

Digital Press Social Sciences and Humanities

---

Escape from the Cold War Mindset to Set Up a Post-Cold  
War History of Philosophy

*Ferry Hidayat*

Proceeding of 10th International Conference on Nusantara Philosophy (ICNP)

Risalatul Hukmi, Ranga Kala Mahaswa, M. Rodinal Khair Khasri, Putu  
Pradnya Lingga D. (eds)

# Escape from the Cold War Mindset to Set Up a Post-Cold War History of Philosophy

Ferry Hidayat

Pusat Kajian Filsafat "Darul Hikmah", Pondok Modern Tazakka, Batang, Central Java, Indonesia

e-mail: [ferryhidayat1973@mail.ugm.ac.id](mailto:ferryhidayat1973@mail.ugm.ac.id)

## Abstract

In the pre-Independence era, our republic founders held the Cold War mindset strongly. Consequently, the Indonesian republic proclaimed in 1945 was based on a Cold War mindset; our state philosophy (*Pancasila*) and the Constitution (*UUD '45*) were understood and construed on the Cold War discourse basis; and binary oppositions of capitalism-socialism and liberalism-communism since then have been created. Up to the 2020s, the Cold War mindset has still been held by public intellectuals and the binary oppositions have still been rampant in intellectual discourses. If the mindset were still held for three decades to come, it would cause a setback to the development of Indonesian philosophy history. This article is a call to stop and an invitation to escape from the retrogressive mindset. As a call, the article exposes first the evil root of the Cold War mindset as well as the philosophical critique towards it. Then, as an invitation, it suggests three realistic alternative mindsets to replace the Cold War mindset, i.e. post-Cold War capitalistic mindset, deconstructive mindset, and utopian mindset, which are called herein as three growth scenarios. It is believed that, if the three generating scenarios are followed, they will move Indonesian philosophy history forward, and its ongoing development will not hinder or retard.

## Keywords

capitalism, Cold War, Cold War mindset, communism, scenario of philosophical growth, word play

## 1 Introduction

What is 'the Cold War mindset'? It is a tendency of seeing that the world is divided in two conflicting blocs, either a capitalist bloc or a communist bloc, and the one bloc is wrong and the other is right. Initially, the tendency was born out of the Cold War between America and the Soviet Union which had lasted since the 1920s, yet later it was widespread and globalized when America and the Soviet Union both competed to win political support and philosophical validation from the countries all over the world, including Indonesia.

Since the 1920s through the 1960s, Soekarno (1901-1970), Mohammad Hatta (1902-1980), Sutan Sjahrir (1909-1966), Tan Malaka (1897-1949), and Semaoen (1899-1971) had begun to hold the Cold War mindset, thinking that the wrong bloc was the capitalist bloc and the right bloc was the communist one. Meanwhile, since the 1960s through these days, Soeharto (1921-2008), Ali Moertopo (1924-1984), and Leonardus Benyamin Moerdani (1932-2004) had thought that the wrong bloc was the communist bloc and the right bloc was the capitalist one. This mindset never thinks or dreams of the possibility of transcending the two blocs; it even perpetuates the dualism in all intellectual discourses.

Chronologically, Semaoen is the first philosopher in Indonesian history of philosophy to hold the Cold War mindset. Five years later, Tan Malaka in his pamphlet *Naar de Republiek Indonesia* (1925) also expressed his Cold War mindset. Five years later, Soekarno wrote in his *Indonesia Menggugat* (1930), expressing his Cold War mindset. Three years afterwards, Soekarno emphasized his Cold War mindset in his *Mencapai Indonesia Merdeka* (1933). Twelve years later in his speech before the Preparatory Committee of Independence (BPUPKI) on 1 June 1945, Soekarno included his Cold War mindset in the formulation of the state philosophy, *Pancasila*. Mohammad Hatta held the Cold War mindset when he

included a socialist concept of cooperative into the Constitution of Indonesia (*UUD '45*). Thirteen years later, during his presidency period, Soekarno continued to hold his Cold War mindset.

Since Soeharto's presidency period in the 1970s through the 1990s, the Cold War mindset had been retained, yet the pendulum swung to the other bloc: from hatred of capitalism to hatred of communism, and from the love of communism to the love of capitalism.

## 2 Methods

There are three things which the present writer did for this article: (1) identifying and discovering the Cold War mindset in books and pamphlets written by Indonesian philosophers throughout the Indonesian philosophy history; (2) arguing that the perpetuating mindset is a setback to the development of Indonesian philosophy history so that escape from it is deemed urgent and so critical; (3) constructing three alternative scenarios of philosophical growth which function to replace the Cold War mindset and to keep the Indonesian philosophy history going. For all the three activities, there are three methods employed.

*First*, to identify and discover the Cold War mindset in the books he studied, the present writer collected all the primary sources written by the republic founders, used his own *Sketsa Sejarah Filsafat Indonesia* (2004) as a guidebook, paid a special and thorough attention on the propositions the republic founders created, read all attentively, and collected findings out of the reading.

*Second*, to argue that the Cold War mindset is a setback to the development of Indonesian philosophy history, the present writer used his reading of Odd Arne Westad's *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (2007) as an interpretation guide to interpret the findings he collected in the first activity. He also employed his understanding of ontology, epistemology and axiology to evaluate the validity of the Cold War mindset, using contemporary reality of the Post-Cold War world.

*Finally*, to construct three alternative philosophical growth scenarios which replace the obsolete Cold War mindset, the present writer made a good use of his understanding of capitalistic production of philosophy out of his reading of I. Frolov's *Dictionary of Philosophy* (1984), his understanding of Jacques Derrida's *Glac* (1986), and his understanding of Patrick Hughes' *More on Oxymoron* (1984). His reading of I. Frolov's *Dictionary of Philosophy* is useful to set up a following-the-current scenario; his understanding of Jacques Derrida's *Glac* is beneficial to set up a deconstructive scenario; while his understanding of Patrick Hughes' *More on Oxymoron* benefits to set up a utopian scenario.

