



**Ivory Tower on Dirt:
The Impact of Regime Change on
Academic Freedom in Indonesian
Universities**

By Abdul Wahid

June 2019

Working Paper
SHAPE SEA Research Project

Abstract

Academic freedom is an essential aspect of university, by which it functions as a socio-cultural institution. For the sake of its political position, government regimes in any state of the world are interested in having control over university. Therefore, the change of regime often had certain effects on the working of universities, including their academic freedom practice. This paper seeks to investigate the impacts of regime change in Indonesia during the period of 1950-1980 on the way Indonesian universities examines the principle of academic freedom during the period of 1950-1980. Based on first hand sources of information and interview, the paper argues that Sukarno's anti-colonial and revolutionary policies and then Suharto's anti-communist and developmental projects have manipulated Indonesian universities and disrupted substantially their practice of academic freedom. The aftermath of this regime change contributes in shaping the nature of academic freedom practice in present day Indonesian universities.

Key words: Academic freedom; regime changes; Indonesian university; Sukarno; Suharto

Introduction

This paper investigates the impact of regime change on Indonesian universities since 1950 until 1980. It focuses on how and in what way the changing political regimes did affect the way Indonesian universities perceive the principles of academic freedom and how did they formulate, develop and practice their own academic freedom. During the period of concern, Indonesia experienced at least two important regime changes, namely from the Dutch colonial government to the Indonesian independent government in 1945/1950, and from Sukarno's presidency to Suharto's presidency in 1965/1966. Literature has shown that in the wake of these political events (public) universities were forced to receive political-administrative restructuring often based on different ideology, which drastically changed the existing academic freedom climate in those universities and the nature of the state-university relationship in Indonesia.

Despite having a significant socio-cultural function in society, Indonesian higher education and its history surprisingly attract little interest from Indonesian researchers and scholars. Indonesian historiography shows that there are only a few studies that really examine the development of Indonesian higher education and their academic freedom tradition. This might have to do partially with the fact that Indonesian higher education system is relatively young. As a former

colonialized country, Indonesia inherited a tiny legacy of its higher educational system from the Dutch colonial government. There were indeed some colleges established during the colonial period that provided training for a limited number of indigenous students in the field of engineering, medicine, and administration. These were established mainly to serve colonial interests, particularly to produce ‘cheap indigenous technocrats’ who would be employed to occupy middle to lower ranks of the colonial bureaucracy. Yet, this Western educated group of Indonesians emerged unexpectedly as the propagator of the nationalist movement who would destroy the legitimacy of colonialism and brought about the new political era for Indonesian people as an independent country in 1945 (Sutherlands 1983, Hans Pol 2018).

Shortly after independence, the Indonesian government strove to develop a national higher education system. It is noted that in the first five years after independence – while involved in a long armed conflict with the Netherlands, in mid-1946 Indonesia established the first national university – Universitas Gadjah Mada in Yogyakarta, then the capital of Republic of Indonesia, and nationalized five ‘colonial universities’. One decade later, after gaining full recognition as an independent country, the Indonesian government successfully established eight public universities, 55 public academies, and around a hundred private universities in 1959/1960. By 1965, the number of Indonesian universities and academies grew enormously. State/public universities and academies had grown respectively to 39 and 88, while private universities doubled to 228 units/institutions. Thus, in total there were 355 universities/academies all over Indonesia that trained around 278,000 students (Thomas 1973: 50-55).¹

This was quite an achievement for the Indonesian government considering its slow start in developing its higher education system. To manage and regulate these universities and improve their quality, Indonesian government introduced various institutional arrangements. Initially these higher education institutions were under the coordination of the Ministry of Education and Culture, but later since 1963, the Ministry of Higher Education and Science (Perguruan Tinggi dan Ilmu Pengetahuan – PTIP) was installed to administer these higher education institutions all over Indonesia. In 1967, Soeharto after being appointed as new president, decided to give back the Ministry of Education and Culture the authority to coordinate the management of the Indonesian higher education system. During this period, the Indonesian government received

¹ In 2014, Indonesia has already 85 state/public universities (or 3% of total universities) with 907,323 students and 151,642 faculty staffs; meanwhile the number of private universities is 3,151 units with 2,298,830 students and 122,092 faculty members (docents).

international assistance and cooperation to improve the quality of its higher education system (Hutagaol 1985: 178).

Considering the young history of the Indonesian higher education system, it is a bit too much to expect that Indonesian universities would have developed a high-quality learning process and academic life in comparison with universities in the developed countries. As a centre for knowledge production, universities in a developing country like Indonesia are expected to contribute to the 'nation-state building project' by providing guidance or direct involvement in the development process and producing high-quality human resources. In that context, it is interesting to see how Indonesian universities try to improve their quality time after time and how independent/dependent they are from the changing socio-political environment, particularly regime changes. One of the important aspects is the practice of academic freedom, because – as Karl Jasper (1946) has argued – academic freedom is 'the core idea of a university, which is reflected in the freedom of teaching and doing research'. In the same token, another classic thinker John Dewey (1984) has also argued that academic freedom 'is essential for the creation of intelligent citizen and the creation of democracy'.

The importance of academic freedom not only concerns its function as the foundation for the learning process and academic life of a university, but also on its meaning for the entirety of human beings. On this point, Joseph Saunders (1998: x-xi) argues that:

‘...while academic freedom is not a self-contained right, the freedom to pursue research and scholarship unfettered by censorship and persecution cannot be separated from freedom to exercise basic civil and political rights as set forth the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).’

Following Saunders's logic above, academic freedom can be understood as not merely attached to 'educational institutions that provide formal learning process', but more importantly it is also embedded in the individual rights that constitutes the very existence of human beings.

Theoretically, academic freedom as a basic requirement for a viable higher academic institution has been debated in the Western world since the medieval period when early universities were established, particularly in Europe. Yet, it became a global concern and convention only in the modern period. One of the most cited efforts is the initiative of the American Association of University Professor (AAUP), which came up with a firm declaration of academic freedom in 1915. According to AAUP's Declaration, academic freedom consists at least of three elements,

namely freedom of inquiry and research, freedom of teaching within the university, and freedom of extramural utterance and action (freedom of expression) (Fish 2000: 7).

Using the AUUP 1915 Declaration as a conceptual framework, this paper examines the impact of regime changes on academic freedom practice in Indonesian universities. The main question to be answered is: how and in what way did the regimes changes during the period of 1950-1980 affect the practice of academic freedom in Indonesian universities? It is based on a hypothesis that Indonesian universities since its earlier history developed under close proximity to the state to an extent that their operation was highly influenced by the changing political regime. Many studies have revealed that regime change, especially the 1965 coup d'état, has had a deep repercussion on Indonesian academia and universities in general (Farid 2003; White 2003; Dhakidae 2005; Wahid 2018).

