JURNAL MENGKAJI INDONESIA, 3 (2), 2024: 330-360
E-ISSN: 2963-6787
P-ISSN: 2963-3451
DOI: 10.59066/jmi.v3i2.865

The Shadow of Koentjaraningrat: Anthropology in Indonesia's Post-Colonial

Zinedine Reza Imawan[1]

Article history: Received: 8 August 2024, Accepted: 8 December 2024
Published: 10 December 2024

Abstract: This paper aims to explore the development of Koentjaraningrat's thoughts and his role in establishing the anthropology discipline in Indonesia. Through a comprehensive literature review of books, journals, articles, and reports, this paper traces Koentjaraningrat's intellectual journey and the evolution of anthropology within the country. The findings reveal that Koentjaraningrat was a pivotal and consistent intellectual figure who not only laid the foundation for anthropology in Indonesia but also contributed significantly to nation-building through an anthropological framework. This paper aims to elaborate on the development of Koentjaraningrat's ideas, which emerged in the context of Indonesia's decolonization and the influence of American intellectual traditions.

Purpose: The aim of this study is to explore the development of Koentjaraningrat's thoughts in the context of establishing the anthropology discipline in Indonesia.

Design/Methodology/Approach: his study uses literature review to examine books, journals, articles, and reports detailing Koentjaraningrat's intellectual journey and the development of anthropology in Indonesia.

Findings: The findings reveal that Koentjaraningrat was a consistent intellectual figure who not only built the anthropology discipline in Indonesia but also contributed to nation-building through the anthropological framework.

Originality/value: Examining the development of Koentjaraningrat's thoughts that evolved amidst

[1] Member of the Indonesian Association of Anthropology | zinedinerza@gmail.com

Indonesia's decolonization and American intellectual traditions.
Keywords: Koentjaraningrat; Indonesian Anthropology; Decolonization; Nation-building
Paper Type: Article-Research

Introduction

Koentjaraningrat is undeniably a key figure in Indonesia's social sciences. He was crucial in establishing anthropology as an academic discipline at numerous Indonesian universities. His influence endures through the network of his students, who have continued to advance Indonesian anthropology. About 60 years ago, he predicted that the growth of postcolonial anthropology would align with the increasing number of non-European anthropologists dominating the field in their own countries. Koentjaraningrat's critical awareness reflects the academic evolution in Indonesia, where Indonesia intellectual dominance emerged after Dutch scholars were displaced by the post-independence dynamics.

The conflict in Irian Jaya during the 1950s between the Netherlands and Indonesia was a key factor in initiating programs to train Indonesian scholars to replace Dutch lecturers who left due to the political situation. Many Indonesian students turned to the United States to study fields like economics, sociology, anthropology, and other social sciences (Prager 2005). Notable figures from the sociology group included Selo Soemardjan, who studied at Cornell University; Harsja W. Bachtiar, who earned his master's at Cornell and his doctorate at Harvard; Sulaiman Sumardi, also a Cornell graduate; and Mely G. Tan, who completed her master's at Cornell and her doctorate at the University of California, Berkeley (Fansuri 2015). The influence of American social sciences can be seen in the research of these Indonesian sociologists. Soemardjan wrote "Perubahan Sosial di Yogyakarta" (Social Change in Yogyakarta), Bachtiar authored

"The Formation of the Indonesian Nation," and Sumardi published "Some Aspects of the Social Origin of Indonesian." The structural-functional theories and positivist epistemology prevalent at the time were influenced by American sociologists like Talcott Parsons, Robin M. Williams, and Neil J. Smelser. Parsons' approach, with its focus on system maintenance and equilibrium, left little room for system disruption. Selo Soemardjan, a prominent domestic social scientist who also served on the Vice President's staff, firmly stated that social science should be objective and that social scientists should remain neutral (Fansuri 2015).

Koentjaraningrat pursued his M.A. at Yale University in 1954, studying under G.P. Murdock, who was influential in anthropology with his Cross-Cultural Comparison project (Human Relations Area Files). This American anthropological influence significantly shaped Koentjaraningrat's ideas and the development of anthropology in Indonesia. He adapted the concept of "value orientation" from American anthropologist Florence Kluckhohn at Harvard University to create his own framework for understanding Indonesian culture, which he introduced in the late 1960s(Ramstedt 2005). Koentjaraningrat also passed down quantitative research methods to Indonesian social science. He edited a key book on quantitative methods, which was reprinted 11 times by 1993, playing a crucial role in steering Indonesian social science towards North American empiricism. The book's contributors included notable scholars who later became prominent academics during the New Order era, such as Harsja Bachtiar and Selo Soemardjan (Hadiz and Dhakidae 2006).

Koentjaraningrat's students have compared him to Franz Boas. Both are seen as founding figures in anthropology in their respective countries, but Koentjaraningrat's contributions are viewed as more institutional compared to Boas, who pioneered new theoretical approaches(Shri-Ahimsa 1997). Masinambow

notes that Koentjaraningrat was not a paradigm-shifter like Boas. Boas is considered more progressive, having mentored influential American anthropologists such as Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, and Alfred Kroeber. Masinambow also points out that Koentjaraningrat cannot be seen as a central figure like Boas. Instead, his influence led to a process of decentering, resulting in a more diversified focus due to his cadre system and advanced education programs in Indonesian universities (Masinambow 1997).

However, the comparisons made by Ahimsa and Masinambow between Koentjaraningrat and Franz Boas seem somewhat unfair. Given the significant differences in their social and political contexts, their approaches and contributions should be evaluated with these backgrounds in mind. Boas and his students, like Margaret Mead, often produced knowledge with the help of local assistants without giving them proper credit, which can be seen as intellectual exploitation(Rosyada 2022). Their prominent works and academic success heavily relied on the contributions of local researchers who were often unrecognized and unappreciated in academic circles. The cultural and political awareness, initiative, and hard work of these local collaborators are what truly make them intellectuals in their own right(Rosyada 2022). Koentjaraningrat was well-known for his modest in crediting others who deserved recognition. James Danandjaja noted that Koentjaraningrat consistently spotlighted young authors. For example, in his book *Masyarakat Desa di Indonesia*, even though Koentjaraningrat played a major role in editing each piece, he did not claim the credit. Instead, he elevated the names of his former students who contributed to the book. He was also known for his fairness and strong desire to set aside personal ego for the advancement of anthropology in Indonesia (Dharmaperwira-Amran 1997).

