Journal of Language and Literature
Vol. 25 No. 2, October 2025, pp. 500 - 514
DOI: 10.24071/joll.v25i2.12538
Available at https://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/JOLL/index

Ambivalent Occidentalism in Mochtar Lubis's Cold War Literature *Maut dan Cinta*

Muhammad Taufiqurrohman, Sudibyo Sudibyo, Fadlil Munawwar Manshur
muhammadtaufiqurrohman@mail.ugm.ac.id
Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, INDONESIA

Abstract

This article revisits Maut dan Cinta (1977), a seminal Cold War-era novel by Indonesian author Mochtar Lubis, to examine how the text engages with cultural imperialism in postcolonial Indonesia through its complex portrayal of the Occident. Employing Martin Suryajaya's "wide-close-deep" methodology—a three-pronged framework for literary analysis—the study situates Lubis's work within Indonesia's Cold War cultural politics, highlighting the author's contested ideological stance. Through the lenses of Occidentalism and cultural imperialism, the analysis reveals Lubis's profound ambivalence toward Western influence: while critiquing Western hegemony and cautioning against uncritical adoption of Western values, his works simultaneously echo the capitalist Bloc's anticommunist rhetoric, and his cultural-intellectual networks remain entrenched in Western capital. This paradox deepens with Lubis's selective embrace of Western liberalism, which coexists with a striking silence on capitalism's role in perpetuating global inequality. Crucially, his vehement rejection of communist internationalism starkly contrasts with his reluctance to address capitalism's transnational exploitation of the Global South—a contradiction epitomized by his protagonist Sadeli's distorted view of the Occident and the characters' failure to recognize global capitalism's neocolonial and culturally imperialist dynamics. By unpacking these tensions, the study argues that Lubis's ambivalence in Maut dan Cinta reflects the broader ideological fissures of postcolonial intellectual resistance during the Cold War, caught between anti-imperialist critique and complicity in hegemonic structures.

Article information

Received: May 26, 2025

Revised: July 28, 2025

Accepted: August 16 2025

***Keywords**: Cold War literature; cultural imperialism; Mochtar Lubis; New Order; Occidentalism*

Introduction

The encounter between the West and the East has become one of the central issues in postcolonial literary studies. Interactions with the West have generated diverse representations of the West, which have been integral to Indonesian literary traditions since the pre-nation-state era. These representations emerged from Indonesian

writers' encounters with the Occident, facilitated by transcontinental trade and, more profoundly, colonialism. In his book *Occidentalism* (2019) Salhi refers to literary works primarily concerned with representing or portraying the West and the experience of East-West encounters from an Eastern perspective as "Occidentalist literature."

Previous scholars have observed that representations of the West in Occidentalist literature in Indonesia have undergone shifts over time, from traditional to modern periods—specifically transitioning from monologism to dialogism (Braginsky, 2007b; Foulcher, 2002; Hunter, 2002; Koster, 2007a; Kouznetsova, 2007; Murtagh, 2005; Susanto, 2008). However, research on Occidentalist literature during the nation-state era, particularly within the postcolonial Cold War context, remains underexplored. This study addresses this research gap in Occidentalism scholarship by focusing on representations of the Occident in Indonesian literature produced during the Cold War in the early New Order era.

Indonesian literature during the New Order era (1966–1998) emerged amid the intersecting forces of Third World decolonization and Cold War geopolitics (1945–1991), which intensified pre-existing tensions within Indonesia's nationalist movement and fragile postcolonial state-building. While the Cold War did not singularly determine Indonesia's trajectory, the ideological contestations of Western and Eastern blocs profoundly shaped its historical development (Anwar 2012; Fibiger 2023). Anwar (2012) frames the New Order (1965–1990) as a period of political stability, economic growth, and decisive alignment with the Western/Capitalist Bloc—a stark contrast to the non-aligned diplomacy of the early post-independence era (1945–1957) and the revolutionary leftward pivot under Sukarno (1957–1965).

Fibiger (2023) frames the New Order's Cold War as "Suharto's Cold War"—a regime-driven project that reshaped Indonesia's domestic politics, regional relations, and global alliances, anchored in the anti-communist purges of 1965–1966. These state-sanctioned massacres and incarcerations enabled Suharto's rise, toppling Sukarno (Wardaya, 2021) and solidifying Indonesia's Western Bloc alignment by 1966 (Anwar, 2012). Abandoning Sukarno's Non-Aligned stance, Suharto courted Western powers, securing capital via institutions like the IMF, World Bank, and Inter-Governmental Group on Indonesia (IGGI) (Choiruzzad, 2020; Robison, 2009). This financing underwrote the New Order's authoritarian consolidation, while ASEAN (founded 1967) unified Southeast Asia into a pro-Western sphere, advancing U.S. Cold War aims and sidelining socialist currents (Fibiger 2023).

These geopolitical transformations profoundly shaped cultural production, as the regime weaponized literature to entrench anti-communist ideology—mirroring Indonesia's Cold War realignment and its negotiation of neocolonial pressures (Herlambang, 2011; Heryanto, 1999; Day, 2018; Mayasari-Hoffert, 2023; Saraswati, 2019; Scott-Smith, 2022). Indonesian New Order literature thus evolved as part of *global Cold War literature*: a corpus characterized by Cold War-era transnational forces and entangled with the period's political, military, and ideological currents. Crucially, Cold War literary studies extend beyond U.S.-Soviet binaries (Hammond, 2020), yet remain dominated by Anglophone texts despite incorporating Asian, African, and Latin American works (Hammond, 2020; Ahmad, 2022). This study counters such Anglocentrism by centering Mochtar Lubis's *Maut dan Cinta* (1977), positioning the Indonesian-language novel as a vital yet overlooked node in global Cold War discourse.

This study bridges a critical gap in Cold War literary scholarship by positioning Mochtar Lubis's *Maut dan Cinta* (1977) as an Occidentalist critique embedded within Indonesia's New Order ideological landscape. While existing scholarship has interrogated Lubis's broader influence on Indonesian literary culture (Herlambang 2011; Hill 2010; Scott-Smith 2022) and analyzed his canonical works like *Jalan Tak Ada Ujung, Senja di Jakarta, and Harimau Harimau* (Duile, 2022; Hidayatullah, 2023; Purwantini, 2016), *Maut dan Cinta* remains overlooked as a transnational Cold War text.

