

10/14/65

Copyright by Jack Minnis,
1965.

Like lots of other people in the Great Society, we've been trying to figure out just what is going on in Indonesia. We're particularly intrigued because we remember that, just a few months ago the Indonesia Government took away from the Standard Oil Co., and Texaco, their vast holdings in oil reserves in that country. It has not been the practice of U.S. corporations to take such matters lightly, and we've been wondering if maybe the corporations are changing--maybe they're beginning to recognize that there's some justification for the government of a foreign country wanting to exploit its natural resources for the benefit of its own people. We hadn't come to any conclusion yet, mind you. We were just wondering.

We've been reading the news dispatches, and the news analysts closely, about the Indonesian affair. We notice two things worth considering. First, the news reports indicate a high degree of satisfaction among U.S. policy makers with the turn of affairs in Indonesia. Max Frankel, in the New York Times reports: "The Johnson Administration believes that a dramatic new opportunity has developed both for anti-Communist Indonesias and for United States / read oil companies' and other commercial interests / policies following the 10 days of turmoil in Indonesia."

Second, in all the press explanations that the uprising was an attempted coup by the Communist Party, there is a point where the reasoning breaks down. It seems that the coup was lead by Lt. Colonel Untung, an officer in Sukarno's bodyguard. Stanley Karnow, in the Washington Post, admits that "what motivated Untung... is still murky." Karnow, in the same article, reports that "Indonesia's top Communists were not involved in the Untung maneuver" and that "Jakarta youths broke Communist discipline when they joined the uprising." In a later story Karnow comments that "through a strange turn of events, the Communists have suffered a stunning setback.... the Communists are paying for an unsuccessful uprising that, from all available evidence, their leadership neither instigated nor directed. Essentially they seem to be victims of a curious breakdown in their party's discipline." Frankel's report in the New York Times says that "Communists and their sympathizers were prominent among those named / by Untung / to a short-lived revolutionary council--though probably without their permissions."

Thus the experts who insist that the Communists tried to overthrow Sukarno and the Army, have to admit that

none of the top Party leaders were involved in the action and they also have to admit that something mysterious was afoot--"strange turn of events", etc. Furthermore, it's difficult to find a reason why the Party would have attempted a coup at this time. The former U.S. Ambassador to Indonesia reported last Sunday in the Washington Post that the party had been becoming steadily more powerful under Sukarno, that it controlled the labor unions, that, in short, the Party was doing pretty well with things as they were.

This adds another element of mystery to the theory that the coup was an attempt to take over by the Communist Party-- why would they have resorted to force, when they were making such progress without it? The Ambassador reasons that maybe Sukarno is sick, and soon to be replaced, and that the Party may have felt it would steal a march on its arch-enemy the Army, by acting as it did. With all due respect to the Ambassador, we think this is pretty thin reasoning. The Ambassador himself admits that reports of Sukarno's illness may not be accurate. And he's very careful to hedge his theory with plenty of "if's" and provisos, as well he might be, for there is simply no reason to suppose that the Party, if it is worried about the superior firepower of the Army in a future battle for political control, could not want to put the battle off as long as possible to enable it to assemble adequate weaponry.

Then, there is another matter. Whoever is behind the attempted coup must have known that the killing of the six generals of the Indonesia general staff under particularly brutal conditions would give the Army great public justification for moving with great vigor against whoever it said was behind the coup. The great political prowess which all observers attribute to the Communist Party leaders in Indonesia seems to indicate that they'd have had more sense than to give their major opposition such a weapon to use against them with the public. At last reports the Army had rounded up more than a thousand top Communist Party leaders and had encouraged mobs to burn the public buildings of the Party, as well as the homes of the leaders.)

So, considering the evidence that is available to the ordinary reader of newspapers, who, under our system of "democracy" is supposed to be able to pass judgment on the conduct of public affairs by our elected officials, there seems little reason to believe that the Communist Party was actually behind the coup. But, then, who was.