After a brief discussion on research methods, this paper starts its discussion with a survey on the efforts of the Indonesian government in developing the Indonesian high education system and universities in particular from the early independence period of 1950 until the New Order period of 1980. This will be followed up by the main section on the practice of academic freedom during the entire period of concern. This section will be divided into two sub-sections: the Sukarno period and the Suharto Period. In the first sub-section, the paper analyses the period of Sukarno's administration from 1950 to 1965, which strongly showed the spirit of anti-imperialism and revolution in response to the Cold War political atmosphere. In the first half of his presidency, Sukarno introduced a radical policy to decolonize the Indonesian higher education system by abandoning Dutch curriculum system, expulsing foreign professors, and creating a new national higher system to replace the colonial system. Meanwhile in the second half of his presidency, Sukarno introduced a more authoritarian policy to support his revolutionary ideas, notably by deploying universities as an instrument of the Indonesian revolution. This idea brought universities into the vortex of the power game between nationalist, religious, and communist political factions, which disrupted the life of universities when political competition led to open conflicts.

The following sub-section discusses the New Order period from 1965 until 1980. It starts with a critical analysis on the legacy of the 1965-1966 Crises, after which Suharto took over power from Sukarno and installed a new administration. This part emphasized Suharto's anti-communist campaign and developmental project through repressive control and cooptation over

universities, among other by removing 'leftist' scholars/students and all elements of 'communism/socialism' from university curricula, research agendas, and other socio-cultural activities. In addition, Suharto also established a structural militaristic-control and censorship, which cultivated a culture of 'fear' and self-censorship among scholars and students. Those policies in general clearly violated the principle of academic freedom.

This paper concludes with a reflection on the struggle of Indonesian universities in the midst of changing political regimes since 1950 to gain their independencies in exercising their academic freedom. It also contains a brief recommendation for Indonesian universities, but also for the Indonesian government on the importance of academic freedom as a timely and urgent issue in Indonesia.

B. Research Method

To answer the above main research question, this paper combines a historical approach that relies on documentary and oral historical data. Documentary data is collected from the government and university archives, memoirs, and newspapers. Concerning government archives, it is worth to note that most of the government agencies, such as Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia (ANRI, the National Archive of Indonesia), Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia (PNRI, the National Library of Indonesia), and Badan Perpustakaan dan Arsip Daerah (BPAD, the Regional Library and Archive Office) all over Indonesia are still restricting public access to their archival collection related to the 1965 issue. These archives are still preserved under the 'confidential category', which needs a special permit for those want to access it. Only a very limited number of archives on this issue are available for public access, most of which are have no direct connection to the issue. This likely has to do with the bigger 'anti-communist policy' that was imposed since 1966 forbidding the circulation of communism in Indonesia. It is believed that government views research on and public access to the 1965 related archives may risk a communist revival in Indonesia.

In order to fill the gap of information on this issue, this paper peruses newspapers, magazines, and bulletins published during the period concerned. Despite almost all of the newspapers published by the PKI (Partai Komunis Indonesia, Indonesian Communist Party) having been removed from libraries, surprisingly the available newspapers still provide substantial information about the aftermath of the 1965 anti-communist purge on campuses. This helps the author to gauge the life of Indonesian campuses after 1965 and to analyze their academic

freedom practice. Substantial information and data are also collected from memoirs and biographies of the survivors that appeared largely after the fall of Suharto in 1998. In addition to this, the paper also uses oral history publications containing interviews with survivors of 1965 that also flourished after 1998. Both genres emerged as part and parcel of the wave of revisionist historiography to challenge the New Order's historical narrative (Adam 2007; Klinken 2008)

Lastly, the paper also integrates the information collected from in-depth interview with survivors and witnesses. They are former students and lecturers working in three prominent public universities in Indonesia, namely Universitas Gadjah Mada, Universitas Indonesia, and Insitut Pertanian Bogor. These universities are the oldest, biggest and most influential yet also the most affected campuses by the changing of political regime in the 1960s. By analyzing the life stories of these people, a slightly more complete picture of student and campus life from this period concerned can be drawn.

C. The development of Indonesian universities

Soon after regaining full recognition of its independence, the Indonesian government under Sukarno made an effort to develop a national higher education system. The first step to do that was to reconstruct the existing higher learning institutes established in the pre-war and war period of 1930s and 1940s. Among them, Universitas Indonesia (UI) in Jakarta and Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM) in Yogyakarta are the two most important universities. Universitas Indonesia, then Universitas Indonesia, was established in 1950 along with the re-installment of Jakarta as the national capital. It was constituted from several smaller academies and institutes that have been around since the colonial period in and around the city. Universitas Gadjah Mada was established in 1949, in the midst of the armed conflict between the Indonesian government and the Netherlands, through a more or less similar process. It was a fusion of several academies that had developed earlier in and around Yogyakarta. As a matter of fact, there was initially a plan to merge these two universities into one single university to be located in Jakarta as one of the national symbols of the Republic of Indonesia. But the government dropped that plan as most of professors at UGM rejected the idea and wanted the university to remain in Yogyakarta (Hutagaol 1985: 105).

In their first five years of operation, the two universities showed different trajectories.

Universitas Indonesia still held a strong Dutch orientation, as it continued to use the Dutch curriculum, textbook and even language of instruction. Many Dutch professors appointed prior

to the sovereignty transfers were still working at the university. A report reveals that in 1953, 70% of professors in the university were still foreigners and applied European standard in their teaching methods and methodology. Meanwhile, from its early development, Universitas Gadjah Mada cultivated a fully Indonesian academic atmosphere. It adopted Indonesian as the language of instruction and developed an Indonesia-oriented curriculum supported by professors, almost all of whom were Indonesians. It was only in the mid-1950s when the two universities took a convergence trajectory when the Indonesian government introduced a more unified high education system (van der Kroef 1955; Hutagaol 1985: 106).

Despite having serious financial and economic problems, the Indonesian government managed to expand not only the quantity, but also the quality of higher education institutions. During the period of 1950-1959, the number of state universities increased from two to eight, while state academies (a vocational type of high education institutions) increased from six in 1950 to 45 in 1959. Meanwhile, the number of private universities also increased from two in 1949 to 27 in 1959. The increasing number of state and private universities and academies provides a bigger chance for Indonesians citizens to get a better education. This can be seen from the increase in the number of students in state and private universities during this period. In 1950/51 the total number of students in these universities was 6,158, which increased almost fivefold to 32,501 students in 1956/57. Similarly, the number of students also increased drastically from 4,580 in 1955/56 to 20,000 in 1959/60 (Thomas 1973a; Hutagaol 1985: 107). By 1960, eight public universities, 28 public academies, and tens of private universities already operated in several big cities in Java, Sumatra, Sulawesi, and Kalimantan (Poesponegoro 1959; Sillock 1962: 186).

The credit for this achievement goes mainly to Sukarno's strong commitment to develop the Indonesian high education system, but also to his 'brilliant' political strategy in responding to the Cold War political environment, especially the political rivalry between the Western and Eastern blocs. Literature has revealed that Sukarno strove to promote the non-alignment political movement, while at the same time he was also trying to rebuild the Indonesian economy from the ruins of war. For those reasons, he led Indonesia to receive benefits from both the USA and the Soviet Union side, by starting multilateral cooperation and by accepting 'developmental aids', including the capacity building programs in the military, economy, and higher education sectors (Boden 2008: 110-30).