The study's novelty lies in theorizing Lubis as an Occidentalist cultural broker navigating Indonesia's postcolonial Cold War milieu, where decolonization aspirations collided with Western cultural imperialism. It argues that Lubis's dual identity—as both a New Order literary figure and a Western-aligned intellectual—embodies an ambivalent engagement with Western hegemony: *Maut dan Cinta* advocates liberal ideals like democracy, human rights and anti-communist stance while evading critiques of global capitalism's neo-colonial exploitations. By foregrounding this tension, the study reframes Cold War literature as a contested terrain where power, ideology, and postcolonial agency intersect—offering a model to reassess Global South texts within transnational Cold War discourse.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative descriptive methodology, utilizing a literary critical framework developed by Martin Suryajaya (2023). Suryajaya's model systematically integrates three foundational modalities of analysis, each yielding two dichotomous poles: 1) Coverage/Scope modality (determines whether the analysis focuses narrowly on the text as an autonomous medium or situates it within broader sociohistorical contexts, producing *narrow* and *wide* poles); 2) Access relation modality (governs the critic's proximity to the text, distinguishing between *close* (text-centric) and *distant* (indirect/mediated, e.g. computational technology) reading); 3) Semantic modality (addresses the density of symbolic engagement, differentiating *surface* (literal/denotative) and *deep* (connotative/archetypal) readings. These three modalities generate eight families of reading: *narrow-close-surface* (focusing on literary works-emphasizing direct reading-staying on the surface); *narrow-close-deep* (focusing on literary works-emphasizing direct reading-connecting literature to philosophical issues); *narrow-distant-deep* (focusing on literary works-employing digital tool-connecting literature to broader sociocultural phenomena); *narrow-distant-surface* (focusing on literary works-employing digital tools-staying on the surface); *wide-close-surface* (using macro-literary approach-emphasizing direct reading-staying on the surface); *wide-close-deep* (using macro-literary approach-emphasizing direct reading-connecting literature to a broader political situation); *wide-distant-deep* (using macro-literary approach-employing digital tools-connecting literature to a broader political-economic situation); *wide-distant-surface* (using macro-literary approach-employing digital tools-staying on the surface). In this study, *wide-close-deep* reading is employed to interrogate Mochtar Lubis's *Maut dan Cinta*, enabling simultaneous attention to the novel's Cold War sociopolitical contexts *(wide),* formal aesthetics *(close)*, and layered symbolic resonances *(deep)*.

This study employs Occidentalism and cultural imperialism as theoretical frameworks to analyze Eastern critiques of Western hegemony. While Orientalism examines the West's reductive representations of the East (Said, 1978), Occidentalism disrupts this power dynamic by centering Eastern perspectives on the West. Far from Orientalism's mere inversion, Occidentalism constitutes a mode of resistance that reclaims the Eastern "Self" from its alienation by the Western "Other" (Hanafi, 2000). Expanding this, Metin (2020) defines Occidentalists as Eastern subjects who critically engage the West through texts like novels, memoirs, and diplomatic archives. Salhi (2019) refines this within postcolonial literary studies, framing Occidentalist literature as works that portray the Occident and East-West encounters from an Orientals' perspective, marked by three reactive stances: Occidentophilia (love of the West), Occidentophobia (hatred of the West), and ambivalence towards the West. These stances, intertwined with race, class, and gender dynamics, reveal how authors negotiate cultural imperialism, balancing resistance, appropriation, and ideological compromise. By synthesizing these frameworks, the study positions Lubis's work within a broader discourse of postcolonial agency and critique.

Cultural imperialism, theorized in the 1960s, remains pivotal in critiquing neo-colonial power dynamics. Emerging alongside

Third Worldism—a Global South solidarity movement asserting sovereignty against Cold War binaries (Bevins, 2022; Orsini et al. in Ahmad 2022)—the term was co-opted by Western discourse to frame postcolonial nations as perpetually dependent. Decades after decolonization, asymmetries persist economically, politically, and epistemically, with capitalism perpetuating exploitation (Amin, 1976). Despite nominal political sovereignty, the decolonization of epistemic frameworks remains incomplete, as Orientalism—a Western epistemological regime constructing reductive representations of the East—continues to advance neo-colonialism, ensuring postcolonial policymaking aligns with former colonial powers' interests (Said, 1994; Hanafi, 2000; Uzoigwe, 2019; Degli Esposti, 2024). Cultural imperialism, distinct from territorial conquest, operates discursively by colonizing consciousness and fostering ideological dependency (Thiongo, 1987). It critically complements globalization framework by exposing power imbalances in cross-cultural exchanges, contrasting with narratives of seamless integration (Zhaparaliev & Kyzy, 2024). Tomlinson (1991) identifies four frameworks: media dominance, threats to local cultures, critiques of global capitalism, and modernity's homogenizing force—each underscoring how cultural hegemony reinforces structural inequalities in a capitalist world order.

Employing these theoretical frameworks, this study analyzes Mochtar Lubis's novel *Maut dan Cinta* (1977, reprint 2018). Methodologically, it integrates intratextual elements (dialogues, monologues, narrative structure) with extratextual archival and biographical materials, applying Miles et al., (2014) qualitative analytical framework: data collection (assembling textual and contextual sources), data condensation (coding thematic and ideological patterns), data display (organizing findings into coherent categories), and conclusion drawing (interpreting results through theoretical lenses). Through this analytical design, the article argues that *Maut dan Cinta* exemplifies Occidentalist literature by articulating an ambivalent stance toward the Occident.

Results and Discussion

1. Mochtar Lubis as the Golden Boy of the Early New Order

The New Order's pro-Western pivot marked a stark departure from Sukarno's Non-Aligned stance, positioning Indonesia as a key U.S. ally in Southeast Asia. This realignment, epitomized by the 1967 Foreign Investment Law, liberalized strategic sectors like oil and mining, reintegrating Indonesia into global capitalism as a comprador state (Robison, 2009)—a colonial dynamic its founders had sought to dismantle. Central to this transition was Suharto's formal ascension on March 11, 1966, celebrated publicly amid the release of political prisoners, including Mochtar Lubis (May 17, 1966). While student activists like Soe Hok Gie and Arief Budiman hailed Lubis as an intellectual beacon, he privately distanced himself from this symbolic role. Scholars contextualize these releases as strategic concessions to secure Western alignment, capital inflows, and Cold War legitimacy (Hill 2010). Rapidly, the regime emerged as a key U.S. partner in Southeast Asia, championing anti-communism and American-style capitalism (Hansson et al., 2020).

Following his 1966 release, Mochtar Lubis reemerged as a prominent journalist-intellectual, advocating for independent media to safeguard democracy and human right. With support from Director of the International Press Institute, Rohan Rivett, he revived the banned *Indonesia Raya*, secured roles on the Press Council, and organized regional media forums like the Press Foundation of Asia's Bali session (Wibisono in Lubis 1997). Concurrently, Lubis cultivated strategic alliances with key New Order figures, including Adam Malik (later Vice President), and clandestine groups like the Indonesian Renewal Movement *(Gerakan Pembaharuan Indonesia)*—a network founded by exiled PSI and PRRI leaders, including economist Sumitro Djojohadikusumo. GPI's Jakarta student cells, involving activists like Soe Hok Gie (who had contacted Lubis during his imprisonment), bridged intellectual dissent and regime politics (Hill 2010). Post-1966, Sumitro ascended as a top economic advisor and Universitas Indonesia (UI) professor while expanding his

family's transnational business empire, epitomizing the New Order's fusion of political power and capitalist elite networks (Purdey, 2016).