To fully understand Koentjaraningrat's thinking, it's crucial to consider the social and political context of Indonesia during his time. Koentjaraningrat worked during a period of decolonization and nation-building, which greatly influenced his views on cultural and national identity. He had to navigate the challenge of establishing anthropology in Indonesia amidst dynamic political transitions. Consequently, his ideas reflect the need to build an academic structure for anthropology in Indonesia.

The development of Koentjaraningrat's thought was previously discussed by Heddy Shri Ahimsa-Putra[2] and Sulistyowati Irianto[3] in 1997. Their work was included in a book edited by E.K.M. Masinambow[4], featuring 23 articles by anthropologists, many of whom were Koentjaraningrat's students. Both pieces conclude that Koentjaraningrat's anthropology is characterized by a positivist epistemology. Abdullah also briefly addresses Koentjaraningrat's contributions to the development of anthropology in Indonesia(Abdullah 2018), alongside discussions on Masri Singarimbun and Parsudi Suparlan. In 2019, Ahimsa[5] revisited Koentjaraningrat's thoughts on national integration, evaluating both the strengths and weaknesses of his approach to Indonesia's national integration.

The author will next focus on analyzing how the intellectual development context amidst decolonization and the post-World War II American intellectual tradition influenced Koentjaraningrat's thinking and approach in developing anthropology in Indonesia. To achieve this, the author will trace the impact of American anthropological interests on Indonesia and the American anthropological tradition in Koentjaraningrat's

[2] Antropologi Koentjaraningrat: Sebuah Tafsir Epistemologi
[3] Konsep Kebudayaan Koentjaraningrat dan Keberadaannya dalam Paradigma Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial
[4] Koentjaraningrat dan Antropologi di Indonesia
[5] Koentjaraningrat dan Integrasi Nasional Indonesia: Sebuah Telaah Kritis

work. This analysis will not only cover the factors influencing Koentjaraningrat's thought but also explore his influence on the development of Indonesian anthropology.

Methods

This study adopts a Literature review method. Literature review methods involve examining and selecting relevant sections from books, scholarly journals, reports, or news articles to cite in a paper. These citations serve as the foundation and analysis for the article. A literature review systematically gathers and connects previous research. In this process, researchers integrate findings and perspectives from various empirical studies. Key tools in this research method include references from past studies, which can be books, academic journals, reports, or news related to the research topic.

Discussion and Findings

The development of Indonesian Anthropology Before Koentjaraningrat

As an Indonesian anthropologist, I've long wondered why the anthropology courses I took predominantly focused on Indonesian ethnography. While Indonesia has always captivated foreign researchers, it remains equally intriguing for local anthropologists, who often choose to study their own ethnic groups rather than non-Indonesian subjects. This focus didn't emerge by chance; it can be traced back to the influence of Koentjaraningrat, a pivotal figure in the development of Indonesian anthropology. During the decolonization period, Koentjaraningrat (1923–1999) laid the foundation for the discipline, ensuring that anthropology effectively contributed to national needs. His initiatives provided a strong practical and applied orientation to Indonesian anthropology, closely aligned with national development goals.

Koentjaraningrat was aware that anthropology was initially used as a tool of colonialism. This awareness stemmed partly from

the Dutch's proficiency in collecting information for colonial administration purposes. Koentjaraningrat noted that because colonizers viewed the colonized with indignity, the label of "primitive" was used to describe non-Western peoples, justified by so-called scientific reasons (Koentjaraningrat 1975a). This approach is analogous to microbiology studying simple, small organisms to understand more complex biological systems, with anthropologists examining simpler, non-European cultures to gain insights into the more complex European cultures. Before World War II, anthropological research in Indonesia was predominantly conducted by Dutch scholars in what would later become Indonesian territory (Koentjaraningrat 1975a). Ethnographic records of indigenous Indonesian societies were collected by colonial governments for the purpose of administering the local populations. These records came from various sources: sailors and explorers who had brief interactions with coastal inhabitants, missionaries spreading Christianity, and most notably, colonial government officials (Prager 2005).

Koentjaraningrat categorized these ethnographic writings based on the colonial authorities in Indonesia (Koentjaraningrat 1975a). Notable contributions include W. Marsden, who wrote 'The History of Sumatra', detailing various Indonesian ethnic groups such as the Minangkabau, Aceh, Batak, and Rejang. His focus was primarily on the Rejang people of Bengkulu, where Marsden was stationed during the British colonial period. Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, who was the head of the British colonial government from 1811 to 1816, paid particular attention to village life, especially in Java. His interest was driven by colonial motives, particularly to introduce a new land tax system based on agricultural produce (Koentjaraningrat 1968). These colonial records reflect the varied perspectives and interests of the colonial administrators and their influence on the study of Indonesian societies. During the Dutch colonial period, ethnographic writings

by Dutch officials about the history, language, and culture of the Netherlands East Indies (present-day Indonesia) were published in the colonial government's official journal, *Tijdschrift voor Nederlands Indie* (Journal for Netherlands Indies)(Kommers and Buskens 2007). This journal was published by the Bataviaasch Genootschap voor Kunsten en Wetenschappen (Batavian Society for the Arts and Sciences), which was established in Batavia (Jakarta) in 1778. Another significant institution was founded in The Hague in 1850: the Koninklijk Instituut voor de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde (Royal Institute for Linguistics, Geography, and Ethnology). The journal *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie* (Contributions to the Language, Geography, and Ethnology of Netherlands Indies) began publication in 1853 and became a key publishing organ for Dutch anthropologists (Kommers and Buskens 2007).

The collection and presentation of ethnographic data in Dutch journals were not purely motivated by a pursuit of scientific knowledge but were closely linked to the administrative needs of Dutch colonial rule. The production of ethnographic knowledge was intertwined with the training of civil servants and military officials, aiming to produce knowledge relevant for colonial administration. Academic training for Dutch colonial officials began in Surakarta (1832), Delft (1843), and Leiden (1864) (Prager 2005). The education in "Indologie" during the Dutch colonial era was designed to prepare individuals to become effective government employees or administrators. Graduates of this training were provided with in-depth knowledge about local societies, cultures, customs, and languages to perform their administrative tasks more effectively and efficiently. The primary focus of this education was to ensure that colonial officials had a sufficient understanding of the social and cultural conditions of indigenous communities, facilitating better administration and control of the colonies (Fansuri 2015). Due to its nature and

objectives, Indologie education was designed as a practical training program for administrative officials and practitioners rather than as a pure academic discipline. This education was more focused on practical applications of knowledge about local societies within the context of colonial administration, rather than on theoretical and academic research. Consequently, Indologie became an essential tool for implementing and maintaining colonial control in the colonies (Fansuri 2015).