In the early 1950s, realizing the condition that Indonesian universities were still facing, including basic problems such as financial constraints, lacks of infrastructure, and limited human resources, Sukarno accepted 'the capacity building project aids' from the USA and the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, under the auspices of the Colombo Plan and UNESCO, the USA became the most 'generous' country to provide financial and technical assistance to improve the quality of the Indonesian high education system. The first 'cooperation contract', worth \$2,500,000, was signed in July 1954 by the Indonesian government and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Under this framework, the Medical College of the University of California provided twelve physicians to work with the Medical Faculty of University of Indonesia in Jakarta, and fifty graduate students were sent to California for advanced training. In addition to that, laboratory supplies, teaching materials, and books were supplied as well through the contract. Another \$1,797,907 contract was signed in 1956 to finance the cooperation between the College of Engineering of the Kensington University and the Institute of Technology in Bandung, which covered laboratory supplies, advance training for graduate students, textbooks, and research training. A similar scheme was also formulated between the University of California at Los Angeles and the Science Faculty of University of Gadjah Mada at Yogyakarta. And, last but not least, another \$1,250,000 contract was signed in July 1957 to finance the cooperation between the University of Kentucky and the Agriculture Institute at Bogor in the development and assistance of training, teaching, research and public service aspect of education (Mooney Jr. 1963: 94-96).

Almost at the same time, the Indonesian government also started military and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union, which also included the development of the higher education sector. Boden (2008: 116) has calculated that from 1959 until 1965, Indonesia received a total of 789 million Russian ruble worth of assistance from the Soviet Union, more than one-fifth (21%) of the total amount provided by Moscow to all non-socialist developing countries, making Indonesia the biggest recipient ever. The majority of this financial aid – around 90% – was apparently used not for economic but military purposes, particularly to strengthen the Indonesian armed forces in order to support Sukarno's 'anti-imperialist' agenda. The remaining bulk of the Soviet aid was spent to finance the development of heavy industry (steel production sites), agroindustry (fertilizer factories), energy (thermal power stations), infrastructure (street building), and education (oceanography and engineering) (Boden 2008: 118). The University of Gadjah Mada was reported in 1959-1960 to have received Soviet educational aid, particularly in

advanced training of graduate students and in capacity building assistance for the faculties of medicine, pedagogy and science (Sardjito 1961: 51)

Thank to these international assistances, the Indonesian government was able to continue developing the quality of their higher education institutions. In the last five years of Sukarno's administration, he showed greater ambition to develop the Indonesian higher education sector. In 1960, he proposed a plan that every province should have at least one institution of higher education and one faculty of education. Two years later, Sukarno followed up that plan by issuing a decree stipulating that 'each of 25 provinces is given the opportunity to establish a provincial state university' (Atmakusuma 1974: 4). As a result, during the period from 1961-1965 public universities/institutes increased from 14 in 1961 to 39 in 1965, public academies from 55 to 88, and private universities/universities from 112 to 128. In the same period, the number of registered students also increased substantially. In public universities/institutes, the total number students increased from 65,000 to 158,000; in public academies, it increased from 17,000 to 38,000, while in private universities/institutes the number of students rose from 27,000 to 82,000. Thus, in total higher education institutions in Indonesia in the period of 1961-1965 increased drastically from 181 to 355 institutions, while the number of students had increased from 109,000 to 278,000. In term of student numbers, this is actually bellow Sukarno's target Sukarno who stipulated 315,000 Indonesians from the young generation should pursue higher education (Hutagaol 1985: 147-48).

D. Academic freedom in the wake of regime change

D.1. From Colonial to National Universities: the Soekarno Era, 1950-1965

The years 1950-1965 are known as the time of hyper-politics. It was the period when political parties and factions with different ideologies were tightly competing for power and political influence. This political competition penetrated deeply into the academic life of universities, particularly in the second half of 1950s and first half of 1960s. After leading Indonesia through the destructive period of decolonization and revolutionary war, the charismatic Sukarno, officially sworn as president in 1950, made his country into a liberal parliamentary democracy, an experiment to find the best political system for independent Indonesia. Apart from the successful issuing of the 1950 Constitution and the effective organizing of the first democratic

election in 1955 (Feith 1962), the liberal political parliamentary system failed to establish a stable government (with six consecutive cabinets only within four years), to perform economic recovery from the war hazards, and to create a solid social justice and education system (Ricklefs 2008: 289-320).

The socio-political situation in the second half of the 1950s was highly fragmented. Indonesian society was divided to large extent by different ideological orientations, religious aspirations, ethnic sentiments, and local and regional egoism. This led the political elite to see liberalism as no longer a suitable ideology for the Indonesian political system. Sukarno himself declared later that:

‘Liberalism has poisoned our social consciousness, individualism has cracked and broken our unity and cohesion and mutual cooperation ...making us a nation full of the cancer of regionalism, the cancer of my-ethnic group first, the cancer of multi-*partism*, the cancer of *groupism*’ (as cited and translated by Thomas 1973: 175-76).

As a solution, Sukarno with the support of military elite issued a decree on 5 July 1959 introducing a new political system that positioned Sukarno as the central guidance of the country. To do so, he reintroduced the 1945 Constitution to replace the 1950 Constitution, which gave a strong authority on his hand as president to order all the nation’s affairs. This was the so-called ‘the guided democracy’ system that was introduced by Sukarno on his national address for the national Independence Day celebration of August 17 1959. The principles of this system were *Undang-Undang Dasar 45* (the 1945 Constitution), *Sosialisme a la Indonesia* (Socialism in an Indonesian way), *Demokrasi Terpimpin* (Guided Democracy), *Ekonomi Terpimpin* (Guided Economy), and *Kepribadian Indonesia* (the Indonesian Personality). Altogether, this was known as the *Manifestasi politik (Manipol) USDEK*, the latter standing for the initial letters of those principles (Feith 2007).²

During this period, the politicization of the Indonesian education sector – especially at the secondary and tertiary levels – reached its highest forms (Suwignyo 2012: 291-98). Indoctrination was the first visible form of politicization of the education sector in Indonesia. Sukarno’s

² For many observers, this was the beginning of Sukarno’s authoritarianism after which he required full supports of state apparatus, including bureaucracy and the military, political parties, and the population at large by forces without any exceptions. His authoritarian character was exemplified by the policy to dissolve *Masyumi*, the largest and most influential Islamic party, which refused endorsing Sukarno’s policy (Thomas 1973: 178; Ricklefs 2008: 336-37; Fakhri 2013).

nationalistic speeches and ‘revolutionary’ ideas were adopted as source of inspiration for civic education, citizenship, and national character building in higher education. The speeches were formalized and broadcasted to the population by state ministerial departments as best exemplified by the Coordinating Ministry of Peoples’ Relation (*Menko Hubungan Rakyat*) led by Ruslan Abdul Gani. They were also inserted into the curriculum of universities, by which students were expected to learn and remember them by their heart and then to follow those Sukarnoist doctrines. Higher learning institutions that filled up with adult learners were indeed placed as a strategic instrument to spread Sukarno’s dogma and to mobilize support from the younger generation of the nation. The political parties shared the same belief and tried to develop contacts and relations with university students by establishing a student organization or affiliation. Consequently, the tension among political parties that soared on the national level affected strongly the students and the campus (Thomas 1973: 178-79; Hutagaol 1985: 131-32).

