in our Revolution, is the collective ordering I spoke about. This is because that authority *determines* whether or not we will be able to continue to live as a Nation desirous of realizing a just and prosperous society. This authority *determines* whether our Revolution will achieve its objective, or whether our Revolution will fail midway.

It is clear that the highest authority is not a person, not the President, not the Government, not a council, but a *concept of life* which animates our Revolution. In brief, and to put it simply

everything that is the ideal of the 1945 Revolution, that is the highest authority, that is the highest power, that is the Tjakrawati. That is what we must put into practice, that is what we must be loyal to, and that is what we must serve. We must direct and subordinate all the layers of our national life to the realization of the ideals of the Revolution. And whoever refuses to be directed there, or whoever does not want to be subordinated, is an obstructor of the Revolution.

That is what I meant with "ordering," "re-ordering," "retooling," and the like. And this is the good of the 1945 Constitution: ordering and retooling are made possible and can be executed through the channels of the 1945 Constitution. It also because of that, that we return to the 1945 Constitution. . . .

A Strong Structural Basis

. . . I call this year "The year of the Rediscovery of the Revolution."

Yes, with our return to the 1945 Constitution, we have already "rediscovered the Revolution." We, thanks be to God, have "rediscovered our Revolution." We now feel ourselves to be a wanderer, who after ten years of roving around all over the world to find a place to live outside of his country, at last has returned to the home of his birth—has come home to his own house, as the buffalo comes home to his pen. . . .

The devil of liberalism, the devil of federalism, the devil of individualism, the devil of suku-ism, the devil of groupism, the devil of deviation, the devil of adventurism, the devil of the four kinds of dualisms, the devil of corruption, the devil of scraping up wealth at one blow, the devil of the multiparty system, the devil of rebellion—all kinds of devils have jumped on us in the realm of the Inferno, and now we are undergoing purgatory in all fields. Re-orientation, re-ordering, re-tooling, re-shaping, re-making—all of that is necessary, so that we will be able to continue our journey on the rails of the Revolution, proceeding towards the objective of the Revolution.

Let the imperialists abroad be in an uproar! They accuse us

that the 1945 Constitution is "Japanese-made." They also impute that the authority of the President within the framework of the present 1945 Constitution starts from the base of military dictatorship.

Once again, let them be in an uproar! The 1945 Constitution is not "Japanese-made." The 1945 Constitution is the genuine reflection of the identity of the Indonesian nation, who since ancient times based their system of Government on *musjawarah* [deliberation] and *mufakat* [consensus] with the leadership of one central authority in the hands of a "sesepuh"—an elder—who did not dictate, but led, and protected. Indonesian democracy since ancient times has been Guided Democracy, and this is characteristic of all original democracies in Asia.

Yes, indeed, without concealing anything we have made a complete divorce from western democracy, which is free-fight-liberalism, but on the other hand since ancient times we have flatly rejected dictatorships. Guided Democracy is the democracy of the family system, without the anarchy of liberalism, without the autocracy of a dictatorship. . . .

63

Islam Versus the Secular State in Indonesia

The cleavage between "secular" nationalism and Islam in Indonesia has deep cultural and political roots. It erupted forcefully in the Constituent Assembly, elected in 1955 and dissolved five years later without having accomplished its task. Presented below are segments from a marathon speech by Islam's fiercest spokesman, K. H. Muhammad Isa Anshari, during the Assembly's first general session in 1957. It is entitled "We are Moving towards a Republic of Indonesia Based on Islam."

Our bloody revolution that broke out on August 17, 1945 has been the realization of the determined will and the solid

conviction of the heroic forces who, on November 10, 1945 [date of battle against the British for Surabaya], stood up and marched with the sacred and Holy phrase, "God is great!" [That] phrase echoed and reverberated throughout Indonesia, from Sabang to Merauke, from Anjer to Banjuwangi.

Koranic injunctions . . . resounded loud and far. They were the dynamic voice of the Indonesian Holy War fighters who never retreated.

They had only one battlecry: To win or to perish.

Mr. Chairman, what was the aspiration, the divine will that inspired those Holy War fighters?

What was the inspiration, the divine inspiration whose bright rays of light warmed the breasts and hearts of those Holy War fighters?

What was the idea that possessed the minds of those Holy War fighters, coming out of the dark trenches, hurtling themselves in the heat of the struggle on the battlegrounds, covered in blood and staking their lives?

At the opening session of this Constituent Assembly, President Sukarno made the following statement:

"It is clear that all the sacrifices offered by our heroes in the revolution were brought to defend the idea of the National state, what we call the Unitary Republic which we proclaimed on August 17, 1945. They died for the idea of that state, for the idea of the National state, the Republic of the Proclamation of August 17, 1945, and not for the idea of a different state!"

President Sukarno's statement contains only half the truth. Mr. Chairman, according to my opinion and conviction, those heroes and patriotic sons of Indonesia willingly sacrificed themselves, not only for the idea referred to by President Sukarno, not only for defending the freedom of the fatherland, not only for

K. H. M. Isa Anshari, "Kami menuju Republik Indonesia berdasarkan Islam," *Tentang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia dalam Konstituante* (n.p., n.d.), Vol. II, pp. 181-182, 189-191, 218-221. English translation by Soebagio Sastrowardjojo. The citation from the Koran is taken from Arthur J. Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted* (London: Allen & Unwin, New York: Macmillan, 1955), Vol. II, p. 272, by permission of Allen & Unwin.

liberating the Indonesian soil and seas from foreign domination, not only for the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, not only for defending the Proclamation of Indonesian Independence, but for something more profound and more all-embracing than all of these.

They fought and sacrificed themselves—those who died to become Martyrs no less than those who still live and stand upright, the Holy War fighters of our time—for one idealism, for one ideal inspired by the goal and purpose of their lives: to devote themselves to God, praise be to Him the Most High, by upholding His Word and by expecting merely His grace.

They fought to place Islam in the life of our society and state. They fought to establish the Sovereignty and the Law of Islam. . . .

Mr. Chairman, if we study Bung Karno's [President Sukarno's] address before the meeting of the "Exploratory Body for the Preparation of Independence," which was held on June 1, 1945—the speech that was subsequently published in book form under the title "The Birth of *Pantja Sila*"—it is quite obvious, Mr. Chairman, that that *Pantja Sila* had died in its womb. Why do I say so?

Mr. Chairman, read page 37 of "The Birth of *Pantja Sila*" brochure! We shall find there Bung Karno's following statement: "If I compress the five (principles) to become three, and the three to become one, I shall then get one original Indonesian word, that is the word *gotong rojong* [co-operation, mutual help!]"

You see, Mr. Chairman, as a result of Bung Karno's compressing and squeezing, the Belief in One God [i.e., the first of the Five Principles in *Pantja Sila*] has been completely obliterated. God Almighty has been dissolved . . . in the phrase "*gotong-rojong*." . . .

Mr. Chairman, I have arrived at the specific task placed upon me by my faction in this General Session, that is, to respond to the Communist ideology and atheistic teachings. I shall fulfill my task to the best of my ability, [and] in my own words and in my own manner.