In 1877, anthropology was established as an academic subject at Leiden University (Prager 2005). By 1902, Leiden University had sole authority to provide education for colonial civil servants within a multidisciplinary program known as Indology (Fansuri 2015). As a result, the most enduring Dutch legacy in Indonesian anthropology is the comparative study of customary law in Indonesia. Cornelis van Vollenhoven argued that studying the diverse forms of customary law was impossible without understanding the complex social, historical, and cosmological contexts (Prager 2005). However, this comparative approach was criticized by Fox, who believed it served only colonial administrative interests and did not contribute to theoretical development (Prager 2005). By the mid-19th century, colonial administrators trained in various social sciences experienced confusion about the academic status of each field introduced. The Indologie education program at that time was a mixed curriculum encompassing geography, ethnology, and linguistics. According to Ignas Kleden, although there was a pragmatic division with an emphasis on history and language (which later evolved into anthropology), social-political studies (which became sociology), and social-economic studies (the precursor to modern economics), the academic distinctions between these disciplines were still unclear and not considered significant (Hadiz and Dhakidae 2006).

The historical facts that need to be emphasized from the explanation above include the limited involvement of Indonesians in efforts to study Indonesian languages and cultures (Prager 2005). One major reason for this was the lack of educational facilities available to Indonesians under Dutch colonial rule. While the Dutch established the Hogere Burgerschool (HBS) for their own children in Batavia in 1860, education for Indonesians was confined to basic primary schools (Prager 2005). The issue of higher education for Indonesians became prominent with the introduction of the "ethical policy" in the early 1900s. In 1898, a lawyer named Van Deventer published an essay arguing that the Netherlands owed a debt to the Netherlands-East Indies, as much of the Netherlands' wealth came from the colony (Prager 2005). This essay quickly gained traction in political circles. By the early 20th century, Queen Wilhelmina and Dutch colonial politicians officially adopted the "ethical policy," which aimed to provide Indonesians with better access to higher education and improve social welfare in the colony. Following World War I, the Dutch government provided scholarships for Indonesian students to study at universities in the Netherlands (Fansuri 2015). By 1924, there were 131 Indonesian students in the Netherlands, with 40 enrolled in Law at Leiden. Some pursued Indologie, a program for aspiring colonial officers, but despite their degrees, they were barred from entering the higher ranks of the colonial administration. Although Indologie included ethnology, Indonesian students showed little interest in it, partly due to the poor teaching of A.W. Nieuwenhuis, who taught ethnology at Leiden from 1904 to 1934 (Prager 2005).

Indonesian students excelled in Javanese history, philology, and especially "adat" law studies. Notable scholars include Hoesein Djajadiningrat and R.Ng. Poerbatjakara. Djajadiningrat (1896–1960), a student of renowned Leiden professor Snouck Hurgronje, earned his PhD in 1913 with a study on the *Sejarah*

Banten (History of Banten). He had already published an article in the journal Bijdragen in 1911, earning a medal from the University of Leiden (Kommers and Buskens 2007). Djajadiningrat later became a professor at the Law School in Batavia (1924–35), the first Indonesian appointed to a higher education institution. He founded the Java-Institute in 1919, served as general secretary of the *Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen*, and in 1935, was elected to the Council of the Netherlands-Indies. Indonesian scholars like Djajadiningrat were often seen as "guinea pigs" by supporters of the ethical policy, used to prove that Indonesians could succeed in higher education (Prager 2005).

Another key area for Indonesian students was adat-law studies, led by Leiden Professor Cornelis van Vollenhoven (Kommers and Buskens 2007). A strong supporter of the ethical policy, Van Vollenhoven dedicated his career to documenting and classifying the various traditional adat (customary law) practices among Indonesia's ethnic groups. In his magnum opus, *Het adatrecht van Nederlandsch-Indië* (1918–33), he divided Indonesia into nineteen law provinces (*adatrechtskringen*), each with its own unique adat law. He argued that adat laws were more than just uncodified rules; they represented a worldview with deep social and cosmological roots(Kommers and Buskens 2007). Van Vollenhoven urged the colonial government to recognize these indigenous laws and avoid imposing Western legal systems on the colony. During Van Vollenhoven's tenure as professor (1901–33), several Indonesian students earned PhDs in adat law. Notable graduates include Gondokoesomo (1922), Kusumah Atmadja (1922), who later became President of the Supreme Court of Indonesia, Enda Boemi (1925), Soepomo (1927), who became a professor of adat law at the Batavia Law School and "father" of the 1945 Indonesian Constitution, Soeripto (1929), and Soumokil (1933), the tragic hero of the short-lived Republic of South Maluku in 1950 (Fansuri 2015).

In the 1930s, while there were some connections between the study of adat law and Indonesia's political situation, anthropology remained on the fringes. At the Law School, Ter Haar taught anthropology as a minor part of his adat law courses and never gave it an independent identity or importance (Koentjaraningrat 1975a). Consequently, Indonesian students showed little interest in anthropology. However, the teaching of anthropology improved when the Law School established a chair for ethnology, appointing J.Ph. Duyvendak (1897–1946) in 1938. In his inaugural speech, Duyvendak addressed topics that appealed to modernist Indonesian intellectuals (Prager 2005). He noted that anthropology could no longer be seen as a purely European science, as the spread of European culture had turned former subjects of Western anthropology into practitioners of the discipline. Duyvendak emphasized that anthropology, being taught "in the midst of her field of research," must consider who practices it, highlighting that the researcher's cultural background matters (Prager 2005). Plans to establish a University of Batavia led to the creation of a Faculty of Letters and Philosophy in 1940 and a Faculty of Agriculture in 1941. Duyvendak's anthropology chair was part of the Faculty of Letters, but he left due to illness in 1941. Gerrit Jan Held took over his courses but taught for a short time because Japanese troops invaded Indonesia in 1942. The Netherlands-East Indies were fully occupied by Japan, and many Dutch academics and colonial officers were interned in Japanese prison camps. Duyvendak, released from internment, died in January 1946 shortly after returning to the Netherlands due to the mental and physical strains of his imprisonment (Prager 2005).