The New Order's political-economic restructuring reshaped broader sociocultural dynamics, transcending individual trajectories like Lubis' and his compatriots to reconfigure Indonesia's cultural landscape (Day & Liem, 2010). As a Western-aligned regime, the New Order prioritized cultural cooperation with the United States, building on Cold War-era soft power frameworks, especially with the United States Information Agency (USIA, formerly USIS), established to propagate liberal democratic values, capitalism, and religious faith globally. By the 1950s, the USIA operated across 76 countries via 217 offices, employing roughly 10,000 personnel and commanding an annual budget of up to $100 million. Its initiatives—spanning Voice of America broadcasts, libraries, cultural exchanges, films, and public diplomacy—served as both ideological tools and psychological warfare instruments within U.S. counterinsurgency strategy, reinforcing the New Order's anti-communist agenda (Frey 2003; Kalliney 2022; Whyte, 2018).

The New Order aligned with U.S. Cold War objectives through CIA-backed initiatives like the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF), which covertly funded anti-communist journals and intellectual projects via the Farfield Foundation (Herlambang 2011; Bevins 2022; Rubin 2012). Parallel efforts by Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Foundations cultivated pro-Western academic elites through exchanges and "centers of excellence," embedding Western epistemologies in Indonesian academia (Saraswati, 2019; Parmar 2012). The U.S. further weaponized cultural diplomacy via the International Writing Program (IWP), hosting Global South writers—including Indonesians and Chinese intellectuals—to promote liberal humanism while advancing geopolitical aims (Liu, 2021; Saraswati, 2019). These orchestrated strategies—spanning literature, academia, and education—entrenched Indonesia's pro-U.S. alignment, leveraging culture to undermine Soviet influence and solidify Cold War ideological hegemony (Zhaparaliev & Kyzy, 2024; Suwignyo, 2017).

The New Order regime systematically suppressed leftist and Sukarnoist writers—including figures like Pramoedya Ananta Toer and Sitor Situmorang—through detention, censorship, and exile to Buru Island, silencing decolonial critiques of Western neo-imperialism (Foulcher 2020; Herlambang 2011; Rizal, 2019; Setiadi 2014). Despite this repression, Indonesian literature persisted under state-regulated frameworks, prioritizing apolitical genres like contextual and Sufistic literatures, which aligned with the regime's Cold War-aligned ideological boundaries (Salam & Zamzuri, 2023; Herlambang, 2011). Meanwhile, Islamic literary voices remained marginalized, reflecting the New Order's selective canonization (Rokhman, 2021). Strategically the New Order regime mobilized Indonesian writers within U.S. cultural diplomacy frameworks, notably through participation in the International Writing Program (IWP). Between 1970 and 1990, it dispatched 25 writers—including Gerson Poyk and Sori Siregar—to IWP residencies, (Saraswati 2019). Participation was contingent on ideological alignment: selected writers were predominantly non-leftist, anti-communist, and compliant with the regime's anti-Sukarnoist agenda.

Mochtar Lubis emerged as a pivotal non-leftist writer aligned with the New Order's anti-communist agenda following the 1965 coup. Detained in 1966, he received visits from Western figures like Ivan Kats (Congress for Cultural Freedom) and journalist Bruce Grant, while corresponding with Rohan Rivett (Director of International Press Institute) to praise student protests—including his son Ade's activism, memorialized in the poem *Gas Air Mata* (Hill, 2010). These interactions underscore Lubis's preexisting ties to Western Cold War networks, positioning him as an ideological mediator before the regime's consolidation. Hill (2010) further identifies Lubis as a "golden child of the New Order"—a cultural broker who leveraged his influence to shape early regime narratives, epitomizing the convergence of literary authority and Cold War realpolitik:

> *In talking much later about the early years after his release, Mochtar laughingly recalled he had been treated like 'the Golden Boy of the New Order'. Long out of circulation and lacking a power base, he was not an important political actor in this period, but his good name overseas was an asset to the emerging 'New Order'. He was politically untarnished, with impeccable democratic credentials acceptable to the West and admired in intellectual and professional circles in other parts of Asia. To such observers, he appeared a democrat who might temper military influence in government. Suharto was seeking international legitimacy, partly to encourage foreign aid and investment, but also to reinforce domestic legitimacy.* (Hill 2010, 89-90)

Mochtar Lubis's status as the New Order's "golden child" arose from his dual identity as an anti-Sukarno, anti-communist intellectual and a Western-celebrated democrat—a duality the regime exploited to secure international legitimacy, foreign aid, and IMF-backed economic restructuring via institutions like the Inter-Governmental Group on Indonesia (IGGI) in 1967. Amidst Cold War tensions, Lubis positioned himself as a central Indonesian figure for Western journalists, many of whom were drawn to his residence. This convergence symbolized his distinct Western alignment and cemented his role as a crucial bridge between the New Order establishment and Western intelligentsia. (Hill 2010).

Domestically, Lubis bolstered the regime's credibility by spearheading anti-communist cultural initiatives (*Horison* magazine, Yayasan Obor Indonesia, Jakarta Arts Council) and promoting Suharto's technocratic vision through media outlets like *Kompas* and *Sinar Harapan*. However, this alliance fractured in 1974 when the New Order regime censored Indonesia Raya—a newspaper Lubis founded—alongside other critical press outlets. This crackdown marked the end of the "honeymoon period" between Lubis and the government (Wibisono in Lubis, 1997).

Mochtar Lubis founded the literary magazine *Horison* in 1966 alongside the Cultural Manifesto group and anti-Sukarno student and artists, assembling an editorial team including Jassin, Zaini, Taufiq Ismail, Arief Budiman, D.S. Moeljanto, and Goenawan Mohamad—signatories of the anti-LEKRA manifesto. Positioned as the New Order's inaugural literary platform, *Horison* supplanted the defunct *Sastra* (closed in 1964) to champion anti-communism and liberal humanism, rejecting Sukarno's populism and socialist realism, thereby hegemonizing Indonesia's literary landscape (Hill, 2010; Mayasari-Hoffert, 2023; Sarwoto, 2018). Initially funded by local entrepreneurs like Sukada and A.H. Sahab, the magazine faced financial strain due to niche readership until the International Association for Cultural Freedom (IACF)—successor to the CIA-backed Congress for Cultural Freedom—intervened. Lubis's ties to the IACF, evident in their support for his novel *Twilight in Jakarta* and his role on its Executive Board, secured Horison annual funding of USD 10,000 until 1977, cementing its ideological alignment with Western Cold War cultural agendas (Hill, 2010).