We can think of one explanation for all the mystery, but we've seen no mention of it in the public prints. Suppose--just suppose mind you--that Lyndon decided Indonesia is just too important, both because of its

strategic position in Southeast Asia, and because of its great wealth of natural resources, to be turned over to its people. Suppose, again, that the Central Intelligence Agency was informed, through the proper channels, that His Majesty was displeased with the way things were going in Indonesia--Sukarno so cordial toward the Communist Party, and so belligerent toward the American Oil Companies, so friendly toward China, and so disdainful of American aid. Suppose the CIA, knowing its masters' displeasure, devised a plan for either paying off or making a fool of Untung and an assortment of other Indonesia finks and malcontents. Suppose, then, Untung and the others, acting on the advice and with the support of the CIA, staged the coup, slaughtered the generals, published the names of a revolutionary council composed mostly of members of the Communist Party, and then departed for exile with a nice bag of loot supplied by the CIA (or, perhaps, got turned over to the Army after they'd done the dirty work for Lyndon). Suppose this is what happened--would it explain things any better than does the theory that the Communist Party, acting against its every conceivable political interest, staged a coup that could not possibly succeed.

We think so.

In his book about the CIA, Allen Dulles pointed out that the press is not really fair to the CIA, because its successes never get reported, but its failures (like the Cuban invasion) always get lots of publicity. We suspect this may be a CIA operation that succeeded.

*

*

*

Some time ago we reported on the battle which Litton Industries, the great west coast builder of armaments, is waging against poverty. The company runs a job corps project for Lyndon at Pleasanton, California. It's training the impoverished youth of the nation in how to do the kind of electronic work it needs done in its many plants. It's also training some of the youth to cook. It seems that some of the top people in the Great Society have trouble finding cooks to prepare and serve the family meals. Litton Industries and Lyndon are determined to remedy this situation. Litton put on a show the other day, by having some of the lads it has taught how to cook perform for the rich ladies of the San Francisco area who might be looking for a domestic chef. The next day the lads served 30 University of California educators a meal and on October 27 they will prepare a luncheon for members of the Rotary Club at Stockton, Calif. Then, on November 3, the boys will get a real treat. They'll be allowed to prepare a meal for 200 of the nation's top businessmen.

Lyndon's war on poverty--giving the poor an opportunity to serve the rich.

* * *

And another thing came out about the war on poverty the other day. It seems Sargent Shriver has been paying money to professional writers to write articles about the War and Shriver troops for publication in various magazines. The writers whom Shriver hired with the money he's supposed to be using to fight poverty, were particularly assigned to providing answer to articles that were written to criticize the war on poverty.

When the poor finally to decide to fight their own war on poverty, we have no doubt it'll be some different from Lyndon's war. For one thing, the poor won't have nearly the trouble seeing who the real enemy is--not poverty, but wealth. When the poor start fighting their own poverty-war, Lyndon and Shriver won't be running it. They'll be running from it.

* * *

Back in July we reported that Olin Mathieson Chemical Co. was involved in defrauding the U.S. Government on some contracts for supplying certain drugs to our "Government" in Vietnam. Olin Mathieson admitted it was guilty. Just the other day the company was fined \$30,000 in Federal Court for the offense. Thus America's sense of justice was satisfied. The thief had been caught in the act, admitted his guilt, and had been punished.

Or had he?

Lyndon had also filed a civil suit against Olin Mathieson, in an attempt, it was said, to recover the money Olin Mathieson had gotten from the fraud. Lyndon's boys were suing Olin Mathieson for \$5,000,000, which they said had been stolen from the U.S. taxpayers through the fraud. On September 28, Lyndon's boys agreed to settle with Olin Mathieson, out of court, if the company would repay \$263,000 of the \$5,000,000 they said to have stolen. If you add the \$30,000 fine to the \$263,000 Olin Mathieson agreed to pay back, you get a total of \$293,000 which Lyndon got back, of the \$5,000,000 he said Olin Mathieson stole.