The Political Deadlock of Anthropology After the War Era (1945-1949)

Dutch anthropologists in Indonesia after the war found themselves in a drastically changed political environment. Dutch colonial authorities were based in Australia, carefully planning

their return to the East Indies. They seemed unaware of the significant changes that had taken place in their former colony during the war. Naively, they expected to restore Indonesians to the same subordinate political, social, and economic status they had endured before the war. The Dutch did not grasp that most Indonesians saw the weak colonial defense of the islands in early 1942 as a definitive end to Dutch rule. This misunderstanding persisted even when, in August 1945, Indonesians enthusiastically embraced Sukarno's declaration of independence and raised the red and white flag of the new Republic across the islands (Thomas 1973). The clash between Dutch and Indonesian expectations erupted into a violent revolution. It began with Indonesian volunteers resisting Dutch re-entry, leading to four years of conflict. On December 27, 1949, the Netherlands finally relinquished all territorial rights to the archipelago, except for Western New Guinea (Thomas 1973). During the revolution, Dutch forces maintained control over most of the islands. For much of this period, the Republican government held only a densely populated area in Central Java around Yogyakarta, which served as the capital for the revolutionary government, and a significant part of sparsely populated Sumatra.

During the revolution, two universities were born in Java: one under Dutch control and the other under Republican control. The Dutch university, University of Indonesia, was a *Nooduniversiteit Van Indonesie* (Emergency University of Indonesia) of pre-war colonial colleges and new faculties (Prager 2005). Over the years, it grew to nearly 10,000 students by 1970 and gained respect as the modern successor of the nation's oldest higher education tradition. In contrast, the university that emerged in Republican territory initially consisted of separate colleges, which unified in late 1949 to form Gadjah Mada University, now located in Yogyakarta (Thomas 1973). Gadjah Mada is highly regarded by Indonesians not for its long academic

tradition, but for its romantic origin, as it was established by Indonesians themselves during the Revolution, rather than being inherited from Europeans. The anthropology course at UGM was led by the philologist Prof. Prijohutomo, sociology courses were conducted by M.M. Djojodigoeno, who had studied under Ter Haar at the Batavia Law School. Indonesian anthropologist Koentjaraningrat later noted that teaching at this university was only feasible because students from Jakarta had smuggled hundreds of books to Yogyakarta during the Dutch encirclement of Jakarta (Visser 1988).

At the University of Indonesia, G.J. Held was appointed to the chair of anthropology, replacing Duyvendak. In 1948, the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences had 139 students: 64 Indonesians, 53 Chinese, and 22 Dutch. The number of students studying anthropology is unknown. Indonesian students were likely alert of the subject due to its historical ties with the colonial office. Suspicion against the colonial roots of anthropology remained strong in the following years, casting doubt on the future of Dutch ethnologists at the university. This was a time when the native Indonesians anthropologists will replace their Dutch Anthropologists (Prager 2005).

The Revival of Indonesian Anthropology with Koentjaraningrat (1950-1958)

Despite Indonesia gaining independence, Dutch scholars did not leave immediately. In anthropology, the Dutch faculty at the University of Indonesia continued their roles for a few years. Held stayed in his professorship until 1955, with Dutch lecturers F.A.E. van Wouden and Elisabeth Allard assisting him. The situation for Dutch scholars had significantly changed. Indonesians now led and administered the university, the former Literary Faculty was renamed Fakultas Sastra, and the official language switched from Dutch to Bahasa Indonesia (Prager 2005). Furthermore, during the postwar period, the subject of

anthropology, as represented by the Dutch, became increasingly viewed as politically suspect. Political tensions from the Irian conflict ended the Dutch scholars' efforts in Indonesia. They were forced to leave the country. Held had taken a job in Amsterdam but died in 1955 before leaving. Van Wouden went on leave in 1954 and never returned. Only Elisabeth Allard stayed, teaching until 1958 (Ramstedt 2005). There was a pressing need to replace Dutch knowledge with knowledge held by Indonesians or sourced from foreign countries outside the Netherlands. At the same time, from the moment of Indonesia's independence, it was essential to retain or acquire practical knowledge necessary for economic development (Linbadl, 2021). A newly sovereign nation seeks to free itself from knowledge tied to its colonial past. In this context, knowledge is understood as the accumulated reservoir of information, understanding, and skills available within the nation. It is important to distinguish between general knowledge and the practical know-how required for specific tasks (Kuiter 2021). Indonesia entered the 1950s facing numerous challenges. During Indonesia's colonial period, the Dutch government played a key role as a source of knowledge, distributing information through the production of books, including textbooks and other printed materials (Suwignyo 2021).

Koentjaraningrat faced several challenges in developing anthropology in Indonesia, where the discipline was closely associated with colonial programs that provided education to colonial government officials stationed in the Dutch East Indies. The strong ties between Dutch anthropologists and the colonial government at the time led to anthropology being viewed unfavorably after independence (Winarto and Pirous 2019). Additionally, the focus of anthropology on studying traditional societies during that period contributed to its perception as an anti-progressive discipline. In 1950, a controversy arose due to a statement by T.S.G. Moelia, a sociologist who served as the

Minister of Education (1945-1946). He claimed that anthropology focused only on studying "primitive" and "static" societies, making it unsuitable and irrelevant for a developing Indonesia. Moelia believed sociology was more important for the newly independent country and suggested abandoning the field of anthropology altogether. Fortunately, Moelia's successor as Minister of Education did not follow this advice (Koentjaraningrat 1987). Koentjaraningrat worked hard to demonstrate that anthropology was a valuable discipline for supporting Indonesia's development (Amran 2023). Considering the situation, it's understandable that Koentjaraningrat and his colleagues had to strive to convince various parties of the importance of anthropology for an independent Indonesia. Their efforts were not in vain. Koentjaraningrat eventually gained the government's trust to develop anthropology at several universities in Indonesia. Throughout his academic career, he was instrumental in establishing anthropology departments at universities in Yogyakarta, Denpasar, Jayapura, Manado, Ujung Pandang, Medan, and indirectly at Andalas (Visser 1988). To support educators at these new departments, Koentjaraningrat established a scholarship program that recruited students from various regions to pursue master's degrees in the Netherlands. The condition was that they had to return and teach at the newly established anthropology departments. Many of those recruited and educated by Koentjaraningrat later became key educators and pioneers in developing the anthropology discipline at universities supported by him (Shri-Ahimsa 2023).