In my own words and in my own manner, Mr. Chairman, for

perhaps you may already have heard that this very speaker has been ordered by God Almighty to be the man in the forefront of the fight and struggle against Communism in Indonesia. I feel it necessary to make known to you, Mr. Chairman, that the motivation that presses me to come forward with this speech, to challenge and oppose the Communist ideology and teachings, does not at all stem from a feeling of hatred towards the members and leaders of the Indonesian Communist Party, whether they are here in this building or outside.

The nature and character of the Holy War of Islam has, praise be to God, educated and tempered me, so as not to face the ideological opponent on the basis of hatred or the feeling of enmity. . . .

Above all, Mr. Chairman, many of the young men at present on the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party have been old friends of mine, in the Dutch colonial period as well as in the era of Japanese fascism. Many of them at one time worked with me in the illegal movement when fascist Japan held sway here. [But] . . . Mr. Chairman, the Communist ideology has separated them from me, and the teachings of Islam have separated me from them. . . .

Mr. Chairman, before I present the motivation and the reasoning that underlie the argumentation employed by the *ulama* to anathematize Communism, permit me first . . . to express my regrets and the regrets of the entire Islamic community in Indonesia with respect to President Sukarno's speech at the first annual celebration of the Youth Pledge, held at the State Palace on October 27. Using his well-known style and manner of speech he declared that if there ever existed a Muslim group that disliked and opposed Communism, he would ask them to go and leave Indonesia.

Mr. Chairman, the Islamic community considers President Sukarno's agitation and demagoguery a challenge. . . . It regards [the speech] as an ultimatum and a threat to itself. President Sukarno's speech has already led to disturbance and consternation and to spontaneous reactions among Indonesian Muslims. . . .

Mr. Chairman, as for us Muslims . . . Islam itself makes quite clear what attitude a Muslim should adopt towards individuals or groups of people who wish to drive Muslims out of their own country, towards people who oppose and fight the enforcement of Islamic law in society and the state.

Throughout the Koran are Allah's injunctions, advising and directing Muslims how to act and behave towards such people. Among the hundreds of relevant Koranic verses, I have found one in [the following passage]:

"God only forbids you as to those who have fought you in religion's cause, and expelled you from your habitations, and have supported in your expulsion, that you should take them for friends. And whosoever takes them for friends, those—they are the evildoers" [The Koran, Sura LX, Verse 9].

Mr. Chairman, obviously this Koranic precept and command has so far not been acted upon, thanks [only] to the tolerance and good will on the part of the *ulama* and the Muslim authorities in Indonesia.

Don't [let anyone, however,] abuse the Muslim Community's tolerance and benevolence too long. Don't force the Muslims to adopt radical . . . measures. It is certainly not the Muslims who will lose and bear the responsibility, but those, on the contrary, who force them to act that way.

64

A Communist Interpretation of the Indonesian Revolution

Reproduced below are excerpts from the concluding pages of a long essay, "Indonesian Society and the Indonesian Revolution," by the late D. N. Aidit, Secretary-General of the Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI in Indonesian, CPI in this translation). The essay, written in 1957, was used as a manual in training courses in party schools. Under President Sukarno's "Guided Democracy," the party enjoyed consider-

able freedom of movement and organizational latitude until the fall of 1965.

On the Driving Force or the Force Pushing the Indonesian revolution forward, the General Program of the Consitution of the CPI states that "the driving force of the Indonesian revolution is the working class, the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie and other democratic elements whose interests are harmed by imperialism." All these make up the progressive forces in Indonesian society. The question of the forces pushing the revolution forward or the driving forces of the revolution is the question of which classes and sectors in Indonesian society consistently fight against imperialism and feudalism. The problem of the basic tactics of the Indonesian revolution can only be correctly solved if this is clearly understood. . . .

There is in Indonesian society today a landlord class and a bourgeois class: the upper strata of the landlord class and the upper strata of the bourgeois class are the classes that govern. The governed are the proletarian class, the peasants and all types of petty bourgeoisie besides the peasants; all these make up by far the largest group in society. Thus, it can also be said that the way out of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal conditions in Indonesia is by changing the balances of forces between the classes that govern on the one hand and the classes that are governed on the other.

The attitudes and position of all classes, both those that govern and those that are governed are completely determined by their social and economic position. Thus the character of Indonesian society not only determines the targets and tasks of the revolution but also determines the forces pushing the revolution forward. Which classes can be included within the forces pushing the Indonesian revolution forward? In order to know this, we need to make an analysis of the classes within Indonesian society.

The Selected Works of D. N. Aidit (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Joint Publications Research Service, 1961), Vol. II, pp. 200–205.

The landlord class[es] which exploit and suppress the peasants and which do more to oppose the political, economic and cultural development of Indonesian society than to play a progressive role, are not forces pushing the revolution forward but are a target of the revolution.

The bourgeois class is composed of the compradores and the national bourgeoisie. The big bourgeoisie that are compradore in character directly serve the interests of the big foreign capitalists and they are thus fattened up by them. In the Indonesian revolution, the compradore bourgeoisie are not a driving force but are an obstacle in the way of the revolution, and this is why they are a target of the revolution. However, the national bourgeoisie displays two features; as a class that is also suppressed by imperialism and whose development is also stifled by feudalism, this class is anti-imperialist and anti-feudal, and in this respect it is one of the revolutionary forces. But on the other hand, this class does not have the courage fundamentally to fight imperialism and feudalism because economically and politically it is weak and it has class ties with imperialism and feudalism. The dual character of the national bourgeoisie is the reason why we have two sets of experiences with them, that is, at certain [times], this class can take part in the revolution against imperialism, against the compradores and against the landlords . . . but at other periods they trail behind the compradore bourgeoisie and become their ally in the counter-revolutionary camp. . . .

In facing the wavering characteristics of the Indonesian national bourgeoisie attention should be paid to the fact that it is precisely because . . . it is politically and economically weak that it is not very difficult to pull this class to the left to make it stand firmly on the side of the revolution so long as the progressive forces are large and the tactics of the Communist Party correct. This means that the wavering nature of this class is not fatal, it is not insurmountable. But on the other hand, if the progressive forces are not large and the tactics of the Communist Party not correct, then this economically and politically weak national bourgeoisie can easily run to the right and become hostile to the revolution.

The petty bourgeoisie besides the peasants, that is, the urban poor, the intellectuals, the small traders, the handicraft workers, the fishermen, the independent workers and so on, have a status which is almost the same as that of the middle peasants. They also suffer from the oppression of imperialism, feudalism and the big bourgeoisie and are every day pressed further and further towards bankruptcy and ruination. This is why they are one of the forces pushing the revolution forward and are a reliable ally of the proletariat. They can only attain their freedom under the leadership of the proletariat. The intellectuals and the student youth are not a class in society but their class position is determined by family origin, by their conditions of living and by their political outlook. The small traders in general have stalls and small shops and either employ just a few assistants or none at all; they live under the constant threat of bankruptcy because of the exploitation of imperialists, the big bourgeoisie and the money-lenders. The handicraftsmen and fishermen possess their own means of production, they do not employ any workers or perhaps employ only one or two. The independent workers are persons in various spheres of work, such as private doctors and lawyers, they work on their own, they do not exploit others or exploit others only very slightly. All the petty bourgeoisie besides the peasants can generally support the revolution and are good allies of the proletariat. Their weakness is that some of them easily come under the influence of the bourgeoisie and this is why special attention must be devoted to carrying out propaganda and undertaking revolutionary organizational activities among them.