Mochtar Lubis, in collaboration with former CCF official Ivan Kats, established Yayasan Obor Indonesia in 1975 as part of the New York-based Obor Incorporated network, a public social organization governed by an International Board of Trustees. Supported by Foreign Minister Adam Malik and Dutch patron Prince Bernhard, the foundation aimed to foster liberalism and democracy through cultural exchange, book translations, and Western donor engagement, funded by the Ford Foundation, Dutch/German agencies, churches, academic institutions, the IACF, and multinational corporations like Freeport Indonesia, International Nickel Corporation, Mobil Oil Corporation, Shell Nederland, and Philip Morris (Hill, 2010). However, as Scott-Smith (2022) argues, Obor's mission exemplified the ideological liminality of liberalism, where democratic ideals intersected with neoliberal economics and illiberal practices, challenging its universality. By navigating this tension, Kats enabled Indonesian intellectuals to pursue localized visions of a "good society" while balancing Western donor expectations and local autonomy, revealing how liberal models

distort outside Euro-American contexts. Obor thus became a microcosm of Cold War cultural diplomacy's contradictions, merging idealism with extractive industry interests and geopolitical pragmatism.

Lubis's cultural trajectory during Suharto's Cold War regime epitomized a paradoxical negotiation of ideological allegiances. While he championed Western liberal humanism as a pathway to individual emancipation, his entrenched alliances with figures like Ivan Kats and reliance on Western cultural capital compromised his capacity to resist the neocolonial dynamics underpinning Cold War cultural imperialism. This duality—advocating liberation while being structurally enmeshed in hegemonic networks—frames the ambivalence at the heart of his literary and institutional engagements. The following analysis interrogates this tension through *Maut dan Cinta* (1977), examining how the novel's portrayal of the West (Occident) oscillates between critique and fascination, mirroring Lubis's own negotiation of Indonesia's fraught position as a postcolonial state navigating Cold War ideological battlegrounds.

2. Ambivalence towards the Occident in *Maut dan Cinta* (1977)

Maut dan Cinta (1977), conceived during Lubis's Sukarno-era imprisonment and finalized during a 1973 residency at the U.S. Aspen Institute (Ensiklopedia Sastra Indonesia, 2016), spans Indonesia's anti-colonial struggle and Cold War ideological realignments. Set in 1947 amid post-independence upheaval and the Cold War's emergence, the novel centers on Sadeli, an intelligence officer whose Western education and nationalist zeal embody postcolonial contradictions as he negotiates sovereignty against Western geopolitical and cultural encroachment. Sadeli's residual admiration for the Occident, juxtaposed with his anti-colonial resolve, exemplifies Salhi's (2019) notion of ambivalence as a tension between admiration and hatred (critique). Through this analytical lens, we trace Sadeli's evolution as a postcolonial transitional subject, interrogating his critiques of Western cultural imperialism alongside ambivalent proximity to the Occident.

a. Sadeli as a Postcolonial Transitional Subject

Sadeli, a 33-year-old intelligence officer born in 1914 to a Javanese *priyayi* family in Semarang, poses as a sugar entrepreneur to fund Indonesia's independence struggle. His father, a colonial-era *wedana* (district chief), discouraged him from colonial service, leading Sadeli to serve as a nationalist soldier and civil servant. The name "Sadeli," likely derived from "Syadzali," reflects his devout Muslim upbringing, particularly influenced by his mother's lineage. Educated at Bandung's Hollandsch Inlandsche Kweekschool, his exposure to nationalist thinkers (Hatta, Sukarno) and literature like Multatuli's *Saijah and Adinda* fueled his anti-colonial resolve (Lubis, 2018, pp. 2-3).

Sadeli's worldview, shaped by his Dutch colonial education, reflects a paradoxical blend of Western influence and nationalist fervor. He idolizes warrior-heroes across cultures—from European admirals (Piet Hein) and Islamic conquerors (Saladin) to Indonesian resistance figures (Diponegoro, Acehnese fighters) and Javanese superhero (Gatotkaca)—viewing them as embodiments of moral excellence, with Indonesian heroes surpassing all others (Lubis, 2018, p. 3). His encyclopedic military knowledge spans global history: European battles (Agincourt, Napoleon), Middle Eastern conquests (Sultan Muhammad), Asian leaders (Kublai Khan), and Indigenous resistance (Sitting Bull). A polyglot fluent in six languages (Dutch, English, French, German, Japanese, and Mandarin), Sadeli's expertise mirrors a cosmopolitanism forged by colonial pedagogy and multilingual engagement with Western literature (Lubis, 2018, pp. 4–5, 13).

The narrator's voice, which echoes Mochtar Lubis's vision, articulates his vision of the "new Indonesian man" through the character of Sadeli, a concept that resonates with Frantz Fanon's theorization of the "new human" (Fanon, 1963)—a subject forged in the aftermath of colonialism, striving to transcend the psychological and cultural legacies of

foreign domination. The narrator defines this idealized figure as follows:

> *"… manusia Indonesia baru - manusia Indonesia yang tak pernah punya rasa rendah atau kurang diri, akan tetapi juga manusia Indonesia yang tidak sombong, tinggi hati dan berkepala besar dan manusia Indonesia yang menganggap dirinya adalah manusia yang diciptakan Tuhan, tak kurang, tetapi juga tidak lebih dari manusia lain di dunia. Manusia Indonesia yang hendak membina persaudaraan dengan manusia lain dalam kemerdekaan, perdamaian, kemakmuran dan kebahagiaan."* ("… the new Indonesian – an Indonesian who never feels inferior or inadequate, yet one who is neither arrogant, haughty, nor conceited; an Indonesian who considers himself a human being created by God, no less, but also no more, than any other person in the world. An Indonesian who seeks to forge bonds of brotherhood with others in freedom, peace, prosperity, and happiness.") (Lubis, 2018, pp. 9-10)

The passage highlights the enduring legacy of Enlightenment ideals—liberty, equality, fraternity—in shaping modern nationalism and anti-colonial movements like Indonesia's 1945 independence. These republican principles, rooted in the French Revolution, framed nation-states as entities entitled to self-determination and solidarity, fueling figures like Sadeli, whose activism intersected with Cold War geopolitics. Amid the post-WWII global reordering, Indonesia's independence dismantled Dutch rule while entangling it in ideological contests. Sadeli's ambivalence toward the Occident—oscillating between critique and tacit alignment—mirrors this tension, embodying the paradoxes of postcolonial sovereignty in a bipolar world.

b. Sadeli's Critique of the West

As theorized by Salhi (2019), Occidentalism encompasses both fascination with and hatred of the West, expressed through literary and intellectual discourse. Sadeli, a postcolonial Indonesian shaped by Dutch colonial trauma, embodies this duality: educated under Dutch colonialism yet seething with resentment over unacknowledged atrocities, particularly the Netherlands' refusal to recognize Indonesia's 1945 sovereignty. This bitterness erupts in visceral hatred—symbolized by his primal urge to shred the Dutch flag.