It is important to remember that during the New Order era, the political climate did not allow for openly critical stances against government policies. In an interview documented by Leontine Visser (1988), it is evident that Koentjaraningrat opposed various policies of the New Order government. Despite being Javanese, he strongly disagreed with the Javanization tendencies

promoted by Suharto's government. Koentjaraningrat opposed initiatives to create fields such as Javanology and Baliology (Amran 2023). His primary interest was in strengthening Indonesia's integration as a nation, promoting peace among ethnic groups, fostering tolerance among diverse communities, and addressing the integration of Indonesian society's cultural diversity. Koentjaraningrat was deeply concerned with the issue of integrating a culturally diverse Indonesian society (Amran 2023).

Koentjaraningrat Research Methods and Approaches: Non-Euro-American Anthropologist in Between Euro-American Tradition

This subchapter title is inspired by Koentjaraningrat's 1964 essay "Anthropology and Non-Euro-American Anthropologists," featured in the book "Explorations in Cultural Anthropology: Essays in Honour of George Peter Murdock." This book can be considered as a starting point to trace the genealogy of Koentjaraningrat's thought. Because in the book Koentjaraningrat's identity as Murdock's student is recognized and he wrote a full sub-chapter on Indonesian anthropology as a catalyst for the development of post-colonial anthropology. The book is a collection of essays by Murdock's students, exploring the ongoing development of anthropology in terms of its ontology, epistemology, and methodology. In the preface, Ward H. Goodenough, a former student of Murdock and the book's editor, explains that the contributors to the book were Murdock's students who earned their Phd in anthropology at Yale University, as well as colleagues from Pittsburgh (Goodenough 1968). Koentjaraningrat was one of Murdock's students while pursuing his master's degree at Yale and even assisted Murdock when he moved to the University of Pittsburgh (Shri-Ahimsa 1997). Goodenough emphasizes that the growth of anthropology will be reinforced by the emergence of the discipline in newly

independent countries after World War II. The direction of anthropology's development in these countries will significantly broaden its perspectives and knowledge. Notably, Indonesian anthropology under Koentjaraningrat, as Goodenough mentions, will raise new and important questions (Goodenough 1968).

The central question of anthropology has always been, "Why do human societies, as one species on the same earth, do things so differently from one group to another?" To answer this, anthropology has two major traditions: European and American, which shape modern anthropology today (Pirous 2023). Each tradition has different assumptions. American anthropology focuses on understanding cultural diversity, while European anthropology aims to show social structures. From these centers in England and America, universities worldwide recognize anthropology as a respected discipline with tested methods, producing important ethnographic works (Pirous 2023).

However, anthropology does not exist in a vacuum; it involves debates, discoveries, and mistakes. The field continually evolves to address various academic problems. Concerning anthropology's ontological task, several questions arise. First, the study of subjective human diversity must use objective criteria to be scientific. Second, when anthropology becomes subjective, relative, reflective, and interpretive, it risks being excluded from modern science. These paradoxical issues show a disconnection between objectivity and subjectivity at the most fundamental methodological level.

The American tradition of anthropology evolved from the need to address the reality that outside universities and the white academic culture, there existed Native American societies with remarkable diversity and uniqueness. Franz Boas, known as the Father of American Anthropology, structured the field into four branches: Cultural Anthropology, Linguistic Anthropology, Archaeology, and Physical Anthropology, each for specific

reasons. Meanwhile, across the ocean, British anthropology (and Western European anthropology in general) developed from a different need (Kaul 2006). As a nation with a long history of colonization, there was a growing demand in the early 20th century for a "sociology-like" science to specifically understand non-white colonial societies. The British tradition of anthropology began with E.B.Taylor, who speculated about universal cultural evolution in line with the popular evolutionary theories of his time. However, it wasn't until Radcliffe Brown that British anthropology was built into a modern, systematic, and scientific discipline, drawing from the genealogy and dialectics of sociology. Thus, European anthropologists feel comfortable with sociological figures like Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, and Max Weber as foundational to anthropology. They are also very familiar with philosophers like John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Thomas Hobbes. European anthropology, being a grandchild of philosophy, is not seen as overly specialized. Archaeology and physical anthropology are considered to have different histories. In contrast, if American anthropologists were asked about their history, they would clearly mention key figures such as Franz Boas, Margaret Mead, and Clifford Geertz (Kaul 2006).

The American tradition made "culture" the core concept to explain diversity, while British and other European anthropology used "structure" as their main concept (Layton and Kaul 2006). As colonizers, British anthropologists sought to understand the differences and diversity encountered during their expansion through an objective, cross-cultural lens, believing there must be strict principles or structures that unify the various elements. In contrast, American anthropologists, descendants of migrants, aimed to celebrate and appreciate diversity, focusing on understanding differences and developing interpretative and cross-cultural methods. However, the differences between these

two traditions are not strictly black and white. For instance, Bronislaw Malinowski, a Polish anthropologist teaching at the London School of Economics, initially worked within the "structural" tradition but later incorporated American cultural and psychological concepts, developing the hybrid theory known as "structural functionalism" (Kaul 2006).

How about the influence of Dutch anthropology? Dutch anthropology in their colonies never developed a distinct school of thought. Shaped by practical colonial needs and influenced by 19th-century German academic traditions, Dutch anthropological work in Indonesia was carried out by civil servants rather than social scientists and tended to be more descriptive than analytical (Winarto and Pirous 2019). The decline of Dutch structuralism in the Netherlands, unlike the rise of French and British structuralism, might be partly due to their strained relations with Indonesia. Koentjaraningrat, who studied anthropology at Yale University, rejected Dutch influences, focusing instead on non-Dutch theoretical frameworks. Koentjaraningrat believed that Indonesian anthropology needed "theoretical unity" to produce knowledge useful for political and economic analysis of cultural values (Visser 1988). As Ramstedt notes, Indonesian anthropology gradually became an applied science for the nation-building project.