The peasants account for 60%–70% of the population of Indonesia, they make up the biggest group and together with their families number tens of millions of people. The peasants are basically divided into the rich peasants, the middle peasants and the poor peasants. There are indeed some persons among the rich peasants that lease out a part of their land, carry out money lending and brutally exploit the peasant laborers and they are by nature semi-feudal, but besides this, they themselves generally participate in labor, and in this sense they make up a part of the

peasantry. Their productive activities will continue to be utilized for a certain period to come and they can also help the struggle against imperialism. They can adopt an attitude of neutrality in the revolutionary struggle against the landlords. This is why we cannot consider them as part of the landlords. The middle peasants are independent economically, they generally do not exploit others and do not earn interest on money, on the contrary, they suffer from the exploitation of the imperialists, the landlords and the bourgeoisie. Some of them do not own sufficient land for them to work it themselves. The middle peasants can not only become part of the anti-imperialist revolution and the agrarian revolution, but they can also accept Socialism. This is why they are one of the important forces pushing the revolution forward and are a reliable ally of the proletariat. Their attitude towards the revolution is a decisive factor for victory or defeat because the middle peasants comprise the majority in the countryside after the agrarian revolution. The poor peasants together with the agricultural laborers comprise the majority in the villages in our country, prior to the agrarian revolution. The poor peasants do not have any land or do not have sufficient for them to work it themselves; they are the village semi-proletariat, they are the largest force pushing the revolution forward and it is natural for them to be the most reliable of the allies of the proletariat and a basic part of the forces of the Indonesian revolution.

The poor peasants and the middle peasants can only attain their emancipation under the leadership of the proletariat, and the proletariat can only give leadership to the revolution if it has made a firm alliance with the poor and middle peasants. What we mean when we use the term "peasants" is mainly the poor and middle peasants that make up the majority of the inhabitants of the villages. In leading the people's struggle in the countryside, the Party must always strive to be able to draw in and mobilize 90% of the village inhabitants and must firmly base itself on the poor peasants and the peasant laborers as well as make an alliance with the middle peasants.

The Indonesian proletariat consists of about 500,000 workers in modern industry (transport workers, factory-workers, repair-

shop workers, mine-workers, etc.). The workers in small industry and the handicrafts in the towns number more than 2,000,000. The agricultural and forestry proletariat and other groups of workers make up a very large number. All this amounts to about 6,000,000 or, together with their families, some 20,000,000 which is about 25% of the entire population of Indonesia. Besides this town and village proletariat, there are also in the villages of Indonesia millions of peasant laborers, those village inhabitants who generally own no land and agricultural implements and who make a livelihood out of selling their labor power in the villages. The peasant laborers are the group which suffers most in the village and their position in the peasant movement is just as important as that of the poor peasants.

As is also the case with the proletariat in other countries, the Indonesian proletariat has very fine qualities. Their work makes them unite in the most advanced economic forms, it gives them a strong understanding of organization and discipline, and because they do not own any means of production, they are not individualistic by nature and apart from this, since the Indonesian proletariat is exploited by three forms of brutal exploitation, that is, imperialism, capitalism and feudalism, they become more firm and more thoroughgoing in the revolutionary struggle than the other classes. Since Indonesia is not fertile soil for social-reformism as is the case in Europe, the proletariat is in its entirety very revolutionary indeed, of course with the exception of a small number who have become the scum. It is because the Indonesian proletariat has been led by its revolutionary political party, the Communist Party of Indonesia, ever since it appeared on the arena of the revolutionary struggle that it is politically the most conscious class in Indonesian society. Since a large part of the Indonesian proletariat consists of bankrupt peasants, it has natural bonds with the broad masses of the peasants, a fact which facilitates its alliance.

Although the Indonesian proletariat contains within it certain unavoidable weaknesses, such as for example its smallness in number by comparison with the peasants, its youth by comparison with the proletariat in capitalist countries and the low level of its culture by comparison with the bourgeoisie, it is nevertheless the

basic force pushing the Indonesian revolution forward. The Indonesian revolution will not succeed unless it is under the leadership of the Indonesian proletariat. . . .

It must be understood that although the Indonesian proletariat is the class which has the highest political consciousness and organizational understanding, the victory of the revolution can never be achieved without the revolutionary unity under all circumstances with all other revolutionary classes and groups. The proletariat must build up a revolutionary front. Of the classes in society, the peasants are the firmest and most reliable ally of the working class, the urban petty bourgeoisie is a reliable ally, and the national bourgeoisie is an ally under certain circumstances and within certain limits: this is the fundamental law which has already been and is being proven by Indonesia's modern history. . . .

Based on the above analysis of the classes in Indonesian society, it is clear which classes and groups are the pillars of imperialism and feudalism, that is, the landlords and the compradores. They are obstacles standing in the way of the revolution and that is why they are the enemies of the people. The above analysis also makes it clear which classes and groups are the basic driving force of the revolution, that is the working class, the peasants and the petty bourgeoisie. It makes clear too which classes can take part in the revolution, that is, the national bourgeois class. This is why the workers, the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie are the People, and make up the forces of the revolution, the forces of the united national front.

65

"The Philippines First"

Ramon Magsaysay achieved recognition while Secretary of National Defense (1950-1953) by organizing the campaign that destroyed the Hukbalahap, the Communist-led guerrilla movement in the Philippines. As third President of the Philippine Republic (1953-1957) he negotiated the Laurel-Langley Agreement (1955), which essentially continued the depend-

ence of the Philippine economy on the United States until 1974. The following speech was delivered by Magsaysay before the Philippine-Columbian Association in Manila, July 4, 1955.

I welcome this opportunity to come before this distinguished club and speak at this time.

These are not just the empty words of a politician.

I welcome this opportunity because this club, the Philippine-Columbian, has always been renowned as a gathering place for those who believe in the principles of liberty and justice that typify our nation.

Thus I believe that this is a most fitting place—among the nationalists of this association—and certainly a most fitting time—the ninth anniversary of our glorious independence—for me to review a few basic principles for which I stand.

When I was campaigning for the sacred office of President of the Philippines, I made myself clear on the most vital issue affecting our independence.

I promised our people that I would take all possible steps to preserve our independence and to insure our national security, both from within and from without.

I defined not only our objectives, but how we were going to attain them.

In the matter of preserving our national security from outside threats, we recognized, in the light of the plans and objectives of the aggressive imperialism which then threatened and still threatens us, that there was no safety in standing alone and holding aloof.

We recognized the impossibility, in this world of modern arms, of organizing and providing for our own defense with the limited resources at our command.

We have, therefore, sought and secured the safety of alliance with more powerful nations.

Specifically, we have entered into close alliance with the most powerful nation on the face of the earth—the United States.