## 3 Results and Discussion

The research on the books written by our republic founders showed that they held the Cold War mindset strongly. As an illustration, in 1920 Semaoen in his *Penoentoen Kaoem Boeroeh* wrote:

*... kelas kapitalis masih terus saja mencari keuntungan dengan merugikan kelas rakyat jelata dan kaum buruh. Kelas kapitalis masih berkuasa dan memainkan harga barang-barang yang dibutuhkan rakyat dan kaum buruh. Mereka dapat berbuat apa saja karena mereka mempunyai pabrik-pabrik, menguasai perdagangan, sepur-sepur dan sebagainya. Mereka mempunyai peralatan (modal, uang, mesin, dan sebagainya), membuat barang, dan memproduksi bermacam-macam bahan makanan. Jadi meskipun rakyat dan kaum buruh dapat meningkatkan pengaruhnya dalam pemerintahan, namun selama kelas kapitalis masih mempunyai modal, pabrik, tanah dan sebagainya, maka selama itu pula kaum kapitalis tetap berkuasa. Oleh karena itu kelas rakyat jelata dan kaum buruh harus berusaha agar alat-alat, modal, pabrik, mesin, tanah, dan sebagainya itu jatuh ke tangan pemerintah yang bersemangat kerakyatan, yang dipilih oleh dan dari rakyat, agar semua perusahaan dan perdagangan dapat diurus oleh pemerintah. Usaha-usaha ini dinamakan Sosialisme atau Komunisme.*

*Jadi sosialisme itu bermaksud menghilangkan semua kelas borjuis. Semua rakyat supaya "bekerja" pada pemerintahan. Sedangkan pemerintah harus dipilih oleh*

*rakyat. Dengan begitu maka tidak ada orang yang dapat memeras orang yang lainnya, karena semua orang bekerja bersama-sama sehingga di dunia ini ada "surga" untuk semua umat manusia, semua bangsa, dan semua agama. Semua hidup rukun, tidak ada yang berebut rezeki. Negara dikepalai oleh wakil-wakil pilihan rakyat, sehingga tampak seperti suatu keluarga yang dipimpin oleh orang tua sendiri, sehingga sama halnya dengan badan sendiri. Inilah yang dinamakan Sosialisme atau Komunisme, dan orang-orang yang bergerak di dalamnya disebut Sosialis atau Komunis. Menurut semua politik atau gerakan yang bertindak untuk kemuliaan dan bermanfaat bagi kelas proletar dan kaum buruh, surga dunia selama ini hanya untuk kelas borjuis saja. Politik kaum borjuis yang memusuhi tujuan gerakan sosialisme atau menjauhkan tercapainya maksud dari kelompok sosialis itu menghambat gerakan kaum buruh atas nama "cinta kebangsaan" (nasionalisme). Hanya politik sosialisme yang akan dapat menggerakkan rakyat Indonesia mencapai kemerdekaannya untuk memerintah negaranya sendiri dan membagi secara adil pendapatan negara. Hanya politik sosialisme yang akan menolong rakyat jelata dan kaum buruh. Semua manusia yang mengetahui kebaikan serta kemuliaan orang yang hidup, tentu setuju dan harus turut serta membantu gerakan sosialisme (Semaoen, 1920).*

(... the capitalist class is still seeking profits at the expense of the laypeople and the working class. The capitalist class is still in power and plays on the price of goods needed by the people and workers. They can do anything because they own the factories, control the trade, own the trains and so on. They own the equipment (capital, money, machines, and so on), manufacture goods, and produce various kinds of foodstuffs. Even though the people and workers can increase their influence in the government, the capitalist class still owns capital, factories, land and so on; hence, the capitalists remain in power. Therefore, the class of the laypeople and the working class must make every effort so that these tools, capital, factories, machines, land, and so on, fall into the hands of a government that is people-minded, elected by and from the people, so that all business and trade can be managed by government. These attempts were called Socialism or Communism.

Socialism aims at eliminating all bourgeois classes. All the people are to "work" for the government. Meanwhile, the government must be elected by the people. That way, no one can exploit other people, because everyone works together to create a "paradise" in this world for all mankind, all nations, and all religions. Everyone lives in harmony, no one fights over sustenance. The state is led by representatives elected by the people, so that it looks like a family led by their own parents; hence, it is the same as their own body. This is Socialism or Communism, and the people who struggle to erect this kind of state are called Socialists or Communists. So far, all political parties or social movements which have been working for the sake of the glory and benefit of the proletariat and the working class claim that heaven on earth is only for the bourgeoisie. In fact, it is the politics of the bourgeoisie hostile to the goals of the socialist movement or distances the achievement of the goals of the socialist group which impedes the movement of the workers in the name of "love of the nation" (nationalism). Only the politics of socialism will be able to direct the Indonesian people to achieve their independence, to govern their own country, and to distribute state revenues fairly. Only the politics of socialism will help the laypeople and the workers. All humans who know the goodness and nobility of people on the move, of course, agree and must participate in helping the socialist movement.)

Then, in 1925 Tan Malaka expressed his Cold War mindset in his pamphlet *Naar de Republiek Indonesia*:

*Jika kita bayangkan kapitalisme sebagai satu gedung dan negeri-negeri di dunia adalah tiang-tiang yang mendukung gedung itu, maka Indonesia merupakan salah satu dari tiang-tiang itu. Kita mengetahui sebelumnya bahwa cepat atau lambat gedung itu sekali waktu akan runtuh seluruhnya. Akan tetapi wujud dan luas*

*runtuhnya serta cara bagaimana runtuhnya, hanya praktek yang akan menentukan. Sangat mungkin bahwa semua tiang akan serentak tumbang dan bersama-sama dengan itu juga robohlah seluruh bangunan. Akan tetapi mungkin juga bahwa tiang-tiang itu tidak tumbang serentak, tetapi berurutan, tiap-tiap kali tiang tumbang membawa sebagian dari bangunan itu roboh.... Dan jaman baru menyingsing, dimana obor komunis selanjutnya akan membimbing rakyat Indonesia yang muda ke arah tujuan yang paling akhir: KEMERDEKAAN, KEBUDAYAAN DAN KEBAHAGIAAN BAGI SEMUA RAKYAT DI DUNIA (Malaka, 1987).*

(If we imagine capitalism as a building and the countries of the world are the pillars that support the building, then Indonesia is one of the pillars. We know in advance that sooner or later the building will completely collapse at some point. However, manifestation and extent of the collapse and how it collapses, only praxis will determine. It is very probable that all the pillars will fall at once and with it the whole building. But it is also possible that the pillars do not fall all at once, but successively; each time a pillar falls, bringing part of the building to the ground... And a new era will dawn, in which the torch of communism would henceforth guide the young Indonesian people towards their ultimate goals: FREEDOM, PROSPERITY AND HAPPINESS FOR ALL PEOPLE IN THE WORLD.)