Koentjaraningrat's awareness of the position and history of Indonesian anthropology was central to his ideas on developing the field. He believed that anthropologists in former colonies would face significant challenges when applying this traditionally Euro-American science to their own societies. One major challenge is the prevailing notion that anthropology focuses on primitive peoples and has colonial roots (Koentjaraningrat 1968). Non-Euro-American anthropologists cannot refer to their rural compatriots as "primitives" or "nonliterate" if they want local support. In the early stages of establishing anthropology in these countries,

practical results are crucial. Anthropologists must adapt the scope, objectives, and functions of the field to address the immediate needs of their rapidly changing societies. Only after these needs are met can anthropology be introduced as a science aiming to solve broader questions about human nature and culture. According to Koentjaraningrat, despite its Euro-American biases, anthropology is the most suitable social science for studying social processes in new Asian and African countries (Koentjaraningrat 1968). Its focus on gathering "intimate data" through continuous firsthand observation, its experience with small communities, understanding of cultural diversity, sensitivity to local attitudes and values, attention to historical depth, and emphasis on local languages make it ideal for emerging nations. In these countries, the rural areas are crucial and significantly impact national issues. With many ethnic groups and languages, the social processes in rural areas are closely tied to national problems. Koentjaraningrat emphasized that non-Euro-American anthropologists must go beyond merely studying the uniqueness of small communities. They owe their respective countries a serious interest in how these communities relate to broader national issues. This requires a specific approach to their subjects, structuring of problems, and even introducing new methods of investigation. Unlike other anthropologists, they must focus on the larger implications of their studies for their countries (Koentjaraningrat 1968).

Finding the genealogy of Koentjaraningrat's anthropology is quite challenging because he rarely, if ever, wrote about it specifically in any scientific articles or his own books. According to Ahimsa, tracing Koentjaraningrat's genealogy requires examining the works of anthropologists whose views he followed (Shri-Ahimsa 1997). Ahimsa has previously defined the epistemology of Koentjaraningrat's anthropology in his writing titled "*Antropologi Koentjaraningrat: Sebuah Tafsir Epistemologis*." According to Ahimsa, the concept of anthropology as a science can

be realized in three stages. The first is the collection of facts, the second is generalization and systematization or determining general characteristics, and the third is verification (Shri-Ahimsa 1997). In anthropology, there are broadly two methods for collecting data: field research and library research. Field research, which involves intensive and extended study to achieve high accuracy, is a hallmark of anthropology and is influenced by British social anthropology traditions (Visser 1988). However, library research is also crucial. For instance, Koentjaraningrat conducted library research for both his thesis (A Preliminary Description of the Javanese Kinship System) (Koentjaraningrat 1957)and his dissertation (*Beberapa metode anthropolog dalam penjelidikan2 masjarakat dan kebudajaan di Indonesia*) (Koentjaraningrat 1958). Koentjaraningrat believed that qualitative and quantitative research methods are not opposing but complementary.

Generalization or identifying common characteristics occurs after gathering facts about cultures and societies. This is followed by comparison and classification work. Through comparative studies, general traits within the data can be identified and grouped into specific categories or types. This process of classification is explained through the concept of cultural taxonomy (Shri-Ahimsa 1997). An example of cultural taxonomy can be found in Koentjaraningrat's work, "Introduction to the Peoples and Cultures of Indonesia and Malaysia."The book provides a foundational explanation of the cultures of Indonesia and Malaysia (Koentjaraningrat 1975b). It begins with a brief history of culture in both countries, then explores similarities and differences among various cultures using a typology of cultures (Irianto 1997). Koentjaraningrat identifies four types of cultures based on the number of cultural influences integrated into them: (1) Cultures based on shifting cultivation, yams, taro, and other root crops, (2) Inland cultures based on swidden agriculture or

irrigated agriculture. (3) Coastal cultures based on swidden agriculture or irrigated agriculture with rice as the main crop. (4) Inland cultures based on wet-rice agriculture. However, Koentjaraningrat's cultural taxonomy does not address the impact of cultural contact. Instead, his findings focus more on subsistence practices and cultural locations (Shri-Ahimsa 1997).

After establishing cultural taxonomy, verification is necessary through comparative studies. Koentjaraningrat distinguishes two types of comparative studies: (1) Comparative Study for Classification, this type aims to create a specific classification system by identifying similarities and differences among cultures, which helps in understanding societies and cultures. This approach focuses on typology. (2) Comparative Study for Validation, this type tests the accuracy of concepts about societies and cultures by comparing them with additional variables. It is used to verify and refine the understanding developed through the initial study (Shri-Ahimsa 1997). The essence of these comparative studies is that the first type seeks to identify commonalities and differences to form a basis for understanding cultures and societies. The second type examines and validates the understanding by including various cultural and societal variables.

Koentjaraningrat was significantly influenced by G.P. Murdock, a prominent American anthropologist known for developing various forms of cross-cultural studies (Shri-Ahimsa 1997). Inspired by his mentor, Koentjaraningrat wrote works such as *Manusia dan Kebudayaan di Indonesia*, *Atlas Etnografi Sedunia*, and *Masyarakat Desa di Indonesia*. These books highlight a strong focus on 'cultural universals' in their ethnographic frameworks. Koentjaraningrat's approach to anthropology is fundamentally comparative, aligning with general practices in the field globally (Irianto 1997). However, due to his specific influences and historical context, his anthropology also prominently features a

practical, applied focus aimed at Indonesia's development (Shri-Ahimsa 1997).

However, Koentjaraningrat never demonstrated how to conduct large-scale cross-cultural studies in Indonesia, despite having worked on such studies at Yale University. He acknowledged this limitation by stating, "...Although I had done work in cross-cultural anthropology at Yale, I had never had the opportunity to do much work in that field in Indonesia…" . According to Ahimsa, this might be due to the lack of infrastructure, such as the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF) collection, in Indonesia. Instead, Koentjaraningrat used smaller-scale comparative methods while maintaining the scientific basis of his work, as seen in his book *Masyarakat Desa di Selatan Jakarta* (Ahimsa 1997).