> *"Tiap kali dia melihat warna merah putih biru, dia ingin menyobek warna biru, dan membuangnya jauh-jauh. Ketiga warna itu menimbulkan rasa benci dan marah dalam hatinya. Menimbulkan kenangan dalam dirinya pada, kejahatan-kejahatan penjajah Belanda, penipuan, pembunuhan, pengkhianatan, perkosaan, penindasan dan penghisapan yang dilakukan Belanda di seluruh Indonesia."* ("Every time he saw the red-white-blue, he wanted to tear off the blue and fling it far away. Those three colors stirred hatred and anger in his heart. They evoked memories within him of the evils of the Dutch colonizers: the deception, the murders, the betrayals, the rapes, the oppression, and the exploitation perpetrated by the Dutch throughout Indonesia.") (Lubis, 2018, p. 71)

The Dutch colonial atrocities have crystallized into Indonesia's collective memory (Bijl, 2012)—a trauma not confined to Sadeli alone. Another character, Amir, echoes this sentiment, his rage mirroring Sadeli's visceral antipathy toward the colonizers.

> *"Aku benci dan dendam. Bukan main sombongnya mereka. Ayahku jadi guru desa di daerah perkebunan. Tuan-tuan kebun Belanda lagaknya seperti raja-raja saja. Kuli-kuli kontrak mereka perlakukan seperti budak belian. Perempuan-perempuan mereka pakai sesuka hati. Jika ada kuli yang lari, dikejar seperti binatang liar. Jika tertangkap dipecut punggungnya hancur luluh."* ("I burn with hatred and resentment. Their arrogance was beyond measure. My father was a village schoolteacher in the plantation district. Those Dutch plantation owners strutted about like kings. They treated their contract laborers like slaves. They helped themselves to the women as they pleased.

> If a laborer ran away, they hunted him down like a wild animal. If caught, they lashed his back until it was shattered." (Lubis, 2018, p. 196)

This resentment emerged as a response to Dutch colonial superiority—a system perpetuated through racist and criminal acts against native Indonesians. The Dutch refusal to acknowledge Indonesia's 1945 independence starkly exemplified the enduring rigidity of Western supremacy. For Sadeli, this hypocrisy laid bare the contradictions of colonial ideology, "*Karena Belanda rupanya menganggap prinsip-prinsip kemerdekaan hanya berlaku buat diri mereka saja, dan tidak bagi bangsa kita."* ("Because the Dutch apparently considered the principles of independence applicable only to themselves, and not to our nation.") (Lubis, 2018, pp. 21–22). Through this critique, Sadeli exposes the legacy of Western hypocrisy and injustice, unmasking the colonizer's pretensions to republican virtue as a hollow facade.

From Sadeli's perspective, this legacy is framed as rooted in the belief of Western superiority and Eastern inferiority. The narrative critiques Eurocentrism's marginalization of the East—a hallmark of Orientalist binaries (Said, 1978).

> *"Manusia-manusia Barat terlalu lama menganggap manusia kulit berwarna sawo matang, hitam atau kuning, sebagai manusia kelas rendah. Tak setaraf dengan mereka dalam martabat, intelijensia, budi, akhlak, pribadi dan kemuliaan."* ("Western peoples have long considered brown, black, or yellow-skinned human beings as inferior. Not their equals in dignity, intelligence, character, morality, personality, or human worth." (Lubis, 2018, pp. 9-10)

This Western superiority is embodied by Gaston d'Arlieu, a French businessman who frames France as the pinnacle of civilization. Gaston echoes France's colonial-era "civilizing mission" ideology, asserting cultural assimilation as distinct from—and superior to—British, Dutch, or Portuguese colonialism. He dismisses Ho Chi Minh as a communist and anarchist (Lubis, 2018, pp. 128–129). Another French character, Pierre de Koonig, reinforces this chauvinism, claiming French is a "cultured language" compared to English's "barbarism." Yet such claims obscure half-truths: French assimilation policies in colonies like Martinique, Algeria, and Indochina were marked by systemic violence, discrimination, and racism, belying its purported benevolence.

Fanon (1986), a Martinique native, documents how French colonial rule institutionalized racism through the systemic devaluation of local culture and language, inflicting a crippling inferiority complex on the colonized Martinicans. His experiences in Algeria further expose colonialism's psychological violence: as a psychiatrist-turned-activist, Fanon (1963) observed how institutionalized racism and discrimination inflicted widespread mental trauma on Algerians. French colonial brutality—contradicting its "civilizing" rhetoric—was evident from the outset, as historian Benjamin Stora (quoted by Salhi, 2019) notes: massacres, torture, and forced displacement marked France's occupation:

> *"In 1842, Saint-Arnaud destroyed part of Blida; Cavaignac inaugurated 'smoke-outs', asphyxiating rebels in caves on the west bank of the Chéliff; Canrobert razed a village in the Aurès to 'terrorize the tribes'; Pélissier, colonel of Bugeaud's column, smoked out a thousand men22 from the Ouled Riah tribe who had sought refuge in the caves".*

French colonial brutality, contradicting its professed republican values, also ravaged Indochina. As Ho Chi Minh asserted in Vietnam's 1945 Declaration of Independence: *"Nevertheless, for more than eighty years, the French imperialists, abusing the standard of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, have violated our Fatherland and oppressed our fellow citizens. They have acted contrary to the ideals of humanity and justice."* (Ho Chi Minh, 1945).

Historical data aligns with Sadeli's critique of the West's hypocrisy: proclaiming liberty and humanism as universal values while systematically hoarding them as exclusive privileges.

> *"Kini mereka yang menang perang di Eropa, mereka yang telah menaklukkan kaum Nazi dan fasis kini mereka lupa pada perjuangan mereka melawan kezaliman manusia atas manusia! Dan mereka mengirim serdadu, senjata, kapal perang, kapal udara, bom, meriam, roket dan perintah membunuh kemari untuk menghancurkan kemerdekaan dan nilai manusia, yang mereka perjuangkan untuk diri mereka."* ("Now they, the victors of the war in Europe, they who conquered the Nazis and fascists – now they forget their own struggle against the tyranny of humans over humans! And they send soldiers, weapons, warships, warplanes, bombs, cannons, rockets, and kill orders here to destroy the very independence and human values they fought for themselves.") (Lubis, 2018, p. 193)

In other words, Sadeli critiques Europe's "organized forgetting" (Henry Giroux in Altanian, 2022)—a willful blindness to atrocities like Nazi camps (Belsen, Auschwitz) and global carnage in Asia, Africa, and the Pacific (Lubis, 2018, p. 193). Despite these horrors, European colonial ambitions and claims of civilizational superiority persisted, starkly contradicting their self-fashioned role as moral arbiters while perpetuating the colonial violence they ostensibly condemned.