That leaves Olin Mathieson with a net profit of \$4,707,000 on the fraud. Furthermore, just a week before the \$30,000 fine was imposed on Olin Mathieson, the company was given a contract by Lyndon's army to supply \$4,574,574 worth of ammunition for the U.S. troops in South Vietnam.

Fraud and war and profit. The three foundations stones upon which Lyndon builds the great society.

* * *

If we believed the propaganda which keeps spewing forth from the Justice Department, and particularly from the FBI, we'd believe that the Justice Department is the great bulwark against arbitrary police action, the great protector of the rights of the citizens against the police of the state. Can we believe it? Look.

On October 4 Katzenbach was in Miami to speak before the convention of the International Association of Police Chiefs. He announced to the assembled fascists the good news that the FBI academy was expanding its facilities for training state and local policemen in the gentle arts of law enforcement. He said, hereafter, J. Edgar would be able to handle 1200 cops a year, instead of just 200.

Katzenbach told the Chiefs that Lyndon insists that the Justice Department "bring the resources of the federal government more sharply to bear on the problems of the patrolman on the beat, in the criser, or in the precinct station." The "resources" he was talking about were, of course, the FBI training facilities.

A good example of what the local and state cops will be trained to do was provided just three days after the speech in District Court in Washington, D.C. The judge told the FBI that certain evidence it was introducing in the trial of a man accused of murder could not be admitted because FBI agents "intimidated / the defendant / into letting them search his apartment without a warrant."

The FBI, says Katzenbach, is going to spend \$14,000,000 training local and state cops next year. Our experience with these cops has been that they don't need any training in how to intimidate people. We think Katzenbach and Lyndon and J. Edgar would better serve those whom they represent if they spent the \$14,000,000 on tear gas, cattle prods, police dogs, machine guns and the rest of the stuff they need to keep those who own the Great Society in power.

* * *

Last October 7, General Harold K. Johnson, Lyndon's Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, was speaking to the 22nd annual lunch meeting of the National Security Industrial Association, an outfit composed of the representatives of the big business of the country. The Association is one of the specific monsters Eisenhower was talking

about when he warned, back in 1960 about the military-industrial complex taking over.

General Johnson reported to the gathered industrialists that "Since 1961 the Army alone has invested over nine billion dollars in weapons, equipment, ammunition and other supplies." And, he assured these merchants of death with whom most of the nine billion dollars had been spent, more loot is in sight for them. "To support the war in Vietnam and other commitments," said General Johnson, "the Administration has asked Congress for an additional two billion, four hundred million dollars.

The general reviewed the performance of some of the more outstanding items of equipment the members of the Association have supplied for the Army. One of these was the "M-79 grenade launcher which allows the soldier to place accurately with lethal effect a fragmentation-type shell out to a distance of about 400 meters." a fragmentation-type shell, of course, is the kind which is made up of an explosive core encased by a metal jacket. The metal jacket is designed to split into many tiny, sharp-edged pieces, when the core explodes. These tiny fragments are very effective at ripping, tearing and slicing through human flesh--"with lethal effect."

General Johnson wound up his speech by informing the weapons makers that "the Army must be prepared for missions unlimited, and if we are to continue to fulfill these missions with the best equipment obtainable, we will continue to need the assistance of the members of the National Security Industrial Association."

The General said he thought it appropriate to repeat the words of Winston Churchill:
"Give us the tools and we will finish the job."

We thought of that recent Army operation in Vietnam which involved 4,000 U.S. soldiers, equipped with all those magnificent weapons supplied by the Association members. At the end of the day's work they had to show for their efforts this: One dead pregnant woman, whom one of General Johnson's soldiers had found cowering in a hole in the ground. He finished the job, just as General Johnson promised.

Jack Minnis

October 14, 1965