From a global perspective, this was also a period when Indonesia actively engaged in the global and regional politics, via taking position in the mid of competition for political influence between the Western and the Eastern blocs. Up to the end of the 1950s, Sukarno was trying to make Indonesia into a leading country among the nation of former colonies of Asia and Africa. He successfully organized the 1955 Asia-Africa Conference in Bandung, which resulted in a political agreement among the participating countries to reject imperialism and to support the liberation of all colonized countries (Kahin 1956). This success strengthened Indonesia’s bargaining position vis-à-vis Western capitalist and Eastern Communist countries (the USA and the Soviet Union, USSR, in particular). In fact, Sukarno was trying to ‘play around’ with this global competition.

Thank to these international assistances, the Indonesian government was able to continue developing the quality of their higher education institutions. In the wake of Guided Democracy on July 1959, however, the academic life of Indonesian universities was affected badly by Sukarno’s political ambitions who was now declaring the campus as ‘tool of revolution’. This can be seen in the early 1960s when Sukarno launched two political confrontations; first, against the Dutch in 1959-1962 on the issue of West Papua, and then against Malaysia and Western capitalist nations that supported the formation of the Malaysian federation in 1962-1965. The confrontations affected students’ activism and campus life in the following forms: the increase of political indoctrination for students and faculty members; the recruitment of students into the armed forces abandoning their study; the strengthened antagonism against some foreign nations

and the extradition of international experts and professor working with several Indonesian universities; and lastly, the burgeoning unnecessary budget allocation in military purposes, which reduced the investment in education sectors, including in universities, which desperately needed financial support for quality and quantity improvement. Consequently, these problems had seriously disrupted and halted the advancement of Indonesian universities (Thomas 1973: 197-8)

Compared to other parties that aspired to NASAKOM ideology, PKI and its student wing organization CGMI (*Consentrasi Gerakan Mahasiswa Indonesia* – Concentration of Indonesian Student Movement) showed much more aggressive steps and behaviour aiming at controlling campus politics while showing support to Sukarno's principles of guided democracy. Along with the shifting political atmosphere to the left, CGMI with its nationalist ally, GMNI (*Gerakan Mahasiswa Nasional Indonesia* – Students Nationalists Movement of Indonesia) prominently led the students' political activism in the early years of the 1960s. They aggressively engaged in several issues, such as their support for the dismissal of Mochtar Kusumaatmaja, a professor at the Padjadjaran University in Bandung who criticized Sukarno's guided policies in 1962, and the ousting of Western professors (mostly from the USA, UK and Australia), who had served in Indonesian universities since the 1950s (Thomas 1973: 202-203).

In the context of national politics, PKI in the same period emerged as the most energetic party in promoting progressive ideas and programs on the education sector, touching upon issues from primary until higher education levels, including an extensive extra-university program. With such progressive and strategic programs in the education sector, the PKI turned into the prominent provider of private education institutions outside the state educational institutions. The party developed a 'modernity teaching' to a large constituency, consisting of mainly 'lower groups' of Indonesian society (McVey 1990: 5-27). An American contemporary observer, R. Murray Thomas (1981:373) identifies three schemes of strategy in the education sector that the PKI deployed to gain sustainable support from Indonesian society, namely: (1) controlling the existing governmental bodies; (2) weakening the uncontrollable organizations that would become a potential threat; and (3) creating new organizations to attract support from the main targeted constituents.

PKI applied the first strategy to secure the highest-rank position in several relevant institutions, particularly the ministry of education. This was directed to exert influence on the policy making process in this department. The strategy was quite successful in 1957 when the PKI's favourable

figure (but was not its cadre), Professor Prijono was appointed by Sukarno as the new Minister of Education, and then Supardo as the secretary-general of the ministry. These key persons became the PKI's agent to stir the direction of the Indonesian education system towards the pathway of communist-based education 'ideology'. They did so, for example, by appointing more pro-communist teachers-educators and by influencing the direction of the national schooling system, especially curriculum, textbooks, and teachers training. For these purposes, PKI also intervened in the recruitment of teachers and schoolmasters and infiltrated the organization of Indonesian Teachers Union (*Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia*), which in both cases were quite successful.³ Overall, the PKI's objectives to control the Ministry of Education produced only a modest achievement; the Nationalist Parties, Muslim organizations, and the Military refused to cooperate, and even countered those PKI's strategies (Thomas 1981:374-75).

The second strategy to weaken the opposing groups was implemented among others in the field of student activism, for example when CGMI aggressively 'attacked' the religious-based students' organization, HMI (*Himpunan Mahasiswa Indonesia* – Muslim Students Association) of being a treasonous instrument of foreign imperialism, for which reason, CGMI asked Sukarno to dismiss this organization (Thomas 1981: 378-80). As of course, HMI resisted this assault and rejected all CGMI's suspicions. The polemic between CGMI and HMI created a political tension in the campuses, and gradually turned into a mutual hatred between the two organizations, but much more so among Islamic students and Muslim society in general. Such emotional feelings later stimulated an equally aggressive counter-action that the HMI and other Islamic student organizations directed towards CGMI and other leftist organizations in the months after September 1965 (Tanja 1979; Sitompul 1982; Hefner 1990).

The PKI's last strategy to create a new organization was only to respond to certain situations: *first*, when the opponents had already gained control over the targeted institutions so it had little chance to take them over; *second*, when there was no institutions found suitable to fulfil the need of a particular group of society who were important constituents of the party; and *third*, when the party could not fully control the targeted institution, but still wanted to influence it from outside

³ Researchers have measured the PKI's success on this specific education sector quantitatively by taking into account the number of teachers who were lost or removed from their job. Thomas (1981: 375-76) has estimated 32,000 teachers and schoolmasters were removed from their jobs after 1965, while Suwignyo (2012: 429) comes up with calculation of about 30,000 – 100,000 teachers had been dismissed from the schools. The PGRI's report mentions that the number of communist members among schoolteachers amounted to no more than 10,000. These figures show the PKI's relative success in attracting interest from the teachers' community although they did not gain it without resistance from other parties as well other groups of society.

by means of a pseudo-official organization. The establishment of two ambitious bodies exemplified this strategy: they are *Lembaga Pendidikan Nasional* (the National Education Institute) and *Universitas Rakyat* (UNRA or the People's University). Created by enthusiastic educators, the first organization sought to solve the leadership crises in the national educational affairs and supported President Sukarno's intentions to eliminate the remaining vestiges of Western cultures, particularly capitalism, imperialism, and colonialism, to be replaced by a national democratic education system (Thomas 1981: 381-82).