Next, in 1930 Soekarno wrote in his *Indonesia Menggugat*, expressing his Cold War mindset:

*Imperialisme-modern, —imperialisme-modern yang kini merajalela di seluruh benua dan kepulauan Asia dan yang kini kami musuhi itu, —imperialisme-modern itu adalah anak kapitalisme-modern (Soekarno, 1930).*

(Modern-imperialism—the imperialism which has been recently rampant throughout the continents and islands of Asia and which we are now hostile to—is a child of modern-capitalism.)

Soekarno also emphasized his Cold War mindset in his *Mencapai Indonesia Merdeka* (1933):

*Maksud pergerakan kita haruslah: suatu masyarakat yang adil dan sempurna, yang tidak ada tindasan dan hisapan, yang tidak ada kapitalisme dan imperialisme... Kita bergerak karena kita tidak sudi kepada stelsel kapitalisme dan imperialisme, yang membikin kita papa dan membikin segundukan manusia tenggelam dalam kekayaan dan harta, dan karena kita ingin sama rata merasakan lezatnya buah-buah dari kita punya masyarakat sendiri. Kita, oleh karenanya, harus bergerak untuk menggugurkan stelsel kapitalisme dan imperialisme! ... kemerdekaan nasional hanyalah suatu jembatan, suatu syarat, suatu stridjmoment. Di belakang Indonesia Merdeka itu kita kaum Marhaen masih harus mendirikan kita punya gedung keselamatan, bebas dari tiap-tiap macam kapitalisme (Soekarno, 1984).*

(The objective of our movement must be a just and perfect society, in which there is no oppression and exploitation, in which there is no capitalism and imperialism... We are struggling because we do not want the system of capitalism and imperialism, which make us destitute and make the mound of humanity sink into wealth and possessions, and because we want to equally taste the delicious fruits of our own society. We, therefore, must struggle to abort the system of capitalism and imperialism! ... national independence is only a bridge, a condition, a *stridjmoment*. Beyond the free Indonesia, we, the Marhaens, still have to found a nation-state which is safe and free from every kind of capitalism.)

In his speech before the Preparatory Committee of Independence (BPUPKI) on 1 June 1945, Soekarno included his Cold War mindset in the formulation of the state philosophy, *Pancasila*, especially its fifth principle, the principle of *Keadilan Sosial Bagi Seluruh Rakyat Indonesia*. He proposed the newly independent state which later became Indonesia to be anti-capitalist and chose it to be a socialist one:

*Prinsip nomor empat sekarang saya usulkan. Saya di dalam 3 hari ini belum mendengarkan prinsip itu, yaitu "prinsip kesejahteraan", "prinsip: tidak akan ada kemiskinan di dalam Indonesia Merdeka" ... Apakah kita mau Indonesia Merdeka yang kaum kapitalisnya merajalela, atautkah yang semua rakyatnya sejahtera, yang semua orang cukup makan, cukup pakaian, hidup dalam kesejahteraan, merasa dipangku oleh Ibu Pertiwi yang cukup memberi sandang pangan kepadanya?*

*Mana yang kita pilih, Saudara-saudara? Jangan Saudara kira, bahwa kalau Badan Perwakilan Rakyat sudah ada, kita dengan sendirinya mencapai kesejahteraan ini. Kita sudah lihat, di negara-negara Eropa adalah Badan Perwakilan, adalah parlementaire democratie. Tapi tidaklah di Eropa justru kaum kapitalis merajalela? ... Tak lain dan tak bukan sebabnya, ialah oleh karena badan-badan perwakilan rakyat yang diadakan di sana itu, sekadar menurut resepnya Fransche Revolutie. Tak lain tak bukan adalah yang dinamakan democratie di sana itu ialah politieke democratie saja; semata-mata tidak ada sociale rechtvaardigheid, tak ada keadilan sosial, tidak ada economische democratie sama sekali... Adakah keadaan yang demikian ini yang kita kehendaki?*

*Saudara-saudara, saya usulkan: Kalau kita mencari demokrasi hendaknya bukan demokrasi barat, tetapi permusyawaratan yang memberi hidup, yakni politik economische democratie yang mampu mendatangkan kesejahteraan sosial! Rakyat Indonesia sudah lama bicara tentang hal ini. Apakah yang dimaksud dengan Ratu Adil? Yang dimaksud dengan faham Ratu Adil ialah social rechtvaardigheid. Rakyat ingin sejahtera. Rakyat yang tadinya merasa dirinya kurang makan kurang pakaian, menciptakan dunia baru yang di dalamnya ada keadilan, di bawah pimpinan Ratu-Adil. Maka oleh karena itu, jikalau kita memang betul-betul mengerti, mengingat mencintai rakyat Indonesia, marilah kita terima prinsip hal social rechvaardigheid ini, yaitu bukan saja bersamaan politik, Saudara-saudara, tetapi pun di atas lapangan ekonomi kita harus mengadakan persamaan, artinya kesejahteraan bersama yang sebaik-baiknya (Alam, 2001).*

(Now, I must propose Principle Number Four. In these 3 days I haven't listened that principle to be proposed, namely "the principle of prosperity"; the principle that there will be no poverty in the free Indonesia" ... Do we want the free Indonesia in which the capitalists are rampant, or in which all the people are prosperous, in which everyone can eat sufficiently, can have enough clothes, can live in prosperity, and can feel comfortable in the lap of Mother Earth who provides enough food and clothing?

Which one do we choose, brothers and sisters? Don't you all think that when the People's Representative Council already exists, we will automatically achieve this prosperity. We have seen in European countries that the Representative Body practices parliamentary democracy. But isn't it precisely in Europe that the capitalists are rampant? ... This is so because the People's Representative Bodies who convene there simply convene according to the recipe of the *Fransche Revolutie*. This is so because the practice of *democratie* therein is just *politico democratie*; simply there is no *sociale rechtvaardigheid*, no social justice, no economic democracy at all... Is it the system that we want?