Ramon Magsaysay, "The Philippines First," *Department of Foreign Affairs Review* (Manila), Vol. II, No. 2 (January, 1956), pp. 2-3.

We have become part of the Southeast Asia pact, better known as the Manila Treaty.

We have done these things for the sake of no other country except our own country and for the sake of no other people except the Filipino people.

For this—the Philippines first—has always been and always will be the guiding principle of my administration.

We have served and will serve no other interest except our own national self-interest.

We have entered into these alliances to strengthen our own defense, secure our own independence, preserve our own freedoms.

We now find our own defenses augmented by the free world's collective strength and by the actual presence here of America's great fighting power.

I have also adhered to my promise of protecting our freedom from internal attack.

You will remember I broke with the Liberal administration because it just wanted me to fight and kill Huks. I felt that this gave only half the answer to this problem, and I wanted to do more.

I wanted to give our discontented a new life, to correct the abuses from which so many of them had suffered, to give them confidence in the honesty of our free and democratic institutions. I wanted to welcome those who were truly repentant and show them the meaning of our independence, the ninth anniversary of which we are celebrating today.

I believe that considerable progress has been made in that direction in the one-and-a-half years since I was given your mandate.

The leader of the Huk movement himself, Luis Taruc, has surrendered to the government.

The administration's policy of benevolence continues to attract surrenderees from the Huk ranks.

At the same time, the reforms we have instituted, the confidence that we have restored in the government's sense of justice, have prevented those with grievances from becoming Huks, or

from turning to the Huks. They turn to us now, confident that they will get justice and redress of grievances.

An examination of Communist propaganda will bring out the fact that its greatest enemy in this country today is this administration.

Thus have we strengthened our independence against threats and attacks both from without and within, since I was elected to office.

We have done this—to repeat—by always serving foremost the interest of our country and people, by always thinking of the Philippines first. We have also gained added prestige and honor for our independence in this way.

When we sent a delegation to Bandung, to the Asia-African conference there, it was freely forecast by some that we would merely be looked upon as puppets of the United States.

I never shared that fear. We proved at Bandung how wrong were the prophets of puppetry.

Under the able leadership of our chief delegate, Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, we made a deep impression upon our fellow Asians and upon the African nations at Bandung. Instead of finding ourselves labelled as puppets, we found ourselves as one of the leading advocates of the high principles of dignity for mankind in which all Filipinos believe.

It was not our delegation which had to retreat at Bandung. It was the representative of Communist China who was obliged to retreat. He found out that the desire for freedom and the hatred of Communism had inspired more nations to resistance than he had imagined.

Let me say here and now that we cannot flirt with Communism if we want our independence to remain real and secure.

When I say that, I am saying it because I am thinking of the Philippines first.

I am amused by those who try to put forward this slogan as some kind of new concept. To me, there certainly is nothing new in the idea. I do not know, and I could not practice, any policy but Philippines first. I cannot see how any Filipino who loves his

fellow countrymen and the land of his birth can ever think in any terms other than Philippines first.

Only on this basis can we shape and build the kind of Philippines that you, here in this room, and the millions who have agreed with the principles I set forth during the campaign, want for yourselves and your children.

Our people want a Philippines strong and stable internally and able to preserve its hard-won independence against external threats, in firm alliance with our great and good friend the United States of America.

I am determined to see to it that our people continue to get what they want.

66

A Communist View of American Rule in the Philippines

Luis Taruc (1913-) joined the socialist movement in the Philippines during the 1930s and became Supremo (head) of the Hukbalahap, or People's Army Against Japan, in 1942. In the postwar years he led the peasant insurrection against the Manila government until his capture in 1954 and subsequent imprisonment. Assisted by William J. Pomeroy, an American Communist, Taruc completed his Born of the People in 1949. Passages from this work are presented below. It is one of the few autobiographies ever written by a South-east Asian Communist, and has since abandoned Communism.

For over half a century the Philippines has become largely the private landed estate of a handful of big businessmen who live ten thousand miles away in the United States. They acquired possession by taking us away from a previous owner, Spain, as the spoils of war in 1898, and they made sure of their possession

Luis Taruc, *Born of the People*. Reprinted by permission of International Publishers, Co. Inc. Copyright © 1953. Pp. 265-271, 274-275, 277-279.

by using the iron fist in 1899 to crush with blood our revolutionary movement for real independence. Since then, posing as our friends and benefactors, they have robbed and plundered our wealth, and they held back the achievement of our democracy and freedom. When they pretended to give us independence, in 1946, it was only as a smokescreen to hide an even greater domination.

The American imperialists used many excuses to justify their taking of the Philippines. President McKinley said that he had been advised to do so by God. Some said that it was the duty of the United States to civilize the Filipino. Others said that it was their duty to teach us how to govern ourselves. None mentioned publicly that they could make huge profits in our country.

To guarantee those profits, American imperialism has kept us a backward, colonial people, with the majority living in the misery of poverty and ignorance. It has prevented our growth as an independent nation, forcing us to act according to its own wishes, both in our internal and in our external affairs. It has stood in the path of our free economic development, compelling us to endure the narrow, outworn system of feudalism and keeping us from using our own means and our own energies to advance the welfare of the people.

It has boasted that it "educated the Filipinos," but today nearly fifty per cent of our people are still illiterate and a large proportion of the rest can barely read or write. It has said that it raised our standard of living to the highest in the Orient, yet today tens of thousands of Filipinos die each year of tuberculosis and beriberi, the diseases of poverty. It has claimed that it trained us in the ways of democratic government, but today the most corrupt regime in our history, with American approval, massacres the people and conducts itself like the worst emperors of pagan Rome.

It has allowed all of these things to exist because ignorance, poverty and corruption are weapons used by imperialism to maintain its rule. . . .

The American imperialists did not want our country to become

industrialized because they wanted our people to buy only the products made in American factories. Our country was to be a market for their goods. It was also supposed to remain a source of raw materials needed by the American factories: unrefined sugar, copra, abaca, metallic ore, lumber, tobacco. Under our backward system of economy such raw materials could be obtained cheaply because our workers were paid very low wages. The raw materials were converted into finished products by the American factories and then sold back to us, by American import companies. All the Filipino ever received from this process, which involved the exploitation of the resources of his country, were very low wages.

The Filipino moves about in an American-made world. The clothes he wears, the cigarettes he smokes, the canned food he eats, the music he hears, the news of the world he reads (and the books and the magazines) are all American, although his own country has the ability to produce all these. He eats pineapple canned in California, but he grows it in the Philippines. His country grows millions of coconuts, but he has to buy toilet soap made in New Jersey out of coconut oil. He buys sugar refined in American mills, but grown on his own island of Negros; if he wants to buy Filipino-made sugar he must be content with *muscovado* [brown, unrefined sugar] or *panotsa* [brown sugar cakes]. He rides on American-made busses or an American-made train. On the radio, made in New York (if he is one of the very few who have a radio) he listens to recorded American programs. American movies dominate his theaters. His schools use American textbooks that explain science, economics, history, and politics from an American standpoint. . . . And finally, of American make, are the guns, the tanks, the planes, the artillery, the vehicles, and even the uniforms of the troops that have been used to shoot down the Filipino people who would like to see a Filipino-made future for their children. . . .