Unlike *Lembaga Pendidikan Indonesia* that claimed to have no formal affiliation with the PKI, UNRA was proclaimed from its outset as the vanguard of the PKI's program in the education sector. In its opening ceremony attended by D.N. Aidit on 25 September 1958, Siswojo – the Director of UNRA – explained that UNRA was PKI's main instrument to meet the pressing need of 'ideological reinforcement' in order to accomplish the Indonesian revolution. In Siswojo's words:

'The university placed itself as a fighter in the field of ideology, knowledge and culture; and together with other parties to be part of the struggle of Indonesian people to complete the August revolution until its roots' (as cited by McVey 1990: 14)

Built on the abovementioned philosophical and ideological principles, the university was designed to develop the following four characteristics. *Firstly*, it is open for public but partisan in practice; meaning everyone can join it, while the university welcomes any knowledge coming from the West or the East; yet the curricula and learning process were formulated in such a way that would empower and liberate Indonesia people. *Secondly*, it developed critical thinking and stood against any anti-progress powers or parties, and against conservatism in ideology, knowledge and culture. *Thirdly*, it emphasized the epistemological stance saying that theory should serve practice and practice must strengthen theory; and to supply 'air and food' for theory development. And *fourthly*, despite it being open for the general public, the university prioritizes labour and peasant activists, patriotic students, progressive women, and any person having good-willing to attend the university (Siswojo 1959: 6-12). In his welcoming speech, the Minister of Education Prof. Prijoyo lauded the university as 'a breaker-through to the old dogma saying that knowledge is only for 'the chosen few', and that the *Universitas Rakjat* was evidence of that knowledge is the rights of mass people not only of those few elite' (Prijono 1959: 18).

Applying those educational strategies, PKI dominated not only education discourse, but also the whole discourse and trajectories of Indonesian political dynamic compared to other *NASAKOM*

pillars and the military. Prior to the attempted coup these triangular political powers competed harshly each other to gain a better place in the close circle of President Sukarno. At that point of time, Sukarno was the only axis power uniting those competing powers together in a fragile political equilibrium, which could collapse any time soon once the axis was weakened. As it became evident, the 1965 *coup d'état*, allegedly orchestrated by PKI, was initially started as the spreading of the rumour saying that Sukarno was dying and a group of army generals called '*Dewan Jenderal*' prepared strategies to take over power from the president. Apart from the unresolved mysteries shadowing the failed coup of September 30th 1965, historical writings have recorded that this political event had jeopardized the PKI's political existence as the fourth biggest political power in Indonesia, and the third biggest communist party in the world after Soviet Union and China. Suharto and his military-men destroyed PKI through a systematic counter-coup strategy that swept all of the state and society institutions using various approaches and methods. The following section discusses the way Suharto's regime shattered PKI's affiliated education institutions and swept all communist traces away from the country

D.2. From Anti-Communism to 'Developmentalism': the Suharto Period, 1966-98

Anti-communist campaign on campus

Ten days after the aborted coup of September 30th 1965, Brigadier General Dr. Sjarief Thayeb, the Minister of Higher Education and Science (*Perguruan Tinggi dan Ilmu Pengetahuan*, PTIP, established in April 1961)⁴ issued a hurried emergency decree to close down temporarily (but, permanently in fact) four universities, nine academies, and one institute that were suspected to have certain links with the PKI.⁵ The policy was apparently the first step taken by the minister as part of the 'counter revolutionary campaigns' of the Indonesian Army against the so-called 'September 30th Movement' in education sector. The Minister's decree was based on a consideration that:

⁴ Brig. Djend. Dr. Sjarief Thajeb was appointed as the PTIP Minister in 1964, replacing Dr. Thojib Hadiwidjaja, a military-supported figure, who was ousted for his failure to condemn the *Manikebu* (Manifest-Kebudayaan) case and for his pro-American policy. Dr. Sjarief Thojib himself was acting as Rector of University of Indonesia from 1962-1964.

⁵ ANRI (Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia), *Kepmendiknas Collection. Surat Keputusan No. 1/dar tahun 1965*. The decree was issued under the auspice of the Higher Command Section or *Komando Tertinggi* (KOTI), a special unit within the Army established by Sukarno, but Lieutenant General Suharto then deployed it to coordinate the counter-revolutionary campaign of the PKI.

*‘Lembaga-lembaga swasta tersebut telah membantu secara langsung maupun tidak langsung petualangan gerakan kontra revolusi bernama Gerakan 30 September, atau setidaknya mereka menjadi sarang di mana petualangan-petualangan politik tersebut bersembunyi’*⁶

(Those private colleges have helped direct or indirectly the adventurist/counter-revolutionary movement called the 30 September Movement, or at least they apparently became the hub where those political adventurers hid their movement).

Thus, KOTI and the PTIP Minister speculatively thought that those institutions had certain connections with the PKI, with some even considered as ‘the PKI’s think-tanks’ in nurturing its communist revolutionary ideologies and in preparing cadres for the 1965 event.

The four universities are *Universitas Res Publica*, *Universitas Rakjat Indonesia*, *Universitas Rakjat*, all located in Jakarta, and *Universitas Pemerintah Kotapradja Surakarta* in Solo. Meanwhile the academies and institutes included the training centres of social and political sciences, journalistic, literature and history, engineering and agriculture. They are *Akademi Ilmu Sosial Aliarcham*, *Akademi Ilmu Politik Bacharudin*, *Akademi Teknik Ir. Anwari*, *Akademi Ilmu Djurnalistik Dr. Rivai*, *Akademi Sastra Multatuli*, *Akademi Ilmu Ekonomi Dr. Ratulangi*, *Akademi Ilmu Sedjarah Ronggowarsito*, *Akademi Djurnalistik W.R. Supratman* (Surabaya), *Akademi Djurnalistik dan Publisistik Teruna Patria* (Malang), and *Institut Pertanian E.G.O.M. Bogor*.⁷

Eventually the policy did not stop with those fourteen institutions only. In the following months, the PTIP Minister Sjarief Thayeb issued two other decrees to extend similar measures to other education institutions presumably having connections with the PKI. They were *Universitas Kesenian Rakjat* in Bandung, *Akademi Ilmu Politik Ngurah Rai* in Denpasar Bali, *Universitas Dr. Tjipto Mangunkusumo* in Yogyakarta, *Institut Pendidikan ‘Harjono’*, *Institut Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (IKIP) ‘Kudjang’*, *Akademi Seni ‘Kornel Simanjuntak’*, *IKIP ‘Dr. Tjiptomangunkusumo*, *LESRI (Lembaga Seni dan Budaya RI)*, and *Akademi Tekstil-SOTEXI*.⁸ In addition to these colleges and academies, the Indonesian Scholar’s Association (*Himpunan Sarjana Indonesia*), a kindergarten ‘Taman Kanak-kanak Melati’, a primary school ‘Sekolah Dasar Melati’ (both run by *Gerakan*

⁶ *Surat keputusan No.1/dar tahun 1965*. The Consideration section, *ibid*.

⁷ The decree was published in *Berita Yudha*, a nation-wide newspaper owned by the Army, on 13 October 1965, and in a logbook titled *Catatan Kronologis Di Seputar Peristiwa 30 September*, published by the Information Section of the Supreme Operations Command (*Komando Tertinggi -KOTI*), October 1965.

⁸ ANRI, *Kemedikenas Collection*. The decrees are *Surat Keputusan No. 4/dar tahun 1965* dan *Surat Keputusan No. 15/dar tahun 1965*, both issued on 13 October 1965.