Critiques of the West extend to Western voices like David Wayne, an American character who confronts enduring inequalities in his own society: *"Kami telah merdeka lebih dari seabad, tetapi kemelaratan dan ketidakadilan serta kedunguan belum dapat kami lenyapkan seluruhnya. Sedang di negeri kami orang Negro menduduki kursi warga negara kelas empat. Di daerah-daerah selatan mereka dipisahkan, ditindas, dibodohkan terus menerus."* ("We have been independent for over a century, yet we have not been able to eradicate poverty, injustice, and ignorance entirely. Meanwhile, in our own country, Negroes occupy the position of fourth-class citizens. In the Southern regions, they are segregated, oppressed, and kept ignorant continuously.") (Lubis, 2018, pp. 244-245). Wayne's self-reflective indictment exposes the hypocrisy of Western modernity: a civilizational project that champions progress abroad while perpetuating systemic racism and poverty domestically, unmasking the contradictions at the heart of liberal democratic ideals.

Lubis's critique of the West reflects a decolonial stance post-WWII, demanding Indonesia's equality in resisting neocolonialism and cultural imperialism. Yet as Indonesia's decolonization entangled Cold War geopolitics, his resolve wavered. Unlike Sukarno's staunch Non-Aligned stance (Bandung Conference, 1955), *Maut dan Cinta* reveals ambivalence toward the West—oscillating between critique and tacit alignment. The novel's anti-communist rhetoric and veneer of liberal humanism align with Western Cold War propaganda, inadvertently replicating the ideologies it critiques. Thus, Lubis exposes postcolonial resistance's paradox: dismantling imperialism while ensnared in its discursive legacies.

c. Sadeli's Tacit Alignment with the Occident

Sadeli's residual fascination with the West manifest in his tacit alignment with the Occident. *Maut dan Cinta* reflects idealism shaped by Cold War-era U.S. anti-communist propaganda (e.g., 1950s McCarthyism), framing democracy and human rights within a liberal humanist paradigm. This bias renders the novel's narrator and characters—who channel Lubis's views—complicit in flattening the Cold War's ideological complexities. Lubis's perspective emerges through Colonel Suroso (Sadeli's intelligence superior), Inspector Hawkins (British colonial official), David Wayne (American pilot), and Sadeli himself, collectively reinforcing a Western-aligned narrative that obscures critiques of capitalism while amplifying anti-communist rhetoric.

Suroso posits that post-WWII, Soviet Russia emerged as a communist superpower rivaling the U.S., influencing China's civil war between Mao Tse Tung's communists and Chiang Kai-Sek's Kuomintang. He warns that a communist victory in China would imperil Asia and the world, framing communism as a colonialist force akin to foreign imperialism. For Suroso, communism's "internationalist"

mission—already imposing suffering on Indonesians—represents an existential global threat (Lubis, 2018, p. 14). While rejecting alignment with the Soviet-Chinese communist bloc, Suroso overlooks the bloc's internal fractures. Historically, tensions among Soviet, Chinese, and Vietnamese communists, epitomized by the Sino-Soviet split under Khrushchev and Mao, precluded unity. Vietnam's strategic engagement with both powers reshaped Southeast Asia's Cold War dynamics, reverberating across Indonesia's geopolitical landscape (Boden, 2008; Hong, 2023' Lüthi, 2008).

Framing the Cold War through Sadeli, Lubis overlooked its intricate dynamics, especially those involving the communist bloc. This perspective underpins Sadeli's unequivocal critique of Soviet communism, as crystallized in the passage below: *"Kita tak dapat mengharapkan banyak dari Soviet Rusia, karena politiknya berdasarkan komunisme internasional, yaitu hanya mau membantu, jika bantuannya berarti memperluas dan memperkuat kaum komunis."* ("We cannot expect much from Soviet Russia, because its politics are based on international communism, meaning it is only willing to help provided that such help serves to expand and strengthen the communist cause.") (Lubis, 2018, pp. 24-25).

Sadeli frames the Cold War as a Manichean U.S.-Soviet binary, mirroring tacit alignment with the Western Bloc. The narrator champions U.S. hegemony, asserting capitalist nations offer workers superior conditions to communist regimes—a claim echoing entrenched U.S. Cold War tropes: Moscow as communism's puppet master, socialist states as liberty-free zones, and systemic exploitation via forced labor (Lubis, 2018, pp. 24–25). By replicating these tropes, the narrative reinforces Western cultural imperialism, privileging capitalist modernity while erasing socialist critiques of inequality.

This anti-communist propaganda ostensibly rests on democratic principles—the notion that all individuals possess the right to practice their religion, express their thoughts, and adhere to their chosen ideology. Yet herein lies the core contradiction of Western Bloc Cold War rhetoric: if all ideologies are entitled to exist, why is communism outlawed? This prohibition extends to sanctioning the hunting, imprisonment, and even execution of communists. Such contradictions are laid bare in Sadeli's assertion: *"... Janganlah ada pemburuan terhadap orang-orang yang berbeda agama atau keyakinan politiknya. Ah, kecuali kaum komunis tentu, yang harus kita tolak, karena mereka merupakan sebagian dari gerakan komunis internasional."* ("...Let there be no hunting down of people for differing religion or political belief. Ah, except the communist ranks, of course, who must be rejected – for they form part of the international communist movement.") (Lubis, 2018, p. 54)

This hypocrisy epitomizes Cold War liberalism's paradox—professing universal freedoms while suppressing dissent. In Indonesia, Lubis's rhetoric implicitly endorses the state's anti-communist purge during the 1965 tragedy, a systematic campaign scholars estimate killed 500,000–1 million people, with hundreds of thousands imprisoned or exiled (Chandra, 2019; Mayasari-Hoffert, 2023; Wardaya, 2021).

The paradox of liberal ideology becomes increasingly evident in Sadeli's dialogues with progressive Western figures espousing republican ideals. These characters assert that freedom, equality, and fraternity must serve as universal values for all humanity, transcending racial boundaries. Such rhetoric draws Sadeli into a sense of ideological kinship with the West, as illustrated in his reflection: *".... Sadeli merasa pada saat itu amat dekat dengan orang Amerika dan Prancis. Amat dekat dengan Inspektur Hawkins."* ("...At that moment, Sadeli felt profoundly close to the Americans and the French. Profoundly close to Inspector Hawkins.") (Lubis, 2018, p. 222). This affinity signals Lubis's own proximity to Western ideals through Sadeli, blurring the line between critique and camaraderie. The intimacy of these relationships underscores the tension between Lubis's anti-colonial stance and his tacit endorsement of liberal universalism—a duality emblematic of postcolonial intellectual ambivalence during the Cold War.