The clever American imperialist! He came into our country with his talk about democracy and about the superiority of the American way of life, painting a picture in colors about his big

cities and his luxuries and his opportunities, dazzling the humble Filipino who lived on rice and fish, telling him that he too could be fortunate if he would just trust in the American way. He would pat Juan de la Cruz ["John Doe"] on the back and say: "You should feel proud. You are the only Christian nation in the Orient. Look at all the sugar and copra you produce and all the gold you dig and all the abaca you grow. One of these days, too, you'll be independent and then you too can be like your Uncle Sam."

The Filipino peasant, who slept on the floor and whose chair was an empty box, plastered the walls of his nipa hut with American magazine illustrations of mansions in the country and hotels and advertisements of luxurious beds and furniture. In the city the laborer who lived in a *barong-barong* [makeshift hut] that became flooded when it rained, went to the American movies and saw the well-dressed glamorous characters moving around in the handsome drawing-rooms and the modern kitchens that had refrigerators and washing machines and electric toasters.

How long did the purveyor of this kind of civilization think that he could convince the Filipino that poverty was ennobling in a Christian and that subservience was admirable in one whose skin was brown? . . .

The Americans soon realized they could not rule forever with an iron hand; it was too expensive. They solved their problem by getting Filipinos to rule for them. A group of Filipinos stood ready and willing to play such a role, the landlord-*ilustrado* class, the landed gentry. A large number of this group had not even joined the struggle against Spain. Their own fortunes were derived from the exploitation of the masses and they were content to have a strong external power upon which to rely, to help them maintain their exploiter's position. They were afraid the revolution would go too far and would get rid of them as well as of the Spaniards. The Americans were stronger than the Spaniards; they were even more reliable. The American Civil Government, operating through the Philippine Commission, at first based itself upon this class of Filipinos. . . .

American rule brought into prominence a new economic group, the compradores, the middle-men through whom raw materials left our country and finished products entered. The compradores had been a weak group under Spain but they grew and flourished under the United States. . . . Owing their fortunes to the operations of imperialism, they became the right-hand men of foreign rule.

The whole process of "training to govern," about which American imperialism has boasted so much in the Philippines, has been built around the training of these groups to govern in the interests of American imperialism. One reason for perpetuating the feudal system of landowning that had functioned under the Spanish regime was to keep the big landlords in power because they were an integral part of the new American pattern of rule.

In the old Spanish universities, as well as in the new University of the Philippines and in the other higher schools of learning established by the Americans, the theory of the "intellectual aristocracy" was driven home to the students. The school system grew less and less adequate the closer down it got to the masses until, in the barrios [villages], it was mere perfunctory instruction. The gap between the educated and the uneducated or poorly educated was a sharply accentuated class difference. In addition, American textbooks were moved from the United States into Philippine schools without a line of revision, regardless of how great a difference existed between the two countries. The sociology of the American big city and of the American rural community was clamped grotesquely upon the mind of the Filipino student, to whom the cacique [rich landlord] and the governor-general were the symbols of authority. . . .

What happened in 1945 was almost a duplication of what had happened in 1898. The American army, on both occasions, landed to find a revolutionary movement fighting against the common enemy. On both occasions they took steps to crush it, and on both occasions they found allies in the exploiting classes of Filipinos. In 1945, however, there was a difference: the revolutionary movement was not led by vacillating elements who would sell it out; it was led by the working class leadership of Communists.

Within three years after the end of the war, the operation of American imperialism had resulted in converting the Hukbalahap guerrilla struggle into a national liberation movement.

At the beginning of our struggle in Central Luzon many observers referred to it as a movement for agrarian reform, just as they had referred in similar terms to the revolutionary movement of the Chinese people. They pointed out that centuries of feudal relations had brought our movement into being. What they said was correct, but they did not carry their observations far enough. They failed to see that our struggle, as well as that of the Chinese people, took place within the setting of imperialist relations. Our feudal agrarian economy was one of the mainstays of imperialist control in our country, and any movement to change it was inevitably bound to conflict with imperialist interests that were determined to perpetuate the age-old system. Our movement, therefore, could not be merely a movement for agrarian reform; it had to develop into a struggle against imperialism. . . .

The final pages of this book are being written in a very small nipa hut, somewhere on the slope of a mountain above the central plain of the island of Luzon. It is a temporary shelter, newly built, and it may have to be abandoned quickly, perhaps today, perhaps this afternoon. Perhaps even as I sit here writing, an alarm will come. The enemy is not far away.

There is no furniture in the hut. I balance my notebook on my knee. The roof is so low that I must bend my head where I sit. Bits of sun come through the branches overhead and through the nipa roof and fall on this page. It is very quiet in the forest. Down the slope, below the hut, I can hear the water on the rocks in the little stream from which we drink. The tuko [bird] calls from the tall trees in the sun. Crickets are chirping incessantly, and frogs sing, deep-voiced. These are the sounds of peace.

They are deceptive. At any time may come the sound of guns.

This hut is big enough to hold five sleeping men, lying close. Its sides are open, so we can roll out fast, if need be. It sits under dense trees, to escape aerial observation. Washed clothes drying in the sun are pulled from sight when a plane is heard. Cooking, when there is something to cook, is done in the early morning and

after dark, so the smoke of the fire will not be seen. To the enemy, from above and below, there must be only the trees. The mountain is a friendly mother sheltering us. . . .

This mere act of sitting on the rough floor of a hut in the forest is not an isolated incident today. It is being duplicated by the armed men of liberation movements in Indo-China, in Indonesia, in Malaya, in Burma, and wherever the masses of Asia are stirring themselves. The facts and the men are everywhere, and towering over them all is the enormous fact of the Chinese people, who have emerged from their mountains, and from their huts in the forests, into the towns and the cities, into their own.

On the corner poles of this hut hang all my possessions: a light, packed knapsack, and a carbine. Both are the unintentional gifts of American imperialism. None among us has more. Something else, however, is ours: the love and comradeship of each other and of thousands more like us in a thousand huts across our country, and of the masses of people to whom we are the hope of the future. That is more than enough to keep alive a man's body and his spirit—indefinitely if necessary.

67

The Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Vietnam

Following the establishment of the new republican regime in Vietnam after the abdication of Bao Dai, the new state formally declared its independence from the French during the period when a power vacuum existed after the collapse of imperial Japan. It was signed at Hanoi by the President of the Republic, Ho Chi Minh, on September 2, 1945, the very day of the Japanese surrender on the battleship Missouri.

"All men are created equal. . . . They are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

These immortal words are from the Declaration of Independ-

ence of the United States of America in 1776. Taken in a broader sense, these phrases mean: "All peoples on earth are born equal; all peoples have the right to live, to be free, to be happy."

The Declaration of the Rights of the Man and Citizen of the French Revolution of 1791 also proclaimed: "Men are born and remain free and with equal rights."

These are undeniable truths.

Nevertheless for more than eighty years the French imperialists, abusing their "liberty, equality, and fraternity," have violated the land of our ancestors and oppressed our countrymen. Their acts are contrary to the ideals of humanity and justice.

In the political domain, they have deprived us of all our liberties.