Brothers and sisters, I must suggest: if we look for democracy, it should not be western democracy, but deliberations that give life, that is, *economische-democratie* which are capable of bringing about social welfare! Indonesian people have been talking about this for a long time. What does "Ratu Adil" mean? It is the Messiah which people believe can manifest *social rechtvaardigheid*. The people want to be prosperous. The people who previously felt that they were eating too little and not wearing enough clothes struggle to create a new world in which there is justice, under the leadership of the Messiah. So therefore, if we really understand and love



the Indonesian people, let us accept this principle of *social rechvaardigheid*. Not only in political domain, brothers and sisters, but also in the economic domain we must establish equality, prosperity which as best can be achieved.)

Mohammad Hatta held the Cold War mindset when he included a socialist concept of cooperative into the Constitution of Indonesia (UUD '45). When asked why he included the socialist concept, he explained:

*Sejak dari penjajahan Belanda, cita-cita koperasi sudah dipandang sebagai jalan yang terbaik untuk membangun berangsur-angsur ekonomi rakyat yang lemah. Orang sudah membaca dan mengetahui contoh-contoh yang diperlihatkan oleh kaum buruh Inggris dan kaum tani di Denmark pada abad ke-19. Berhadapan dengan kekuasaan dan pengaruh kapitalisme yang begitu hebat, hanya organisasi rakyat jelata sendiri, berdasar atas solidaritas dan setia kawan, yang dapat memperbaiki nasibnya. Undang-undang sosial belum ada pada waktu itu. Orang banyak yang lemah ekonominya mulai berpikir, bahwa organisasi harus dihadapi dengan organisasi. Organisasi yang tepat bagi kaum buruh dan rakyat tani ialah koperasi. Apabila kapitalisme berkembang dengan semangat individualisme, konkurensi merdeka dan modal yang kuat, koperasi dasarnya kerjasama, tolong-menolong antara orang-orang kecil. Lain daripada itu koperasi berdasar atas prinsip "self-help", menolong diri sendiri. Sejarah di Eropa memperlihatkan, bahwa orang kecil yang lemah ekonominya dapat bertahan dan meningkatkan derajat hidupnya dengan kerjasama dan bantu-membantu dalam menolong diri sendiri (Yasni, 1980).*

(Since the Dutch colonialism period, foundation of cooperatives had been considered the best way to gradually empower the weak people's economy. People have read and have known the examples set by the British workers and the Danish peasants in the 19th century. In the face of the immense power and influence of capitalism, only the organization of the laypeople themselves, based on solidarity and loyalty, can improve their lot. Social laws did not exist at that time. Many people who were economically weak started to think that organizations had to be encountered with other organizations. The proper organization for the workers and peasants was the cooperative. If capitalism develops with the spirit of individualism, independent concurrency and strong capital, cooperatives are based on cooperation, mutual help between people. Moreover, cooperatives are based on the principle of self-help, to help one own self. History in Europe shows that people who are economically weak can survive and increase their standard of living by cooperating and helping themselves by themselves.)

Two months after the Proclamation of Independence (17 August 1945), Sutan Sjahrir wrote in his *Perjuangan Kita* (October, 1945), perpetuating the Cold War mindset:

*... bangsa kita memerlukan berubahnya dasar-dasar pergaulan hidup kemanusiaan, yang akan dapat menghilangkan imperialisme dan kapitalisme di dunia ini. Selama ini belum terjadi, maka perjuangan kebangsaan kita akan tidak dapat memuaskan sepenuh-penuhnya, serta kemerdekaan yang kita dapat, jika kita peroleh sepenuhnya terhadap Belanda, pun hanya berupa kemerdekaan seperti yang terlihat pada lain lain negeri kecil, yang di bawah pengaruh negeri kapitalis yang besar, yaitu berupa kemerdekaan nama saja... Perancis serta revolusi Perancis adalah perintis serta pembuka jalan untuk dunia yang kapitalistis-imperialistis, sedangkan revolusi kita ini sebenarnya harus dipandang revolusi yang akan turut menutup sejarah kapitalistis-imperialis, sehingga perjuangan sosial yang telah berlaku di dunia sebagai akibat dari sistem kapitalis-imperialis, yang merupakan perjuangan kaum buruh, perjuangan kaum sosialis dan segala kemenangan-kemajuannya, seperti terdapat di dunia pada waktu ini, tentu membedakan benar kedudukan revolusi kita dari revolusi Perancis, yang hanya demokrasi burgerlijk itu (Sjahrir, 2010).*

(... our nation needs a change in the foundations of human social life, which will be able to eliminate imperialism and capitalism in this world. If the change does not

occur, our national struggle will not achieve anything, and the independence that we can get, if we get it completely from the Netherlands, will only be in the form of independence as seen in other small countries, which are under the influence of capitalist big countries in the form of independence in nominalistic sense only... France and the French revolution were pioneers and opened the way for a capitalist-imperialist world, while our revolution actually must be seen as a revolution that will also eradicate capitalist-imperialist history; the social struggle that has been taking place in the world as a the result of the capitalist-imperialist system—the struggle of the workers, the struggle of the socialists and all their victories, as is the case in the world at this time—certainly distinguishes the position of our revolution from the French revolution, which is only a *burgerlijk* democracy.)

Thirteen years later, during his presidency period, Soekarno continued to hold his Cold War mindset. In a lecture delivered in 1958 in a short course on *Pancasila (Kursus Pancasila)*, Soekarno remarked:

*Keadilan sosial ialah suatu masyarakat atau sifat suatu masyarakat adil dan makmur, berbahagia buat semua orang, tidak ada penghinaan, tidak ada penindasan, tidak ada penghisapan... Semua berbahagia, cukup sandang, cukup pangan... Sosialisme Indonesia, sosialisme Indonesia, sosialisme, sosialisme, adil makmur, adil makmur...* (Alam, 2001).

(Social justice is a social condition or a social nature in which a society experiences justice and prosperity, in which everyone is happy; there is no humiliation, there is no oppression, there is no exploitation... Everyone is happy, has sufficient clothing, enough food... Indonesian socialism, Indonesian socialism, socialism, socialism, just and prosperous society, just and prosperous society...)