One of his best-known books is *Penduduk Irian Barat* ("The Inhabitants of West Irian"), published in 1963 during the height of the Irian crisis, which worsened relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands. This book demonstrates that Koentjaraningrat, the undisputed 'father' of Indonesian anthropology, had been trying to make anthropology address the nation's needs since he became a professor in the anthropology department at UI in 1962 (Ramstedt 2005). Under his leadership, Indonesian anthropology developed significantly as 'applied anthropology.' At Yale, Koentjaraningrat worked on the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF) with G.P. Murdock. This inspired him to start a similar project in Indonesia, focused on documenting Indonesian cultures. He was also influenced by the concept of 'value orientation', developed by Florence R. Kluckhohn and Fred L. Strodtbeck (Marzali 2006). Both the project of creating an encyclopedia of all Indonesian cultures and the concept of 'value orientation' were intended to support nation-building efforts. Koentjaraningrat aimed to use these projects to help with nation-building and wanted the Indonesian government to recognize

how important anthropology could be in this process. Koentjaraningrat was well-placed to achieve his goals. In 1964, he became the Director of the Institute for Research on National Culture at the Indonesian Institute of Science (LIPI), a position he held until 1967. From 1967 to 1977, he served as deputy chair of LIPI. Additionally, he was the Dean of the Faculty of Letters at UI from 1965 to 1966 (Ramstedt 2005).

The Influence and Legacy of Koentjaraningrat

Indonesian anthropology faced a challenge from a lack of capable lecturers. Koentjaraningrat tackled this challenge by tirelessly teaching at various Indonesian universities. He prepared talented students to promote anthropology across the country's academic institutions (Ramstedt 2005). Koentjaraningrat's influence on his students is evident in their substantial contributions to applied and engaged anthropology, reflecting his commitment to addressing practical issues within Indonesian society (Ahimsa-Putra 2019). Suraya A. Afiff, for example, has advanced the discourse on customary and cultural rights, agrarian issues, and land grabbing, leveraging anthropological insights to advocate for justice and equity in land tenure (Winarto and Pirous 2019). Iwan Tjitradjaja, inspired by Koentjaraningrat's emphasis on practical applications, has focused on repositioning local farmers as forest conservers rather than encroachers, aiming to reconcile conservation efforts with local livelihoods. Yunita T. Winarto's work on mangrove rehabilitation and environmental management highlights the challenges of environmental change, natural resource management, and conflict over tenure rights, emphasizing community empowerment and sustainable practices (Winarto and Pirous 2019). Meutia F. Swasono has applied anthropological perspectives to medical and psychiatric issues, including family planning, demonstrating the relevance of anthropology in addressing health crises (Winarto and Pirous 2019). Sulistyowati Irianto has explored legal pluralism, gender,

and the experiences of migrant women, reflecting Koentjaraningrat's legacy in applying anthropology to legal and social issues. Heddy Shri-Ahimsa's analysis of moral economy, rationality, and politics within small-scale industries in Java further illustrates the application of anthropological theories to economic and social contexts. Collectively, these contributions underscore how Koentjaraningrat's teachings have shaped a generation of anthropologists dedicated to addressing real-world challenges through engaged and applied research.

Nearly all Indonesian anthropologists today can trace their academic lineage back to Koentjaraningrat, either directly or indirectly. James Fox has noted that he shares this intellectual lineage with Koentjaraningrat, thereby connecting his Indonesian students at ANU to this wider genealogy (Fox 2024). For example, several students from Islamic education system background under Fox supervision have produced significant ethnographies on Islam in Indonesia. Notable works include Zamakhsyari Dhofier's *Tradisi Pesantren: Studi tentang Pandangan Hidup Kyai* and The Pesantren Tradition: The Role of the Kyai in the Maintenance of Traditional Islam on Java, and Adlin Sila's research on the ethnography of contemporary Islam in Bima, Being Muslim in Indonesia: Religiosity, Politics and Cultural Diversity in Bima (Sila 2021). Additionally, Endang Turmudi's Struggling for the Umma: Changing Leadership Roles of Kiai in Jombang, East Java bridges the disciplines of anthropology and sociology (Fox 2024).

Koentjaraningrat, who remained the strongest protagonist of Indonesian anthropology until his retirement in 1988, seized the opportunity to enhance the status of anthropology by fully supporting the development policy of the government (Ramstedt 2005). When, from the beginning of the 1970s onwards, investors from Japan and the neighbouring ASEAN countries were increasingly attracted to Indonesia, Koentjaraningrat sought cooperation with academic institutions in Japan, Malaysia,

Thailand and Singapore. After the return of the students, whom he had sent to those countries in order to study the local language and culture, the study of Southeast Asian and East Asian cultures was integrated into the anthropological curriculum. Today, it is an integral part of the studies pursued at the UI anthropological department as well as at some anthropological departments of other universities in Java, such as the UGM. With the increasing importance of Australia as an economic partner, academic relations were established with Australia, too. These relations have somewhat suffered, though, due to the tensions between Indonesia and Australia that arose in connection with the referendum for independence in East Timor in 1999 (Ramstedt 2005).

When 'cultural tourism' was designed to promote the economic development of the country, Koentjaraningrat immediately responded by promoting the study of tourism by Indonesian anthropologists. One of his students, I Gusti Ngurah Bagus, who became professor of anthropology at the Udayana University in Denpasar in the beginning of the 1970s, meticulously monitored the development of tourism in Bali, until his premature death in 2003. Tourism studies are by now well established at every anthropological department throughout the country (Winarto and Pirous 2019). From 1984 until the mid-1990s, Koentjaraningrat sent many students to the Netherlands, promoting the study of pre-independence 'Indonesia' (i.e. the Netherlands' Indies) by having them study the language of the former colonial power as well as the 'Indonesian cultural heritage' in the Dutch archives and museums. He himself was also personally concerned with Europe at that time (1987–8), for he investigated the issue of ethnicity in Yugoslavia and Belgium in order to obtain comparative data for the case of Indonesia. Until now, Koentjaraningrat has been the only Indonesian

anthropologist who has chosen 'the West' as a field of study (Winarto and Pirous 2019).

Conclusion

Koentjaraningrat left a lasting legacy that continues to grow. He was the foundation of a large tree with many branches that are still expanding. Almost all Indonesian anthropologists today can trace their academic roots back to Koentjaraningrat, either directly or indirectly. However, this vast network hasn't been fully traced yet, and the complete history of anthropology in Indonesia still needs to be explored and documented. Koentjaraningrat succeeded in shaping Indonesian anthropology, and his contributions are undeniable. He stick firmly to his theoretical assumptions, maintaining a belief that a comparative perspective was the most relevant approach for addressing the socio-cultural issues arising from Indonesia's diverse society. These foundational assumptions provide insight into the type of anthropology Koentjaraningrat aimed to develop. This exploration of Koentjaraningrat's intellectual genealogy is not intended to judge the anthropology he pioneered, but rather to uncover its origins. Understanding the roots of Indonesian anthropology is crucial for comprehending the current state of the field and envisioning its future direction. By examining these historical foundations, we gain a clearer perspective on how Indonesian anthropology has evolved and how it might continue to develop. This awareness allows us to consciously advance an anthropology that is uniquely Indonesian, reflecting its distinctive cultural and social context.