Wanita Indonesia, GERWANI) and several secondary schools (*Sekolah Lanjutan Pendidikan Nasional*) were also dissolved.⁹

Following those policies, the Minister PTIP issued two others decrees that were related to the elimination of PKI-affiliated organizations, namely *Surat Keputusan No. 2/dar tahun 1965* and *Surat Keputusan No. 16/dar tahun 1965*. The first decree was issued on 11 September 1965 to justify the dismissal and banning of the communist students' organizations CGMI (*Central Gerakan Mahasiswa Indonesia*) and PERHIMI (*Perhimpunan Mahasiswa Indonesia*). Both were deemed to have been actively participating in the September 30th Movement. Therefore, the government officially prohibited all activities of those organizations, including their participation in the representative bodies, sports, art, and press organizations, and in any other state/official institutions. The second decree that was issued slightly later on 30 November 1965 officially outlawed the Teachers Training Colleges administered by the PGRI *non-vaksentral* all over Indonesia (the wing of Indonesian Teachers Association leaning into PKI). Like previous decrees, this was also issued to meet the need for clearing higher education institutions from the influence of counter-revolutionary actions committed by the September 30th 1965 Movement.

The series of the PTIP Minister decrees were actually immediate measures taken by Suharto and his army team concerning the education sector, especially after he was officially granted an authority from Sukarno, through a notoriously suspicious mandate to restore order, to counter the September 30th Movement, and then to destroy PKI.¹⁰ As a matter of fact, there was no further explanation of why these policies were taken and to what extent did those banished institutions really have a connection with the PKI so that the government policy was really justified? As it was a political decision in the midst of crises and for the sake of urgency, indeed such radical and authoritarian policies obviously needed no justification what so ever. The only reason for the PTIP Minister to issue the decrees was that it wanted to take a pre-emptive act to create a clear parameter in order to cut down the PKI-linked institutions, no matter how irrational those policies were and how unclear their connections with the PKI had been in the past.

⁹ Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia, *Gerakan 30 September Pemberontakan Partai Komunis Indonesia: Latar Belakang, Aksi, dan Penumpasannya* (Jakarta, 1994), Lampiran 22, p. 41-42.

¹⁰ The mandate is known as *Surat Perintah Sebelas Maret or Supersemar (Order of the March Eleventh)*. Many observers cast doubt about the content and originality of the letter, and some view it as Suharto's covert strategy to take over power from Sukarno (Ricklefs 2008: 349).

The questions to be raised in this context is what happened to the students, lecturers, administrators, and other people working in those dissolved institutions? How many were they actually? Did any of these people become victims of the mass killing or, if they survived, were they among those to be exiled to Buru Island? These are still unanswerable questions due to limited sources available. Yet, considering their position as the core of PKI's cadres or considered to be so, it is assumed that the people working in these education institutions who survived would be arrested as political prisoners under the categories A or B. These categories were applied to elite and active members of PKI and the affiliated organizations suspected to be involved directly in the preparations of the coup. Meanwhile, Category C is for those who were considered indirectly involved in the movement. They might be PKI supporters and who, after investigation, were categorized in neither the A or B category. Political detainees of Category A were sentenced to death or life imprisonment, Category B were sentenced to imprisonment for a certain number of years, mostly 7-15 years, while Category C were much shorter. After imprisonment, these people were still under continued surveillance, and they were also given a special mark in their ID card, namely *ET* (*Eks Tabanan Politik* or Ex Political Detainees).¹¹ These measures were all part of Suharto's anti-communist policy, introduced as a follow up to the previous immediate measures in 1965-1966, and lasted until the end of his New Order Regime.

The screening of public universities

After abolishing the PKI-affiliated institutions, Suharto and his military regime launched further extended counter-revolutionary strategies, in the form of the implementation of a structural screening scheme following the hierarchy of the government bureaucracy. The policy was directed in the first place to the core of state institutions and later to non-state institutions. Via this policy, Suharto sought to 'clean up' the state apparatus and state institutions from any PKI's elements or legacies. For this purpose, Suharto, acting as the supreme commander of the restoration of peace and order (*Kepala Staf Komando Operasi Tertinggi/Panglima Operasi Pemulihan Keamanan dan Penertiban – Pangkopkamtib*), issued an instruction letter No. 22/KOTI/1965 on October 15th. The letter contained an order to state administrators and bureaucrats to start a structural screening process. The letter was complemented with a comprehensive screening procedure to be operated in all departments, bureaus and other state institutions in order to eliminate any possible elements of the PKI's September 30th Movement.¹²

¹¹ *Indonesian Government Policy in Dealing With the G-30-S/PKI (The 30th September Movement of the Indonesian Communist Party) Detainees* (Jakarta: Department of Foreign Affairs Republic of Indonesia, January 1978), p. 17-18.

¹² ANRI, Koleksi HUBRA (Sekretaris Menteri Koordinator Perhubungan dengan Rakyat Tahun 1963-1966), No. 1900.

Following this instruction, the screening process began in state institutions all over the country, from the central government in Jakarta to the local government on district level. Interestingly, some institutions had already commenced the screening process before the issuing of the official instruction. This was exemplified by the House of Representative (DPR), which announced three days earlier - on 12 October 1965 - its screening results. In that letter, Arudji Kartawinata, the chair of the House explained that all the seven PKI's Members of Parliament had been suspended. They are Susilo Prawiro Atmodjo, Jagus, Let. Kol. Ranu Sunardi, Siauw Giok Tjhan, Nja' Diwan, K. Wardojo, Gde Puger, and Supardi.¹³

The Minister of Higher Education and Science (PTIP) in cooperation with local and regional military authorities (*PAPELRADA – Panitia Pelaksana Dwikora Daerah*) coordinated the screening process in higher education institutions. At the local level, rectors of big universities were often assigned as the coordinator of the screening committee. For example, the rector of Gadjah Mada University was assigned as head of the screening team and was responsible for the screening process of all universities located in Yogyakarta; the rector of Diponegoro University became coordinator of the screening committee in Central Java; the rector of Padjadjaran University was the chair of screening committee for West Java, etc. The screening of universities was intended to identify students, lecturers, professor, and university employees who were deemed to have been involved in the September 30th Movement and to take action towards them. In practice, the screening process was often implemented rather recklessly and as a result, ad hoc in nature and far from a coordinated process. The screening often was highly complicated, dramatic, and prone to be fraudulent. In several institutions, it became an office that was used for private interests as well. Moreover, information about the screening process and its results was highly scattered and far from complete. Not all universities announced publicly the result of their screening process. Based on the available information, the following paragraphs highlight the screening process in some state universities and their effects.