The Cold War mindset had been retained since Soeharto's presidency period in the 1970s through the 1990s, but as mentioned above, the pendulum swung to the other bloc: from hatred of capitalism to hatred of communism, and from the love of communism to the love of capitalism. However, to express boldly the preference for capitalism would be a blunder and deemed a blatant violation of the nation-state founders' canonic, politico-economical covenant; hence a neologism to hide it is extremely needed. The capitalism was then hidden under a mask of deceptive terms such as "*pembangunan*" (Baker, 1999; Koentjaraningrat, 1990), "*modernisasi pembangunan*" (Moertopo, 1974), "*modernisasi*" (Alfian, 1971), "*development*" (Vatikiotis, 1994), "*democratic development*" (Gardner, 1997), "*national development*" (Vasil, 1997), "*emergence*" (Hill, 1996; Schwarz, 2000), "*economic development*" (Dahlan, 2004), "*economic pragmatism*" (Prawiro, 1998), "*konglomerasi dan oligarki ekonomi*" (Budimanta, 2020), "*authoritarian development*" (Simpson, 2008), etc.

Ali Moertopo, for instance, wrote in his *Strategi Politik Nasional* (1974), expressing his Cold War mindset, mentioning the term "*pembangunan nasional*", thus celebrating his love of capitalism:

*Sementara keamanan dalam negeri ditingkatkan, dan dengan demikian terdapat kestabilan politik, bangsa Indonesia mulai dapat memikirkan perencanaan pembangunan nasional. Kestabilan ini juga diperlukan untuk bisa melaksanakan pembangunan. Di sinilah letak inti pemikiran bagi pendekatan pembangunan nasional yang dinyatakan sebagai "security and prosperity approach" ... Sehubungan dengan ini, dengan Surat Keputusan Presiden No. 319 Tahun 1968, Presiden RI melaksanakan perintah MPRS untuk menyusun dan melaksanakan pembangunan. Pada tanggal 1 April 1969 REPELITA mulai dilaksanakan (Moertopo, 1974).*

(While domestic security is being improved, and thus there is political stability, the Indonesian people have begun to be able to think about national development planning. This stability is also needed so as to be able to generate development. Herein lies the core of thought for the national development approach which is stated as the "security and prosperity approach" ... In this regard, with Presidential Decree No. 319 of 1968, the President of the Republic of Indonesia carries out the



MPRS order to prepare and carry out the development. On April 1, the 1969 REPELITA [Five-Year National Development Plan] has begun to be implemented.)

In spite of the neologism undercover, there are some writers who admit the capitalism bluntly such as Ariel Heryanto and Richard Robison who called it “*capitalism*” (Heryanto, 2000; Robison, 1986); Sukardi Rinakit and Yushihiro Kunio who called it “*ersatz capitalism*” (Kunio, 1988; Rinakit, 2005); Sumitro Djojohadikusumo and Y.B. Mangunwijaya who called it “*crony capitalism*” (Dijk, 2002; Mangunwijaya, 1999). Even Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana cried out loud:

*... untuk memperbesar kekayaan diri seperti tersimpul dalam ekonomi kapitalisma itu, bukanlah hanya bersifat suatu tehnik bagaimana mesti melakukannya atau suatu manipulasi keuangan dan ekonomi, tetapi dari tujuan ekonomi kapitalisma itu timbul suatu cita-cita manusia yang berasio dan efisien memakai setiap waktu dan kesempatan dan yang jujur dan dapat diandalkan untuk diberi berhutang ataupun kepercayaan. Dan sesungguhnya di sini keinginan menjadi kaya yang termaktub dalam “Semangat Kapitalisma” itu terangkat menjadi suatu etik, yang melahirkan suatu etos yang istimewa: Siapa yang melanggar etik itu bukan saja bodoh, tetapi juga melupakan tanggung jawab dan kewajiban... (Kleden, 1988).*

(... the increase of one's wealth as in the economics of capitalism is not only a technical instrument or a financial and economic manipulation, but from the economic goals of capitalism arises an ideal human who is rational and efficient in spending his time and acquiring opportunity; an ideal human who is sincere and accountable to be given debt or trust. And actually herein the desire to be rich in the “Spirit of Capitalism” embodies an ethic, which gives birth to a special ethos: Whoever violates the ethic is not only stupid, but also irresponsible and negligent...)

Along with this capitalism is the perpetual hatred of communism as a retention of the Cold War mindset. Hamish McDonald (2015) reported:

Communism in Indonesia had vanished. The army had quickly detected attempts by PKI remnants to regroup and wage “people’s war” from remote rural areas of East Java. All were quelled by 1968. In West Kalimantan, party elements merged into the substantial population of Chinese gold miners, timber and rubber traders, and other settlers. The army stirred up a racial vendetta among the indigenous Dayaks, who slaughtered hundreds of Chinese and drove 50,000 into the towns, thus removing the population in which guerrillas had operated. Until 1979, the army kept some 30,000 former sympathizers of the PKI, including intellectuals like the novelist Pramoedya Ananta Toer, in prison settlements on Buru, an island in the Moluccas, and on Nusakambangan, an island close to the south coast of Java. They and hundreds of thousands of others remained noncitizens, barred from political activity and voting (McDonald, 2015).

After scrutinizing all references above, the present writer came to the following conclusions:

1. The founders of the republic, who wrote books and pamphlets in the 1920s, wrote their works in the zeitgeist of the Cold War.
2. Consequently, our republic was built in Cold War period.
3. Accordingly, *Pancasila*, our state philosophy, was understood and construed on the Cold War discourse basis
4. Similarly, the *UUD '45*, the Constitution, also was understood and construed on the Cold War discourse basis.
5. The philosophical conclusion is that the Cold War mindset was strongly held by the republic founders.
6. They understood and interpreted the national historical events on the basis of the Cold War mindset.
7. The epistemic consequence of the perpetual application of the Cold War mindset by them are the perpetuation of the binary oppositions of capitalism-socialism or liberalism-communism.

8. Since the 1960s up to the 2020s, the Cold War mindset has still been held by public intellectuals.
9. The binary oppositions have still been rampant in the intellectual discourses.