> *"Sadeli, bolehkah saya memanggilmu demikian? Panggillah saya John. Saya merasa kita sudah kawan kini. Let me tell you something, friend. Janganlah melihat di belakang tiap kulit putih seorang penjajah, seorang kapitalis yang menghisap negerimu dan rakyatmu."* ("Sadeli, may I call you that? Call me John. I feel we're comrades now. Let me tell you something, friend. Do not see behind every white skin a colonizer, a capitalist exploiting your country and your people.") (Lubis, 2018, p. 68)

Lubis, through Hawkins, acknowledges the West's internal diversity, recognizing that not all Westerners are colonizers or capitalists. Yet this idealism cannot negate neocolonialism's reality—Western capitalism's exploitative domination of the Global South. While Lubis's narrative captures Western heterogeneity, it ignores communism's global diversity and local adaptations, reflecting post-independence Indonesia's limited geopolitical understanding, especially within the military. Suroso's voice frames communism as an existential threat to Indonesia's revolution but overlooks capitalism's parallel global reach, expansionist ambitions, and erosion of sovereignty under nominal independence.

In responding to Indonesia's 1945 decolonization, for instance, the U.S. prioritized capitalist interests over democratic ideals. Initially neutral, it later backed the Netherlands and Western allies against anticolonial movements (Poulgrain, 2020). Pro-Western narratives, like Suroso, naively ignore that U.S. intervention stemmed not from humanitarianism but cold pragmatism: a Dutch defeat risked post-war European poverty and unemployment, fostering communism's appeal (Wardaya, 2021). Fearing this ideological contagion, Cold War liberalism weaponized democratic rhetoric while sacrificing Global South sovereignty to safeguard capitalist hegemony—exposing its foundational hypocrisy.

Ambivalence also manifests in contradictory character dynamics: Suroso embodies the military's forced Cold War binary, decisively favoring capitalism over communism. Dismissing non-alignment as impractical, he becomes complicit in capitalist cultural imperialism. Conversely, Sadeli rhetorically champions Indonesian sovereignty and self-reliance—"free from geopolitical blocs" (Lubis, 2018, p. 104)—yet maintains ambivalent ties to the Occident, mirroring the novel's unresolved tension between anti-colonial ideals and Cold War realpolitik.

Lubis's ambivalence toward Western domination is embodied by the military establishment—represented by Sadeli and Suroso—who critique Western superiority and imperialism yet overlook global capitalism's threat. As Tomlinson (1991) notes, critiques of cultural imperialism must address capitalism's hegemony over global systems. Capitalism's transnational power, rivaling communism's reach, threatens national sovereignty as both ideologies subsume autonomy. Lubis's characters expose a Cold War-era blind spot: the inability to reconcile anti-colonial resistance with critiques of capitalist imperialism.

The ambivalence in *Maut dan Cinta* mirrors Lubis's own duality as a Western-aligned journalist and Indonesian intellectual. Recognized as Indonesia's most U.S.-aligned journalist (Hill, 2010), Lubis cultivated ties with Western networks—figure like Ivan Kats (CCF), a "cosmopolitan elitist" who was devoted to Indonesia's modernization in a Western-oriented image (James Scott in (Scott-Smith, 2022), paralleling Sadeli's cosmopolitan engagements with characters like Gaston d'Arlieu (French), David Wayne (American), Hawkins (English), and Derek Scott (American). Though critical of specific U.S. policies, his anti-communism and sidelining neo-colonial dynamics cemented the novel's alignment with the capitalist Bloc.

The novel reflects these entanglements: Sadeli's interactions prioritize Western Bloc figures, echoing Lubis's avoidance of communist networks. As New Order Indonesia navigated Western cultural imperialism and neocolonial capitalism, Lubis's ambivalence—advocating sovereignty while entrenched in Global North-dominated systems—paralyzed his vision of a "new Indonesian human,"

constrained by Cold War propaganda's ideological biases.

Conclusion

This study examines the Cold War's impact on Indonesian literature during the early New Order regime through Mochtar Lubis and his novel *Maut dan Cinta*. Hailed as the regime's "golden child" and a Western-celebrated cultural broker, Lubis mediated Indonesia's ideological landscape. His writings advocate resistance to Western mimicry and national sovereignty, yet his actions reveal deep ambivalence: he forged ties with Western intellectuals and founded institutions like *Horison* magazine and the Obor Foundation (Ford-funded). This duality permeates *Maut dan Cinta* (1977), where protagonists champion liberal democracy and anti-communism while ignoring the West's exploitative global capitalism in the Global South. By critically analyzing Lubis's ideological tensions, this study repositions Cold War literature as a dynamic site of contestation where power, ideology, and postcolonial agency converge—providing a framework to reinterpret Global South narratives within transnational contexts. Future scholarship should broaden its scope through comparative analysis of Global South Cold War literatures (e.g., Caribbean, Latin American, African, Asian). This approach would systematically trace critiques of Western hegemony while amplifying subaltern narratives historically suppressed within dominant discourse.

Acknowledgments

This article is derived from the first author's doctoral dissertation research conducted at the Doctoral Program in Humanities, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada. The study was generously funded by the Beasiswa Pendidikan Indonesia (BPI) scholarship under the auspices of the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology, Republic of Indonesia.

References

Ahmad, S. N. B. (2022). The form of ideology and the ideology of form: Cold War, decolonization and Third World print cultures. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *28*(3), 309–311. https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0254

Altanian, D. M. (2022). Genocide denialism: Organized forgetting or substantive epistemic practice? *Zeitschrift Fur Praktische Philosophie*, *9*(1), 251–278. https://doi.org/10.22613/zfpp/9.1.10

Amin, S. (1976). *Unequal Development*. The Harvester Press Limited.

Bijl, P. (2012). Colonial memory and forgetting in the Netherlands and Indonesia. *Journal of Genocide Research*, *14*(3–4), 441–461. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623528.2012.719375

Boden, R. (2008). Cold War economics : Soviet aid to Indonesia. *The Journal of Cold War Studies*, *10*(3), 110–128.

Braginsky, V. (2007). The Other's borders uncrossed and crossed. In *The Portrayal of Foreigners in Indonesia and Malay Literatures* (p. 387). The Edwin Mellen Press.

Chandra, S. (2019). The Indonesian killings of 1965–1966: The case of Central Java. *Critical Asian Studies*, *51*(3), 307–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2019.1626751

Choiruzzad, S. A. B. (2020). To build the world anew: Decolonization and Cold War in Indonesia. *Asian Perspective*, *44*(2), 209–231. https://doi.org/10.1353/apr.2020.0013

Day, T. (2018). Still stuck in the mud: Imagining World Literature during the Cold War in Indonesia and Vietnam. In *Cultures at War* (pp. 131–170). https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501721205-007

Day, T., & Liem, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Cultures at War The Cold War and Cultural Expression in Southeast Asia* (First). Cornell Southeast Asia Program Publications.

Duile, T. (2022). Plural ecologies of tigers in

Indonesian literature: A comparison of Mochtar Lubis' Harimau! Harimau! and Eka Kurniawan's Lelaki Harimau. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, *50*(148), 342–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2022.2127540

Esposti, N. D. (2024). What happened to neocolonialism? The rise and fall of a critical concept. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, *00*(00), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2024.2346193

Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove Press.