We will start with Gadjah Mada University, one of the oldest and biggest state universities in Indonesia. On 6 January 1966, Professor Herman Johannes, the rector, announced that the

¹³ ANRI, Koleksi HUBRA No. 788. Similarly, the President Sukarno through his Presidential Decree No. 104/1966 had decided to suspend the status of nine PKI cadres as members of Musyawarah Pembantu Perentjaan Pembangunan Nasional, an advisory body for national development planning. They are Abdulmadjid Djodiningrat S.H., Samsir, Suparna Sastradiredja, Roodhito S. Sosrodiwirjo, M. Zaelani, Supardi, Ir. Sakirman, Nj. Suwarti Bintang Suradi, and D.N. Aidit.

screening process in his university had been accomplished. The result was quite ‘shocking’ in the sense that that 115 employees (including 112 lecturers) and 3006 (other sources counted 2986) students, and 1212 administrative staff members were identified to have been involved in the communists’ activities (mostly by joining CGMI,¹⁴ HSI and SSP¹⁵) and hence they were ousted from the campus per 1 November 1965. Statistically, this number was much higher than the initial estimation made by a high-rank official of the PTIP Ministry who visited the university two months before.¹⁶ According to the local newspaper, these ‘suspected’ students originated from almost all faculties in this university. They consisted of 394 students from the Faculty of Law, 201 from the Faculty of Economic, 153 from the Faculty of Letter, 85 from the Faculty of Geography, 87 from the Psychology Faculty, 78 from the Faculty of Science, 631 from the Faculty of Engineering, 176 from the Medical Faculty, 41 from the Faculty of Dentistry, 171 from the Faculty of Veterinary, 80 from the Faculty of Biology, 92 from the Faculty of Pharmacy, 132 from the Faculty of Agriculture, 35 from the Faculty of Agricultural Technology, and 135 from the Faculty of Forestry.¹⁷ Yet, further information about those students is not found, including their gender, religious and ethnicity backgrounds. According to one study, from the total of 3,059 suspended students, 2,034 individuals were allowed to resume their studies, while the rest could not return to campus and were ‘unaccounted’ for on official reports (Rahardjo et al. 1999: 60).

Interestingly, in order to ensure the accuracy of information, the screening team recruited students and even lecturers to do the job since the university almost had no reliable information and database about student activities and their political affiliations. The team believed that they could gain better information from students who had better acquaintance with and knowledge about the activities of their fellow students, especially those were previously engaged in rivalries with the targeted group of students.¹⁸ One survivor told a quite ‘disturbing’ story about the manipulative screening process. According to this witness, suspected students were round up in

¹⁴ By 1964, CGMI claimed to have had 40,000 members all over Indonesia. Of these, 3,000 were in Jakarta, 5,754 were in North Sumatra and Aceh (McVey 1990: 20).

¹⁵ HSI stands for *Himpunan Sarjana Indonesia* (Indonesian Scholars Union), while SSP is *Serikat Sekerja Pendidikan* (Union of Education Workers) The military considered both organizations as having links with the PKI.

¹⁶ ANRI, *Warta Berita Antara*, September 1965.

¹⁷ *Kedaulatan Rakjat*, 19 Januari 1966, cited also by Adaby Darban, et.al, *Kebangkitan Orde Baru di Yogyakarta* (Yogyakarta: Balai Kajian Sejarah dan Nilai Tradisional, 1993/1994). Another source reported that the actual number of the convicted employees was 1,212; 336 was Ngasem group, 34 Pagelaran group, 465 Sekip group, and 377 Bulaksumur group. ANRA, *Warta Berita Antara*, 19 January 1966.

¹⁸ Interview with Tejobayu, former student of Biology Faculty, UGM, 20 August 2015.

several places, namely the Jefferson Library, the Vredeburg Fort building, and the Wirogunan prison, which were places all located in downtown Yogyakarta. In these places, they underwent a torturous and brutal interrogation process, including those committed by the infamous Loekman Soetrisno (LS), who later became a prominent professor of agrarian and rural studies in this university.¹⁹

Unlike what happened in Universitas Gadjah Mada, information about screening process in other prominent public universities is very limited. University of Indonesia UI, another big and old public university in Jakarta, did not make an official report of the 1965 screening result available to the public. Yet, 'Suluh Marhaen', a journal published by GMNI (Ali Surachman Faction) reported that around 1,000 students of UI Jakarta and 700 students of UI-Bogor (now Institut Pertanian Bogor, IPB) were suspended.²⁰ The same journal also reported that according to Major General Amir Machmoed, the commander of Jakarta Army Headquarter, there were 1,153 UI students that had gone through the screening process.²¹ From this total, 219 students were officially ousted from university.²² In addition to this, an unknown number of lecturers were also expelled from the university, after the UI Rector issued a decree (*SK Rektor UI No. 041/Sk/BR/65*) confirming the firing of all lecturers who were affiliated with HSI.²³ Unfortunately, detailed information about their subsequent fates are not available.

The three state universities located in Bandung did report about the screening process in their respective institutions. Padjadjaran University announced that it had suspended per 1 November 1965, 227 students of various faculties and 25 docents, assistant docents, and administrators for their involvement in the communist organization. The neighbouring university, *Institut Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan* (IKIP) Bandung also made a public statement about its screening results. In total there were 80 people convicted 'guilty' for their involvement in the PKI's affiliated

¹⁹ Interview with Sri Muhayati, Tedjobayu, and Kinkin Rahayu, all are former students of UGM. Information about the role of LS in the interrogation process is uncovered and becomes media headlines after Kinkin presents her testimony in a session of the International People's Tribunal of 1965 held in The Hague, Netherlands, 10-13 November 2015. Unfortunately, further information about LS's role in the screening process is hard to find, and none from his colleagues are willing to share their knowledge.

²⁰ "GMNI sesalkan Deputy Menteri PTIP Mashuri SH", *Soeloeh Marhaen*, 5 August 1966

²¹ "Pangdam V/Djaja Majdjen Amir Machmud: Stop Screening Mahasiswa", *Soeloeh Marhaen*, 9 August 1966.

²² "UI Sewenang-wenang. Apakah pemetjatan 219 mahasiswa bukan pemetjatan massal?" *Soeloeh Marhaen*, 7 August 1966.

²³ "Bukan Soal Intern UI", *Soeloeh Marhaen*, 5 September 1966. According Gunawan Wiradi, a large number of students and lecturers in UI Bogor (IPB, now) were also suspended, which some of them are expelled permanently. Interview with Gunawan Wiradi, 25 June 2015, 17.00-20.24 in Bogor.

organization. This group consisted of 17 docents and assistant docents who joined mostly *Himpunan Sarjana Indonesia* (Indonesian Scholar Association), three administrators, and the rest were students (members of CGMI and PERHIMI).²⁴ Institut Teknologi Bandung (ITB), another public university, reported that it had conducted a screening process towards its students and staffs by the end of 1965, but did not make the results available for public.

Other reports can be found from Diponegoro University Semarang, which had formed a special screening committee to investigate its students and employees. After spending one month, the committee announced that 4 lecturers were removed from their positions, 2 lecturers were temporarily suspended, and 11 were deactivated.²⁵ In Sumatra, the North Sumatra University in Medan proclaimed that it had fired ten of students who were former CGMI members and several lecturers for their involvement in the PKI's affiliated organization. University of Andalas in Padang took similar measures, terminating the status of 23 students from the Faculty of Law, 14 students from Medical Faculty, and 2 students from the Faculty of Agriculture, all because of their involvement in CGMI activities.²⁶ From Kalimantan, it was reported that the University of Mulawarman in Samarinda had taken decisive action to expel by force several students of CGMI members, one lecturer, and several university employees.²⁷

From Sulawesi, the rector of Hasanudin University in Makassar made its screening report available for the public on 28 November 1965. He said there were 95 lecturers involved in the counter-revolutionary action promoted by the PKI. Meanwhile in Manado, Sam Ratulangi University had fired without consent 16 docents, 8 administrative staffs, and 100 students who joined CGMI, Perhimi and other PKI organizations. This step was followed by IKIP Manado, which also suspended 19 students who were involved in the G30S Movement. These 19 students came from the Biology department (8 persons), the Pedagogy department (8 persons), and the Law Faculty (3 persons).²⁸

²⁴ ANRI, HUBRA Collection, No. 1174.