Reading Odd Arne Westad's *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Westad, 2007) as an interpretation guide to interpret the findings the present writer collected in the first activity results in the following deductions:

1. The Cold War between the USA and the Soviet Union had lasted from the 1920s to the 1990s.
2. Both countries waged their Cold War in the Third World countries as the battleground.
3. During the Cold War, production of knowledge and production of philosophy supported the Cold War propaganda: the Americans produced works confronting the validity of communism practiced by the Soviet Unions; on the contrary, the Soviet Unions produced works confronting the validity of capitalism practiced by the Americans. Both matured the Cold War mindset.
4. Both countries waging the Cold War globalized the Cold War mindset across the countries on the globe, especially the Third World, including Indonesia.
5. The Cold War mindset widespread the world over is a result of globalization of the Cold War mindset widespread all over the world by both USA and the Soviet Union to win support, affiliation, love, attraction, belief and trust from nations all over the world so that the nationalists and revolutionaries of the countries join their blocs and actively participate in their Cold War.
6. In 1991, the Cold War between USA and the Soviet Union was over, and so was between capitalism and communism.

The validity of the Cold War mindset, using contemporary reality of the Post-Cold War world, can be evaluated through critiques of ontology, epistemology and axiology.

*First of all*, the mindset is invalid ontologically. As found before, the Cold War between USA and the Soviet Union was over in 1991, and so was between capitalism and communism. Further, there is no nation-state on earth which had been civilizationally successful to be a capitalist state as described by Karl Marx; neither has there been nation-state on the globe which has been civilizationally successful as a communist state as prescribed by Karl Marx. The material and empirical manifestation of either communism or capitalism had been nil. How can a mindset which does not have empirical manifestation on earth be justified as valid? If communism and capitalism continue to be philosophized in Indonesian context, the Indonesian communists and the Indonesian capitalists must have material-empirical-ontological basis as the ontological referent, which unfortunately they do not have, and so they are invalid ontologically. Indonesian communists used to have the Soviet Union and China as ontological mecca; but the Soviet Union's communist system ended with failure and China revises and keeps on revising her communism eternally. Indonesian capitalists, on the other hand, used to have USA as ontological axis, but USA was won over by jihadists in 9/11 attack, showing her grave weakness in the face of global terrorism. Moreover, Indonesian capitalists failed to establish Indonesia as a capitalist state, running away in the face of the 1997 monetary crisis; they have not yet founded a capitalist state since the *Reformasi* up to these days.

*Secondly*, the Cold War mindset which does not have ontological-empirical basis is of course invalid epistemologically. Epistemology without ontological basis is solely an intellectual exercise; thought experiment; wishful thinking; mythology; false consciousness. Indonesian communists who are still studying Marxism, Leninism, or Maoism today are in fact studying philosophical mythology and legends. Indonesian capitalists who are still studying Adam Smith's, Keynes's, Neo-Keynes's, Fordian and Post-Fordian economics are in fact studying philosophical legends. Both communists and capitalists are studying utopia, daydreaming, getting philosophical opium, experiencing a Boethian consolation of philosophy and philosophical orgasm.

*Thirdly*, the Cold War mindset which does not have ontological basis and does not have epistemological basis is consequently invalid axiologically. Axiology without ontology and epistemology is solely anarchism; instinctual animal actions. Indonesian communists and capitalists who do their praxis without ontological basis and without epistemological basis do like commoners and laypeople and monkeys do.

*Finally*, if the Cold War mindset held by the republic founders was factually a result of globalization of the Cold War mindset widespread all over the world by both USA and the Soviet Union to win support, affiliation, love, attraction, belief and trust from nations all over the world so that the nationalists and revolutionaries of the countries join their blocs and actively participate in their Cold War, Indonesian communists were truly victims of the Soviet communistic liberation myth and Indonesian capitalists are victims of the American anaesthetizing capitalistic success dream. If Indonesian philosophers holding the

mindset are not back to reality, they are truly sleepwalkers. The Cold War ended, so did the mindset which validate and justify it.

All in all, the philosophical validity of the Cold War mindset is nil, and to hold still the Cold War mindset these days is considered a setback. To develop the history of Indonesian philosophy, an escape from the Cold War mindset is needed and deemed important. The escape is an inevitable condition to set up a post-Cold War history of Indonesian philosophy. The escape opens up three better scenarios of growth: following-the-current scenario, deconstructive scenario, and utopian scenario. The scenarios function to replace the Cold War mindset and attempts to be alternative mindsets to be held by intellectuals in their public discourses. The scenarios also can be an instrument of understanding the history of Indonesian philosophy in the context beyond the 2020s. The binary oppositions, rampant and banal in the Cold War rhetoric, are hence left and deemed obsolete.

*The first scenario of philosophical growth* follows the unipolar scheme of world power: the capitalist scheme. The Cold War was over, and so was the Cold War mindset. The Cold War epistemology, the Cold War ontology, and the Cold War axiology were obsolete already. Studying communism and using it to criticize capitalism are irrelevant, unrealistic, unempirical, unscientific, utopian, idealistic, wishful-thinking, foolish, moronic, naïve, childish. The Cold War winner is capitalism; it plastically transforms into global capitalism, global neo-liberalism, globalization. The world power is unipolar. If Indonesian philosophy takes this crude reality as its moving factor, the road to development is widely open. I. Frolov shows in his *Dictionary of Philosophy* (Frolov, 1984) that capitalism produces abundance of philosophical schools and philosophical systems: feminism, utopianism, individualism, pragmatism, phenomenology, existentialism, analytical philosophy, structuralism, logical-positivism, modernism, postmodernism, LGBTQ, psychoanalysis, perennial philosophy, theosophy, deconstructionism, hermeneutics, semiotics, etc.—in short, all philosophical schools and systems which do not aim at attacking the existing capitalistic order, yet they aim at focusing on individual/personal freedom, at celebrating material joy and sensual gaiety, and they never aim at attending to any kinds of economical egalitarianism.