They have imposed upon us inhuman laws. They have established three different political regimes in the North, the Center, and the South of Viet Nam in order to destroy our historic and ethnic national unity.

They have built more prisons than schools. They have acted without mercy toward our patriots. They have drenched our revolutions in rivers of blood.

They have subjugated public opinion and practiced obscurantism on the broadest scale. They have imposed upon us the use of opium and alcohol to weaken our race.

In the economic domain, they have exploited us without respite, reduced our people to the blackest misery and pitilessly looted our country.

They have despoiled our ricelands, our mines, our forests, our raw materials. They have retained the privilege of issuing banknotes and a monopoly of foreign trade.

They have invented hundreds of unjustified taxes, condemning our countrymen, especially the peasants and small merchants, to extreme poverty.

They have prevented our capital from fructifying; they have exploited our workers in the most barbarous fashion.

Harold R. Isaacs, ed., *New Cycle in Asia: Selected Documents on Major International Developments in the Far East, 1943-1947* (New York: Macmillan for the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1947), pp. 163-165. By permission of the author and W. L. Holland, American Institute of Pacific Relations, University of British Columbia.

In the autumn of 1940 when the Japanese Fascists, with a view to fighting the Allies, invaded Indochina to organize new war bases, the French imperialists, on their knees, surrendered our country.

Since then, under the double Japanese and French yokes, our people have literally bled. The result has been terrifying. From Quangtri to the North, two million of our countrymen died of famine in the first months of this year.

On March 9, 1945, the Japanese disarmed the French troops. Once again, the French either fled or unconditionally surrendered. Thus they have been totally incapable of "protecting" us; on the contrary, in the space of five years they have twice sold our country to the Japanese.

Before March 9, the League of Viet-Minh several times invited the French to join it in struggle against the Japanese. Instead of responding to this appeal, the French struck all the harder at the partisans of the Viet-Minh. They went as far as to murder a large number of the political prisoners at Yen Bay and Caobang during their rout.

Despite all this, our countrymen have continued to maintain a tolerant and human attitude toward the French. After the events of March 9, the League of Viet-Minh helped many Frenchmen to cross the frontier, saved others from Japanese prisons, and besides protected the lives and property of all Frenchmen.

In fact, since the autumn of 1940, our country has ceased to be a French colony and became a Japanese possession.

After the surrender of the Japanese, our entire people rose to regain their sovereignty and founded the democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

The truth is that we seized our independence from the hands of the Japanese and not from the hands of the French.

The French fleeing, the Japanese surrendering, Emperor Bao Dai abdicating, our people broke all the chains which have weighed upon us for nearly a hundred years and made our Viet Nam an independent country. Our people at the same time overthrew the monarchical regime established for tens of centuries and founded the Republic.

For these reasons we, members of the Provisional Government, representing the entire population of Viet Nam, declare that we shall henceforth have no relations with imperialist France, that we cancel all treaties which France has signed on the subject of Viet Nam, that we abolish all the privileges which the French have arrogated to themselves on our territory.

All the people of Viet Nam, inspired by the same will, are determined to fight to the end against any attempt at aggression by the French imperialists.

We are convinced that the Allies who have recognized the principles of equality of peoples at the Conferences of Teheran and San Francisco cannot but recognize the independence of Viet Nam.

A people which has obstinately opposed French domination for more than eighty years, a people who during these last years ranged themselves definitely on the side of the Allies to fight against Fascism, this people has the right to be free. This people must be independent.

For these reasons, we, members of the Provisional Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, solemnly proclaim to the entire world:

Viet Nam has the right to be free and independent and is, in fact, free and independent. All the people of Viet Nam are determined to mobilize all their spiritual and material strength, to sacrifice their lives and property, to safeguard their right to liberty and independence.

Hanoi, September 2, 1945

(Signed) Ho Chi Minh, *President*.

Tran Huy Lieu, Vo Nguyen Giap, Chu Van Tan, Duong Duc Hien, Nguyen Van To, Nguyen Manh Ha, Cu Huy Can, Pham Ngho Thach, Nguyen Van Xuan, Vu Trong Khanh, Pham Van Dong, Dao Trong Kim, Vu Din Hoc, Le Van Hien.

Ho Chi Minh Interprets the Geneva Conference

Founder of the Communist party of Indochina, prominent Comintern agent in Asia, and at one and the same time the most powerful spokesman for Vietnamese nationalism in modern colonial times, Ho Chi Minh (known as Nguyen Ai Quoc in his younger years) became president of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam in September, 1945, and has retained that office in the northern part of the country, temporarily separated at the Geneva Conference of 1954. The following speech, in which Ho obviously tries to render the terms of that Conference acceptable to his followers in the North and South, was pronounced on July 22, 1954.

Compatriots all over the country,
Armymen and cadres,

The Geneva Conference has come to an end. It is a great victory for our diplomacy.

On behalf of the Government, I cordially make the following appeal:

1—For the sake of peace, unity, independence and democracy of the Fatherland, our people, armymen, cadres and government have, during these eight years or so, joined in a monolithic bloc, endured hardship and overcome all difficulties to resolutely carry out the Resistance and have won many brilliant victories. On this occasion, on behalf of the Government, I cordially congratulate you, from North to South. I respectfully bow to the memory of the armymen and people who have sacrificed their lives for the Fatherland, and send my homages of comfort to the wounded and sick armymen.

This great victory is also due to the support given us in our

Ho Chi Minh, *Selected Works* (Hanoi: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1962), Vol. IV, pp. 17–20.

just struggle by the peoples of our brother countries, by the French people and the peace-loving people of the world.

Thanks to these victories and the efforts made by the delegation of the Soviet Union at the Berlin Conference, negotiations were opened between our country and France at the Geneva Conference. At this conference the struggle of our delegation and the assistance given by the delegations of the Soviet Union and China have ended in a great victory for us: the French government has recognized the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of our country; it has agreed to withdraw French troops from our country, etc.

From now on, we must make every effort to consolidate peace and achieve reunification, independence and democracy throughout our country.

2—In order to re-establish peace, the first step to take is that the armed forces of both parties should cease fire.

The regroupment in two regions is a temporary measure; it is a transitional step for the implementation of the armistice and restoration of peace, and paves the way for national reunification through general elections. Regroupment in regions is in no way a partition of our country, neither is it an administrative division.

During the armistice, our army is regrouped in the North; the French troops are regrouped in the South, that is to say, there is a change of regions. A number of regions which were formerly occupied by the French, now become our free zones. Vice versa, a number of regions formerly liberated by us, will now be temporarily occupied by the French troops before they leave for France.

This is a necessity; North, Central and South Viet Nam are territories of ours. Our country will certainly be unified, our entire people will surely be liberated.

Our compatriots in the South were the first to wage the war of Resistance. They possess a high political consciousness. I am confident that they will place national interests above local interests, permanent interests above temporary interests and join their efforts with the entire people in strengthening peace, achieving

unity, independence and democracy all over the country. The Party, Government and I, always follow the efforts of our people and we are sure that our compatriots will be victorious.