²⁵ ANRI, *Warta Berita Antara*, 17 January 1966

²⁶ ANRI, *Warta Berita Antara*, 16 January 1966

²⁷ ANRI, *Warta Berita Antara*, 22 November 1965

²⁸ ANRI, *Warta Berita Antara*, 22 and 23 November 1965

Thus, overseeing the official information available, there were in total around 3,464 students and 299 lecturers/staffs of public universities in Indonesia suspended because of the suspicion of their being part or members of PKI's affiliated organization, notably CGMI, HSI and SSP. The number would be much larger if all public universities published or made their screening archives available for public access, and if private universities were also integrated into this investigation. This is particularly the case for universities located in the cities where the PKI exerted a strong influence on local politics, as shown, for example, by the result of 1955 election. In fact, however, many universities kept their screening archives closed, considering them classified documents only to be used for their own interests.²⁹ Further investigation is needed to know the subsequent fate of those suspended students and employees, whether they became part of the victims of the massacre of 1965-1966 or survived the killing but later imprisoned in Buru Island.³⁰ But for sure, they not only lost their rights and careers as students, employees, or lecturers and researchers, more importantly they also lost the chance to explore their intellectual skills and rights to have a decent living as citizens of Indonesia.

The abolition of communist educational institutions and the elimination of communist sympathizers from state universities did not stop Suharto from worrying about the possible revival of communism and any resemble 'threats' in Indonesia. For that reason, the New Order regime found it necessary to create a systematic preventive mechanism by institutionalizing the screening scheme up until the early 1990s in order to uproot communism completely from Indonesia and to make sure that all public universities were 'environmentally clean' from any legacies of the PKI and other radical leftist.³¹ The screening scheme was even extended further to control the recruitment and promotion of public servants working on campus, the purchase of reading materials, the curriculum, and the supervision of research activities. The latter included the control of writing and teaching of history of 1965 event to ensure that the

²⁹ It is also important to note that in the same period there were many Indonesian students studying abroad. Some of them chose universities in socialist countries like China, Rusia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Cuba, etc., while others sought international degrees in Western countries. By 1965, for example, there were about 2,000 Indonesian students studying in Russia. These students mostly failed to return home after the 1965 event, and their existence was forgotten from the national memory, which under Suharto was engineered to serve the regime's interests (Hill 2008).

³⁰ According to Tedjobayu, more than half of the total around 12,000 political prisoners stationed at the Buru Island, are former student activists, and university staffs, the rest are writers, artists, and bureaucrats. Interview with Tedjobayu, former Buru Prisoners, 20 August 2015 in Jakarta.

³¹ I personally observe that in UGM, for example, the last decree that concerns screening policy was issued in 1992, after which a similar decree is no longer mentioned in the list of university archives, *Daftar Pertelaan Arsip, Arsip Kepegawaian (Rahasia) Universitas Gadjah Mada* (Yogyakarta: Arsip Universitas Gadjah Mada, 2009).

knowledge about Communism-Leninism and the history of PKI were in accordance with the national (regime) interests. Further research is also needed to understand more about the impacts of this screening policy on curricula and learning activities in Indonesian campus.

In addition to that structural scheme of screening, the New Order government introduced since the early 1970s an indoctrination program for all Indonesian citizens to be inserted into the school curriculum, from high school to the university's curriculum. The program contained a substantial element of the official historical narrative of the 1965 event, stressing the PKI's betrayal and the 'evil' of communism. Professors, military generals, and top-rank bureaucrats were all involved in formulating the indoctrination materials, which was overall designed as a contribution to civic education and citizenship, by promoting the official state interpretation of *Pancasila*, the five principles of Indonesian national ideology.³² By the end of the 1970s, the government indoctrination was chiefly directed to achieve the following purposes: 1) to instruct the imprisoned communist-affiliated citizens to obtain their loyalty to *Pancasila* and the government; 2) to prepare new citizens education curricula for the schools; and 3) to conduct a series of courses in *Pancasila* doctrines for all civil servants (Thomas 1981: 392)

The destruction of academic freedom'

- The loss of an intellectual generation, products of liberal and cosmopolitan period of the 1950s (including Indonesian exiles)
- A systematic erasure of communist and leftist inspired people, ideas, elements, and memories
- Reorientation of intellectual 'commitment' among lecturers
- International academic cooperation is becoming more Western oriented, particularly with the USA
- In the curricula, social science in particular, Marxist/conflict theories are 'abandoned' and leftist books/literature 'disappeared' from campus libraries (TAP MPRS 25/1966)

³² *Pancasila* is promulgated by Sukarno, who introduced it for the first time in a speech before the members of *Badan Penyelidik Usaha Persiapan kemerdekaan Indonesia*, BPUPKI (the Investigating Committee for the Preparation of Indonesian Independence) on 1 June 1945. It was said to be a fusion of socialism, nationalism, and religion, the core of Sukarno's political ideology. *Pancasila* nowadays consists of the following principles: 1) Believe in the one supreme God; 2) Justice and civilized humanity; 3) The unity of Indonesia; 4) The democracy led by understanding wisdom among honorable representatives from the parliament house; and 5) Social justice for all of the people of Indonesia. See for example *Badan Pembinaan Pelaksanaan Pendidikan Pedoman Penghayatan dan Pengamalan Pancasila* (Jakarta: BP7, 1991).

- Intellectual culture and critical tradition have been weakened, and student political activism is restricted.
- Research interests on 1965 was weak, it was ‘avoided’ due to structural censorship or self-censorship (state of fear)
- The university is becoming more bureaucratized, capitalistic and market-oriented (Nugroho 2009)
- Joseph Saunders (2008) The barriers of academic freedom under the New Order regime:
 - A. The 1965 impacts:
 1. Extensive militarization
 2. Political screening and censorship
 3. Aggressive suppression of Chinese cultural expression
 4. Restriction for family of political prisoners to academia
 - B. The 1974-1978:
 1. 1974 and 1978 political control on campus and students
 2. Political background checks
 3. Book censorship
 4. The criminalization of dissent
 5. On campus ideological indoctrination
 6. The ban on student political activity and expression
 7. Military intervention on campus
 8. Restriction on academic inquiry and expression

E. Conclusion

- The practice of academic freedom in Indonesian universities had been disrupted since the end of 1950s by Sukarno’s regime politicization.
- The situation turned even worst after 1965, when Indonesian universities were targeted and used for Suharto’s anti-communist campaign.
- The New Order’s political screening created a ‘state of fear’ among academia; it was part and parcel of Suharto’s state terrorism
- The screening turned into a systematic intellectual restriction that shaped ‘state of the art’ of Indonesian higher education system today
- Scholars have considered the 1965 massacre as ‘politicide or genocide’, what happened to the Indonesian academia after 1965 was an ‘*intellectualcide* (intellectual genocide)’