Bibliography

Abdullah. 2018. "Misrepresentation of Science and Expertise: Reflecting on Half a Century of Indonesian Anthropology." Humaniora 30, no. 1: 82–91.

Ahimsa-Putra, Heddy Shri. 2019. "Koentjaraningrat Dan Integrasi Nasional Indonesia: Sebuah Telaah Kritis." Patrawidya 20, no. 2: 115–216.

https://patrawidya.kemdikbud.go.id/index.php/patrawidya/article/download/288/146/622.

Amran, Damayanti, and Pirous. 2023. Seabad Koentjaraningrat; Bapak Antropologi Indonesia. Jakarta: Kompas.

Dharmaperwira-Amran, Frieda. 1997. "Corat-Coret Koentjaraningrat / Frieda Dharmaperwira-Amran" 1997: 1–99.

Fansuri, Hamzah. 2015. Sosiologi Indonesia: Diskursus Kekuasaan Dan Reproduksi Pengetahuan. Jakarta: LP3ES.

Fox, James. 2024. "Koentjaraningrat Memorial Lecture: Koentjaraningrat's Legacy and Contemporary Anthropology in Indonesia." The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology 25, no.1: 49-63.

Goodenough, Ward H. 1968. Explorations in Cultural Anthropology; Essays in Honor of George Peter Murdock. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Hadiz and Dhakidae. 2006. Ilmu Sosial Dan Kekuasaan Di Indonesia. Jakarta: Equinox Publishing.

Irianto, Sulistyowati. 1997. "Konsep Kebudayaan Koentjaraningrat Dan Keberadaannya Dalam Paradigma Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial." In Koentjaraningrat Dan Antropologi Di Indonesia, edited by E K M Masinambow. Jakarta: Asosiasi Antropologi Indonesia bekerjasama dengan Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

Kaul, Robert Layton And. 2006. "American Cultural Anthropology and British Social Anthropology; Connections and Differences." Anthropology News 47, no. 1: 14.

Koentjaraningrat. 1957. "A Prelimenary Description of the Javanese Kinship System."

———. 1958. "Beberapa Metode Anthropologi Dalam Penjelidikan2 Masjarakat Dan Kebudajaan Di Indonesia (Sebuah Ichtisiar)."

———. 1968. "Anthropology and Non-Euro-American Anthropologists; The Situation in Indonesia." In Explorations in Cultural Anthropology; Essays in Honor of George Peter Murdock, edited by Ward H Goodenough, 293–308. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

———. 1975a. Anthropology in Indonesia; A Bibliographical Review. Leiden, Netherlands: KITLV Press.

———. 1975b. Introduction to the Peoples and Cultures of Indonesia and Malaysia. Sydney: Cummings Publishing Company.

———. 1987. "Anthropology in Indonesia." Journal of Southeast Asian Studies 18: 217–34.

Kommers, Jean, and Léon Buskens. 2007. "Dutch Colonial Anthropology in Indonesia." Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science 35, no. 3: 352–69. https://doi.org/10.1163/156853107x224286.

Kuiter, L. 2021. "Balai Pustaka and the politics of Knowledge." Lembaran Sejarah 17, no.1: 2-17

Linblad J. 2021. "The Dilemma of Knowledge Transfer in Early Independent Indonesia." Lembaran Sejarah 17, no. 1: 76-87

Marzali, Amri. 2006. "Pergeseran Orientasi Nilai Kultural Dan Keagamaan Di Indonesia." Antropologi Indonesia 30, no. 3.

Masinambow, E K M. 1997. Koentjaraningrat Dan Antropologi Di Indonesia. Jakarta: Asosiasi Antropologi Indonesia bekerjasama dengan Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

Pirous, Iwan Meulia. 2023. "Penafsiran Anthropological Turn Meneruskan Koentjaraningrat." In Seabad Koentjaraningrat; Bapak Antropologi Indonesia. Jakarta: Kompas.

Prager, Michael. 2005. "From Volkenkunde to Djurusan Antropologi: The Emergence of Indonesian Anthropology in Postwar Indonesia." In Asian Anthropology, edited by Eyal Ben-Ari van Bremen and Syed Farid Alatas Jan, 179–200. USA: Routledge.

Ramstedt, Martin. 2005. "Anthropology and the Nation State: Applied Anthropology in Indonesia." In Asian Anthropology, edited by Eyal Ben-Ari van Bremen and Syed Farid Alatas Jan, 201–24. USA: Routledge.

Rosyada, Amrina. 2022. "Unsung Native Collaborators in Anthropology." Sapiens. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=Z5uoiMYAAAAJ&citation_for_view=Z5uoiMYAAAAJ:u5HHmVD_uO8C.

Sila, A. 2021. "Being Muslim in Indonesia: Religiosity, Politics and Cultural Diversity in Bima." Leiden. Leiden University Press

Shri-Ahimsa, Heddy. 1997. "Antropologi Koentjaraningrat: Sebuah Tafsir Epistemologi." In Koentjaraningrat Dan Antropologi Di Indonesia, edited by E K M Masinambow. Jakarta: Asosiasi Antropologi Indonesia bekerjasama dengan Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

———. 2023. Bapak Antropologi Indonesia-Membangun Antropologi Di Indonesia. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Suwignyo, A. 2021. "A Vast Expansion, Yet a Sorry Infrastructure: A Paradox of the Decolonization of Indonesian Education." Lembaran Sejarah 17, no 1: 48-75.

Thomas, Robert Murray. 1973. A Chronicle of Indonesian Higher Education, the First Half Century, 1920-1970. Singapore: Chopmen.

Visser, L. 1988. "An Interview with Koentjaraningrat." Current Anthropology 29: 749–53. https://doi.org/10.1086/203697.

Winarto and Pirous. 2019. "Boundaries and Ambitions of Indonesian Anthropology." In Southeast Asian Anthropologies: National Traditions and Transnationalpractices, edited by Eric Thompson and Vineeta Sinha., 243–75. Singapore, Singapore: NUS Press.