By welcoming the winning capitalism, Indonesian philosophy can develop its history, integrating all the capitalistic philosophical systems above-mentioned into its growing branches. Further, the ancient Cold War residuals—*Pancasila*, *UUD '45*, and all writings of all republic founders, all socialism-oriented literature produced between the 1920s and the 1960s—are to be interpreted capitalistically, and their socialistic and communistic elements to be thrown away. The fifth principle of *Pancasila*, *Keadilan Sosial bagi Seluruh Rakyat Indonesia*, which formerly had been construed socialistically and even communistically in the context of the Cold War, is to be interpreted capitalistically, like what had been carried out by Soeharto and his philosophers of *Pancasila* in the form of *PMP (Pendidikan Moral Pancasila)* and *P4 (Pedoman Penghayatan dan Pengamalan Pancasila)*. *Pancasila* and the *UUD '45* in the hands of Soeharto was transformed into Weberian capitalistic ethics. Furthermore, *Keadilan Sosial bagi Seluruh Rakyat Indonesia*, which was formerly understood by our republic founders in the light of international communism, is impossibly materialized in today's world of global capitalism; in the world where capitalists hand in hand work together to be egotistically richer and much richer and much more individually prosperous eternally. Every philosopher of Indonesia can then establish new schools of philosophy, following the global capitalistic scheme of philosophical production.

*The second scenario of philosophical growth* is to deconstruct the Cold War philosophies and all existing philosophies developing by playing *word plays* à la Derrida as shown in Derrida's *Glas* (Derrida, 1986). Indonesians have a peculiar liking of deconstructing meanings of words: *anarkis* means spontaneous demonstration; *pragmatis* means egoism; *boring* means bored; *constructive criticism* means prohibition of criticism; *jilbab* means hijab; *gamis* means jilbab; *dosa* means religious sin; *pahala* means religious reward; *upacara* means national ceremony; *agama* means religion; *suwarga/surga* means Paradise/Eden; *budaya* means culture; etc. They all are Derridan *word plays*. If Indonesian philosophy takes this deconstructive path as its historical generating factor, there will be interesting and amusing development within its new branches. In the past there were '*Pancasila economics*' which meant capitalism à la Professor Mubyarto; '*Islamic Banking*' which meant capitalism blanketed in Islamic/Arabic idioms; '*Pancasilanomics*' which meant capitalism à la Arif Budimanta; '*Ekonomi Kerakyatan*' which meant capitalism à la Adi Sasono. In the near future, if the history of Indonesian philosophy takes the deconstructive path, there will more Derridan-style schools and systems of philosophy in Indonesia: *Kapitalisme Pancasila*, *Eksistensialisme Pancasila*, *Fenomenologi Pancasila*, *Feminisme Pancasila*, *Pragmatisme Pancasila*, *Strukturalisme Pancasila*, *Modernisme Pancasila*, *Posmodernisme Pancasila*, *Perenialisme Pancasila*, *Lesbianisme Pancasila*, *Homoseksualitas Pancasila*, etc. All are *word plays*—words which seem meaningful but in fact non-sense; or words which seem etymologically meaningful but

factually non-sense; or words which sound something but mean another thing. Every philosopher of Indonesia can then establish new schools of philosophy based on Derridan *word plays*.

*The third scenario of philosophical growth* is to transcend all existing binary oppositions of capitalism-socialism and liberalism-communism, First World-Third World, metropole-periphery, and utopiates a breakthrough through *oxymorons*. Philosophers love to create oxymorons in their works, as shown by Patrick Hughes in his seminal work, *More on Oxymoron* (Hughes, 1984). The oxymorons function to transcend the binary oppositions there are. Albert Einstein created an oxymoron when he said “*the most incomprehensible thing about the world is that it is comprehensible.*” Montaigne created an oxymoron stating “*stability itself is nothing else than a more sluggish motion.*” Jorge Luis Borges created an oxymoron saying “*Lost, as water is lost in water.*” Voltaire created an oxymoron when he remarked “*Notice that the nose was formed to wear spectacles: thus we wear spectacles.*” Even Karl Marx created one when he mentioned the term “*social individual*” in his work *Grundrisse*. Through the creation of new oxymorons by the post-Cold War philosophers of Indonesia, opposite schools of philosophy can be transcended hence united. By way of illustration, the transcendent version of capitalism-communism is capitalist communism (such as neo-Maoism being practiced in China) or communist capitalism (like the so-called oxymoronic *Humanistic Capitalism* or *Welfare Capitalism*); the transcendent version of liberalism-communism is liberal communism or communist liberalism; the transcendent version of democracy-dictatorship is democratic dictatorship or dictatorial democracy (Soekarno had philosophized it, so it turned to ‘*Guided Democracy*!’); the transcendent version of First World-Third World is the First Third World or the Third First World; the transcendent version of metropole-periphery is metropolitan periphery or peripheral metropole; the transcendent version of orientalism-occidentalism is oriental occidentalism or occidental orientalism; the transcendent version of terrorism-asceticism is terroristic asceticism or ascetic terrorism; the transcendent version of oppression-freedom is oppressive freedom or liberated oppression; the transcendent version of idealism-materialism is idealistic materialism or materialistic idealism, and other utopian oxymoronic new systems of philosophy of the future.

Historiography of Indonesian philosophy has not yet taken the Cold War context into full consideration due to chronological approach employed by historians of Indonesian philosophy. M.M Sharif in his *A History of Muslim Philosophy Volume Two* (Sharif, 1966) exposed episodes in history of Indonesian philosophy. However, he did not approach the history with the Cold War historical frame. This is also the case with Finngeir Hiorth. In his monograph *Philosophers in Indonesia* (Hiorth, 1983), Hiorth explored historical development of Indonesian philosophy, but he did not consider the Cold War context of the history. Andrzej Maryniarczyk, in his *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* (Maryniarczyk, 2001), exposed some Indonesian philosophers such as Ki Hajar Dewantara, Sultan Mangkunegara IV, and Mpu Kanwa with their historical context; yet he did not consider the Cold War historical context which surrounds the philosophers. Mudji Sutrisno, in his *Sejarah Filsafat Nusantara: Alam Pikiran Indonesia* (Sutrisno, 2005) exposed the philosophy of our republic founders such as Tan Malaka, Hatta, Soekarno, Sutan Sjahrir, etc.; however, he also neglected the Cold War historical context in his Indonesian philosophy historiography. The present writer’s own work, *Sketsa Sejarah Filsafat Indonesia* (Hidayat, 2004) employed chronological approach in analyzing history of Indonesian philosophy; hence it failed to understand the Cold War context of the history. In contemporary context, Lara Hofner in her eye-opening and enlightening project *Histories of Philosophy in Indonesian* (Hofner, 2022), sponsored by University of Hildesheim Germany as *Koselleck-Project - Histories of Philosophy in a Global Perspective* (<https://www.uni-hildesheim.de/en/histories-of-philosophy/>), has not yet scrutinized the historiography of Indonesian philosophy to the fullest; she merely listed Indonesian philosophy history literature in a bibliographic manner without going deeper into any historical context discourse.