3—The struggle to consolidate peace and achieve reunification, independence and democracy, is also a long and hard struggle. In order to carry the day, our people, armymen and cadres from North to South, must unite closely. They must be at one in thought and deed.

We are resolved to abide by the agreements entered into with the French Government. At the same time we demand that the French Government should correctly implement the agreements they have signed with us.

We must do our utmost to strengthen peace, and be vigilant to check the manoeuvres of peace wreckers.

We must endeavour to struggle for the holding of free general elections throughout the country to reunify our territory.

We must exert all our efforts to restore, build, strengthen and develop our forces in every field so as to attain complete independence.

We must do our utmost to carry out social reforms in order to improve our people's livelihood and realize genuine democracy.

We further tighten our fraternal relations with Cambodia and Laos.

We strengthen the great friendship between us and the Soviet Union, China and other brother countries. To maintain peace, we enhance our solidarity with the French people, the Asian people and people all over the world.

4—I call on all our compatriots, armymen and cadres to strictly follow the lines and policies laid down by the Party and Government, to struggle for the consolidation of peace, and the achievement of national reunification, independence and democracy throughout the country.

I eagerly appeal to all genuine patriots, irrespective of their social class, creed, political stand and former affiliation, sincerely to co-operate with us and fight for the sake of our country and our people so as to bring about peace and achieve reunification, independence and democracy for our beloved Viet Nam.

If our people are as one, if thousands of men are like one, victory will certainly be ours.

Long live a peaceful, unified, independent and democratic Viet Nam.

69

Problems of Nation-Building in Independent Burma

Aung San (1914–1947), politically active in the Thakin Movement in British Burma, became commander of the Burma Independence Army and founder of the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League. He was the first Prime Minister of the Union of Burma, but on July 19, 1947, he, together with several of his cabinet colleagues, was assassinated in Rangoon. The document presents excerpts from his address to a public meeting in Rangoon, six days before his death.

A FEW PAINFUL TRUTHS

This meeting was originally convened so that we might report, as members of the Constituent Assembly, to you as electors, on what we have so far accomplished in the Assembly. It is the traditional practice in a parliamentary democracy for a member to go back to his electors, when a session is over, and report on progress and events.

Even though we were elected in April, we became the Constituent Assembly only on the 10th June, when the session started in due form. This is an Assembly which is unique in our history, for we are writing the constitution of independent Burma, and even though in strict law the Assembly does not enjoy sovereign powers, it is going through the process of creating a sovereign nation. Our present status in strict law is complicated, but the important thing is that we are moving on to our goal.

I am a great one for uttering the brutal truth, or the painful

Maung Maung, ed., *Aung San of Burma* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1962), pp. 139–142. By permission of the publisher.

truth, as Thakin Nu calls it. He has warned me occasionally that I should refrain from uttering these truths too frequently. But I have some to utter today; I am so full of them, I cannot contain them, and I only wish I had the time to tell them all.

Independence is coming, but it is not going to bring a heaven on earth. Some of you may dream fondly that once we are independent, there will not be the need to work, and the good things will spout out of the earth to take as you wish. That is not so.

Our people are inclined to believe that independence would mean a free-for-all. I remember visiting Henzada during the war, during the believe-it-or-not-independence that we had then. I saw people putting out tobacco leaves in the streets to dry, obstructing traffic. They thought they were independent and could do what they liked. That is not what independence means; liberty is not license.

In a free country the people must be free to develop their individual personality and follow their own occupations in free and equal opportunity, but they must not infringe on the freedom and the rights of others.

You must also remember that you cannot have something for nothing in life. You have to work and earn what you want. You may dream of a new state like the Soviet Union, like America, or England, but dreams will not bring you the new state, you must work and build it.

Years of toil lie ahead of you. Maybe 20 years, at the least, will pass before you see the fruits of your toil. You must work with perseverance, with unity and discipline, always conscious of your duties as citizens of a free country. Rights carry responsibilities; you cannot enjoy the rights without discharging the responsibilities.

Britain is an inspiring example. We may not like the British, because they have been our rulers, but they do show many qualities as a nation which we must admire. How they fought, with back to the wall, during the war, and now after they have won they are still having to go through severe austerity, to rebuild their economy Britain makes a lot of things, but at this point the country needs to sell them abroad, and her own people have

to produce while denying themselves those goods. We too must plan our economy for the long future and persevere with our plans. There is no substitute for work.

We must build and preserve unity between the peoples in our country, people of the frontier areas and other peoples, and in unity we must work together to build our national strength. Without unity and strength, independence will be meaningless; the nation will be weak and vulnerable, whichever party may be in office. Behave like the lion, I therefore say. The lion, the king of the forest, exerts his full strength in hunting down his prey, however small or big the animal may be. We must all, therefore, put forth our very best in our endeavours to build the new nation.

Our people lack stamina and the sporting spirit. I watched a boat race during the war at Bassein; the winning crew relaxed, put up their oars and started to sing their victory songs even before the goal was reached. The crew behind could have exerted and put up a good fight then, but no, they relaxed too, giving up before the race was over. That, I thought, was a national trait. In football games the losers like to play foul, kick and break the limbs of their opponents, instead of putting up a good clean fight in the proper sporting spirit. We must mend our ways.

You have to go abroad and study the lives of other peoples to discover how lax we have been. I visited Japan during the war and saw how their peoples took hardship and self-denial in their war effort. They did not have enough to eat or to wear. I thought, at that time, that perhaps their economic system was at fault to cause such hardship to the people. But I was in India after the war, and there also people had to take restrictions in many ways. One could not entertain more than 24 people to dinner; food was rationed. The same situation prevailed in Britain. In Burma we are lavish; we eat what we want and throw away the rest. There is a lot of wastage, but agricultural production is down, and rice is being looted by lawless gangs in the bargain. Political tensions have eased now, but there is general lawlessness, these lootings and dacoities and destruction, and all patriotic citizens should unite to put them down.

There is a lot of nation-building to be done, and you must remember that you are building over the ashes of the war. Everywhere, we are behind, and to catch up with the world we must work far harder than other nations. Some say we should improve our education by introducing free compulsory education; make laws for that, they say. But what good are laws if we do not have the money, the teachers and the men. It will take another 20 years of persistent effort to turn out the teachers, to build the schools in every village, and have compulsory education.

Then have a look at defence. Every citizen must give his service in the defence forces. Under British rule people got into the habit of thinking that the government would do the needful, and if anything went wrong they could blame the government. That is not the spirit in which you can build a free country. The needs for the defence of Burma are stupendous. We do not have an adequate Army, Air Force or Navy, and with the forces that we have we cannot stand against a modern enemy even for a few hours. The defence expenditure will be heavy if we want our defence to be adequate, and you have to remember that when we are tested here and there by aggressive powers we must be able to reply in no uncertain terms.

All these lead us back to this: you must work hard, be united and disciplined. Otherwise, the fruits of freedom will not be yours to enjoy, whether you have a Communist government or a Socialist government. You must mend your ways and build a New Burma together. These words I leave with you today.