Fanon, F. (1986). *Black Skin White Masks*. Pluto Press.

Foulcher, K. (2002). Dissolving into the elsewhere: Mimicry and ambivalence in Marah Roesli's "Sitti Noerbaja." In *Clearing A Space: Postcolonial Readings of Modern Indonesian Literature* (p. 381). KITLV Press.

Foulcher, K. (2020). *Komitmen Sosial dalam Sastra dan Seni: Sejarah Lekra 1950-1965*. Pustaka Pias.

Hammond, A. (2020). Introduction. In A. Hammond (Ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Cold War Literature*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38973-4

Hanafi, H. (2000). *Oksidentalisme Sikap Kita terhadap Barat*. Penerbit Paramadina.

Hansson, E., Hewison, K., & Glassman, J. (2020). Legacies of the Cold War in East and Southeast Asia: An introduction. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, *50*(4), 493–510. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2020.1758955

Herlambang, W. (2011). *Cultural Violence: Its Practice and Challenge in Indonesia*. VDM Verlag Dr. Muller.

Heryanto, A. (1999). Where communism never dies: Violence, trauma and narration in the last cold war capitalist authoritarian state. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, *2*(2), 147–177. https://doi.org/10.1177/136787799900200201

Hidayatullah, D. (2023). Red Badge of Courage and Jalan Tak Ada Ujung: Comparing Indonesia's and America's national masculinity. *Kata*, *25*(2), 81–91. https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.25.2.81-91

Hill, D. T. (2010). *Journalism and Politics in Indonesia: A Critical Biography of Mochtar Lubis (1922-2004) as Editor and Author*. London & New York: Routledge.

Ho Chi Minh. (1945). *Declaration of independence of Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. Retrieved July 07, 2025*. https://revolution.chnm.org/d/583/

Hunter, T. (2002). Indo as Other. In *Clearing A Space: Postcolonial Readings of Modern Indonesian Literature* (p. 381). KITLV Press.

Liu, Y. (2021). Engagement, reunion, division: 1979 Chinese weekend in Iowa City. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, *22*(1), 36–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649373.2021.1886459

Lubis, M. (1997). *Tajuk-Tajuk Mochtar Lubis di Harian Indonesia Raya Seri 2: Korupsi dan Ekonomi, Pendidikan dan Generasi Muda, Hukum, ABRI*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

Lubis, M. (2018). *Maut dan Cinta*. Penerbit Obor.

Lüthi, L. M. (2008). The Sino-Soviet Split Cold War in the Communist World. In *Princeton*. Princeton University Press.

Mayasari-Hoffert, S. (2024). *The Cold War and Its Legacy in Indonesia Literary Representation of the Red Scare*. Routledge.

Metin, A. (2020). Occidentalism: An eastern reply to Orientalism. *Bilig*, *Spring*(93), 181–202. https://doi.org/10.12995/bilig.9308

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (n.d.). *Qualitative Data Analysis A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Murtagh, B. (2005). *The Portrayal of the British in Traditional Malay Literature (Doctoral Dissertation)*. School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, London, England.

Parmar, I. (2012). *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Purdey, J. (2016). Narratives to power: The case of the Djojohadikusumo family dynasty over four generations. *South*

East Asia Research, *24*(3), 369–385. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967828X16659728

Purwantini, P. (2016). Urbanisme, urbanisasi, dan masyarakat urban di Jakarta dalam novel Senja di Jakarta. *Atavisme*, *19*(2), 162–175. https://doi.org/10.24257/atavisme.v19i2.192.162-175

Robison, R. (2009). *Indonesia: The Rise of Capital*. Equinox Publishing.

Rokhman, M. A. (2021). *Indonesian Islamic Fiction in the 21st Century: Representation of the Other in the Works of Forum Lingkar Pena*. UAD Press.

Rubin, A. N. (2012). *Archive of Authority Empire, Culture, and the Cold War*. Princeton University Press.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Penguin Books.

Said, E. W. (1994). *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage Books.

Salam, A., & Zamzuri, A. (2023). Spaces for literary production in New Order Indonesia and beyond. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *29*(3), 53–63. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2023-2903-05

Salhi, Z. S. (2019). *Occidentalism Literary Representations of the Maghrebi Experinece of the East-West Encounter*. Edinburgh University Press.

Saraswati, A. (2019). *Cold War Mobilities: Indonesian Sojourning Writers, Neoliberalism, and Cultural Politics (Doctoral Dissertation)*. University at Buffalo, The State University of New York, Buffalo, New York.

Sarwoto, P. (2018). The construction of modernity in pre-independent Indonesia and its ensuing manifestation in critical discourse and literary theory. *Kritika Kultura*, *30*(2018), 276–289.

Scott-Smith, G. (2022). Liminal liberalism? Ivan Kats, the Congress for Cultural Freedom, and the Obor Foundation in Cold War Indonesia. *Journal of Contemporary History*, *57*(4), 1051–1071. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220094221107476

Setiadi, H. F. (2014). *Rewriting the Nation: Pramoedya Ananta Toer and the Politics of Decolonization (Doctoral Dissertation)*. National University of Singapore, Singapore.

Suryajaya, M. (2023). Towards a morphology of critique : An attempt to classify approaches to literary criticism. *Poetika Jurnal Ilmu Sastra*, *11*(1), 10–21. https://doi.org/10.22146/poetika.v11i1.79438

Susanto, D. (2012). Relasi Sang Ego dan Sang Liyan dalam Tjerita Njai Dasima Soewatoe Koeban Dari Pada Pemboedjoek: Kajian feminis pascakolonial. *Kajian Sastra*, *32*(1), 1–16.

Suwignyo, A. (2017). The American influence in Indonesian teacher training, 1956-1964. *History of Education*, *46*(5), 653–673. https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2017.1328614

Thiong'o, N. wa. (1987). *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Zimbabwe Publising House.

Uzoigwe, G. N. (2019). Neocolonialism is dead long live neocolonialism. *Journal of Global South Studies*, *36*(1), 59–87. https://doi.org/10.1353/gss.2019.0004

Wardaya, B. T. (2021). The long shadow of the Cold War: The Cold War policies of the United States towards Asia and their impact on Indonesia. *International Quarterly for Asian Studies*, *52*(3–4), 331–347. https://doi.org/10.11588/iqas.2021.3-4.13931

Whyte, J. (2018). Psychological war in Vietnam: Governmentality at the United States Information Agency. *Geopolitics*, *23*(3), 661–689. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2017.1342623

Zhaparaliev, S., & Kyzy, S. E. (2024). The rise and fall of cultural imperialism: A historical and critical review. *Russian Sociological Review*, *23*(3), 326–353. https://doi.org/10.17323/1728-192x-2024-3-326-353