By taking the Cold War context into detailed and serious consideration and by utilizing the Global Cold War approach, historiography of Indonesian philosophy steps up a higher level. The post-Cold War scenarios above-mentioned offer endless possibilities for the set-up of a post-Cold War history of Indonesian philosophy. The present writer cannot imagine how the post-Cold War history of Indonesian philosophy will embody; however, his three scenarios (the capitalist scenario, the deconstructive scenario, and the utopian-oxymoronic scenario) will guide in its making. The post-Cold War history of Indonesian philosophy is wanting to be written soon by Indonesian philosophy historians.

## 4 Conclusions

Making a good use of three methods of philosophical research, the present writer came to a conclusion that the perpetuation of the use of the Cold War mindset by contemporary Indonesian philosophers is a setback to the development of Indonesian philosophy history. The history will be stagnant and its development will hinder and retard. To generate the wheel of Indonesian history of philosophy, philosophers need an escape from the Cold War mindset established by the old-days philosophers of the Cold War period. The escape from the obsolete mindset can be carried out by enacting and playing out three possible scenarios of growth: (1) following-the-capitalist-current scenario; (2) deconstructive scenario; and (3) utopian scenario. The three scenarios, if applied, can trigger the development of Indonesian philosophy history. Hopefully, by following the scenarios or one of them, fresh crazy alternatives to the Cold War mindset are abundant and amusing since the Cold War was over and the nirvanic happiest peaceful post-truth Nietzschean superman's moment is here and now.

## References

- Alam, W. T. (Ed.). (2001). *Bung Karno Menggali Pancasila*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Alfian. (1971). Suharto and the Question of Political Stability. *Pacific Community*, II(3), 536–537.
- Baker, R. W. (1999). *Indonesia: The Challenge of Change*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Budimanta, A. (2020). *Pancasilanomics (Second)*. Bogor: IPB Press.
- Dahlan, M. M. (2004). *Kebudayaan Sosialis (Second)*. Jakarta: Penerbit MELIBAS.
- Derrida, J. (1986). *Glas*. (J. P. Leavey & R. Rand, Trans.). Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Dijk, K. Van. (2002). *A Country in Despair: Indonesia Between 1997 and 2000 (Second)*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Frolov, I. (1984). *Dictionary of Philosophy*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Gardner, P. F. (1997). *Shared Hopes, Separate Fears: Fifty Years of U.S. -Indonesia Relations*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Heryanto, A. (2000). *Perlawanan dalam Kepatuhan: Esai-Esai Budaya*. Bandung: Penerbit MIZAN.
- Hidayat, F. (2004). *Sketsa Sejarah Filsafat Indonesia*. Ciputat: IPS Press.
- Hill, H. (1996). *Indonesian Economy Since 1966: Southeast Asia's Emerging Giant*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hiorth, F. (1983). *Philosophers in Indonesia*. Townsville, Queensland: James Cook University of North Queensland.
- Hofner, L. (2022). *Histories of Philosophy in Indonesian*. Retrieved January 13, 2023, from <https://www.uni-hildesheim.de/en/histories-of-philosophy/histories-of-philosophy/translate-to-englisch-indonesischsprachige-philosophiegeschichten/>
- Hughes, P. (1984). *More on Oxymoron*. London: Vintage Publishing.
- Kleden, I. (Ed.). (1988). *Kebudayaan sebagai Perjuangan: Perkenalan dengan Pemikiran S. Takdir Alisjahbana*. Jakarta: PT. Dian Rakyat.
- Koentjaraningrat. (1990). *Sejarah Teori Antropologi II*. Jakarta: UI Press.



- Kunio, Y. (1988). *The Rise of Ersatz Capitalism in South-East Asia*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Malaka, T. (1987). *Naar de Republiek Indonesia* (Second). Jakarta: Yayasan Massa.
- Mangunwijaya, Y. B. (1999). *Menuju Republik Indonesia Serikat*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Maryniarczyk, A. (Ed.). (2001). *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii*. Oslo: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu.
- McDonald, H. (2015). *Demokrasi: Indonesia in the 21st Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moertopo, A. (1974). *Strategi Politik Nasional*. Jakarta: CSIS.
- Prawiro, R. (1998). *Indonesia's Struggle for Economic Development*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Rinakit, S. (2005). *The Indonesian Military After the New Order*. Singapore: ISEAS.
- Robison, R. (1986). *Indonesia: The Rise of Capital*. Australia: Asian Studies Association of Australia.
- Schwarz, A. (2000). *A Nation in Waiting: Indonesia's Search for Stability* (Seco). Colorado: Westview Press.
- Semaoen. (1920). Penoentoen Kaoem Boeroeh. Retrieved February 13, 2023, from <https://www.marxists.org/indonesia/indones/1920-SemaoenPenuntun.htm>
- Sharif, M. M. (1966). *A History of Muslim Philosophy, Volume 2*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Simpson, B. R. (2008). *Economists with Guns: Authoritarian Development and U.S. -Indonesian Relations, 1960-1968*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Sjahrir, S. (2010). *Perdjoeangan Kita*. Jakarta: Pusat Dokumentasi Guntur 49.
- Soekarno. (1930). *Indonesia Menggugat*. Jakarta: Departemen Penerangan Republik Indonesia.
- Soekarno. (1984). *Mencapai Indonesia Merdeka*. Jakarta: Inti Idayu Press-Yayasan Pendidikan Soekarno.
- Sutrisno, M. (2005). *Sejarah Filsafat Nusantara: Alam Pikiran Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Galangpress.
- Vasil, R. (1997). *Governing Indonesia: The Development of Indonesian Democracy*. Singapore: Butterworth Heinemann Asia.
- Vatikiotis, M. R. J. (1994). *Indonesian Politics under Suharto: Order, Development and Pressure for Change*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Westad, O. A. (2007). *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yasni, Z. (1980). *Bung Hatta Menjawab: Wawancara Dr. Mohammad Hatta dengan Dr. Z. Yasni*. Jakarta: Gunung Agung.