70

Malayan Independence

Malayan political integration has been gradual and peaceful, from the British-created Federated Malay States in 1895 to the Federation of Malaya, established in 1948 and, ultimately, to the independent Federation proclaimed in August, 1957. In marked contrast to the revolutionary anticolonialism that

accompanied independence in many other parts of Southeast Asia, Prime Minister Tengku Abdul Rahman's speech, reprinted below, is a graphic expression of a moderate, evolutionary nationalism. The speech was made at the proclamation of independence in Kuala Lumpur on August 31, 1957.

Your Majesties, Your Royal Highnesses, Your Highnesses, Your Excellencies, People of Persekutuan Tanah Melayu [Federation of Malaya]:

I am indeed proud that on this, the greatest day in Malaya's history, it falls to my lot to proclaim the formal independence of this country. Today a new page is turned, and Malaya steps forward to take her rightful place as a free and independent partner in the great community of Nations—a new nation is born and though we fully realize that difficulties and problems lie ahead, we are confident that, with the blessing of God, these difficulties will be overcome and that today's events, down the avenues of history, will be our inspiration and our guide. It is therefore with a feeling of particular solemnity that we have listened to the eloquent words of His Royal Highness and in particular to the moving message he has conveyed from Her Majesty the Queen. We are indeed honoured that Her Majesty should have deputed her own uncle, His Royal Highness, to be with us on this occasion particularly when we remember that he is no stranger to this land: we recall too with pleasure his previous visit to Malaya and happy recollections of his stay have remained with us.

His Royal Highness has spoken in moving words of the past associations of our two countries. We in Malaya have a long history, but we do not lightly forget old relationships. For many years past our fortunes have been linked with those of Great Britain and we recall in particular the comradeship of two world wars. We remember too the products of our association; justice before the law, the legacy of an efficient public service and the highest standard of living in Asia. We shall therefore always remember

Text from the government of the Federation of Malaya.

with gratitude the assistance which we have received from Great Britain down our long path to nationhood; an assistance which culminates today with the proclamation of Malaya's Independence. But the long standing friendship between our countries does not cease with independence: rather it takes on a new form. As you have heard in the gracious message from Her Majesty the Queen, Malaya will henceforward take her place in the great Commonwealth of Independent Nations whose members are found in all parts of the world, and as an equal partner in that great association. We in this country will do all in our power to promote its wellbeing in the interests of mankind in general and in the particular service of world peace.

Thus today a new chapter opens in our relationship with Britain; our colonial status has given place to full equality but we are confident that, fortified by old associations, and linked by old memories, our ties with Britain will grow ever stronger and more durable. Britain will ever find in us her best friend, and it is a source of much gratification to my Government that British civil servants will continue to serve in this country to assist us in the solution of the many problems which independence will present.

But while we think of the past, we look forward in faith and hope to the future; from henceforth we are masters of our destiny, and the welfare of this beloved land is our own responsibility. Let no one think we have reached the end of the road: independence is indeed a milestone, but is only the threshold to high endeavour—the creation of a new and sovereign State. At this solemn moment therefore I call upon you all to dedicate yourselves to the service of the new Malaya: to work and strive with hand and brain to create a new nation, inspired by the ideals of justice and liberty—a beacon of light in a disturbed and distracted world.

High confidence has been reposed in us; let us unitedly face the challenge of the years. And so with remembrance for the past, and with confidence in the future, under the providence of God, we shall succeed.

71

Thai Foreign Policy in the 1960s

Ever since the end of the Second World War, Thailand has steered a decidedly pro-Western course in international affairs, playing a prominent role in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), whose headquarters are located in the Thai capital. This document consists of excerpts from the translation of an address to the Thai armed forces, delivered by the Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces, Field Marshal Thanom Kittikachorn, Prime Minister of Thailand, on November 8, 1964.

The strength of the Armed Forces is recognized by all civilized nations to be not only the dignity of a free nation but also the staying power determining foreign policy as well as national defence.

Only independent nations can possess military strength and the Armed Forces. Thailand has its own Armed Forces that have played an important role in safeguarding the country's independence for several hundred years. Brave warriors of old made to their credit a great impression in our military history.

It is, therefore, national pride that all servicemen should gratify [rejoice?] as long as they have the Armed Forces of their own with the illustrious record of our ancestors. It is also for you, my fellow Thais, who are patriots holding national independence so dear, to give your country's Armed Forces every support deserving the dignity of the independent country.

The dominant policy of this Government regards the safeguarding of national independence and sovereignty of vital importance. It is the life and death of the nation necessitating constant guard

Thanom Kittikachorn, "Importance of Armed Forces to Free Nations," *SEATO Record* (Bangkok), Vol. III (December, 1964), pp. 40–41.

and not a moment's relaxation. For once we lose our independence, we shall not be able to carry out national development and shall be deprived of personal freedom and happiness. . . .

At present the deadliest enemy of Thailand is Communism. This is because through the use of force the Communists are endeavouring to impose their evil policies on the free nations. Their forces of aggression and the tactics of infiltration and subversion are the courses of action they primarily resort to.

Communist aggression in South-East Asia has once again become an active problem. Laos and South Vietnam are already in the thick of battle. Although direct aggression against Thailand has not yet taken place, the presence of Communist forces in the vicinity is the immediate threat to our security because of the close proximity of the countries involved.

Already, we have had some infiltration and subversion by the Communists in Thailand, which appears to be increasing despite strong counter-measures by the Government. This looming danger which is besetting Thailand every moment cannot be scorned or laughed at. The current situation in our neighboring countries and the crisis after crisis occurring here and there are most unfavourable and must be coped with.

We traditionally mark this day an important day in our profession of arms when members of the three Services assemble to take the oath before the colours. I would like to take the opportunity to call upon all my fellow servicemen and my fellow citizens to strengthen our efforts in guarding against and eliminating this ever-impending danger. I ask you all to bind in harmonious unity in our service of the nation and to be careful not to allow internal rivalry to divide us as that would be detrimental to national security.

The history of Thailand shows that if and when we remain dedicated to unity, no other aggressive nations can deprive us of our freedom and independence. This valuable lesson which our ancestors established with patriotic sacrifice must not be forgotten. . . .

Men-at-arms like you who guard this beloved land of ours must always be on the alert and be prepared. Yours is the pro-

fession of arms and you are trained to fight and to defend your country. In your training you must acquire combat experience as much as you can in order to be ready for any eventuality. Always bear in mind that combat readiness is the only guarantee for the safeguarding of our country. To be qualified for this task, you must be courageous, well-trained, well-informed, in good physical condition and well-disciplined, and must stand ever prepared to truly lay down your lives for your motherland and the Throne. By so doing you are upholding the true hallmarks of the Armed Forces of Thailand and following in your illustrious ancestors' footsteps.

As for myself I pledge my word to you, officers and men of His Majesty's Forces, that if and when our Thai nation is imperiled, you will readily find me in close company with you personally in the struggle for freedom. Only death that ensues can detach me from you at that difficult time, but national independence must be upheld above every other consideration even at the cost of our lives.

In my capacity as your Supreme Commander I most heartily welcome all of you who have taken the oath before the colours today to the glorious company of the nation's warriors. I am confident that you will keep your words of allegiance like the sacred oaths, and maintain unity and harmony among your companions with no discrimination against any of the three Services.