Decolonizing Social Sciences in postcolonial countries: Reflection on the Social Sciences in Indonesia

Descolonizando as Ciências Sociais em países pós-coloniais: Reflexão sobre as Ciências Sociais na Indonésia

Descolonización de las Ciencias Sociales en los países poscoloniales: Reflexión sobre las Ciencias Sociales en Indonesia

Muhammad Takbir
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5334-2416
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, Indonesia
E-mail: muhammad.takbir@uin-alauddin.ac.id
Misnal Munir
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5453-9317
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia
E-mail: misnalmunir@ugm.ac.id
Rizal Mustansyir
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7780-319X
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia
E-mail: mustansyir@ugm.ac.id

Abstract
This study re-scrutinizes the construction of social sciences in Indonesia determined the face of Indonesia today. The aim is to reveal power relations between the power regime and the the social sciences of production in Indonesia through discourse and historical dimensions, because the discourse dimension determines what is called true by a knowledge regime, while the historical dimension reveals the political context. The method used is qualitative research, while the approach used is decolonizing interpretative approach. This approach focuses on three things, namely: the critical influence on the hegemonic knowledge regime, the historicity of knowledge created from a certain social context, and the political economy that determines the interest of knowledge. The results of this study are (1) there are three hegemonic paradigms in the development of social sciences in Indonesia, namely; the Indological paradigm introduced by the Dutch colonial government, the modern social science paradigm introduced by the United States (US), and the contemporary social science paradigm under the influence of the market (neoliberalism); (2) as a response to the three paradigms, Indonesian intellectuals formulated a decolonization project which was articulated in three forms, namely; the indigenization of social sciences was initiated by the researchers at Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Nusantara Philosophy was initiated by the scholars at the Faculty of Philosophy, Universitas Gadjah Mada University, and the Islamization of knowledge or the integrated knowledge was initiated by the muslim scholars at the Islamic States Universities.
Keywords: Decolonizing; Social Sciences; Indonesia.

Resumo
O presente estudo reexamina a construção das ciências sociais na Indonésia, uma vez que tal construção determina a face da Indonésia atual. O objetivo é revelar as relações de poder entre o regime de poder e as ciências sociais da produção na Indonésia por meio do discurso e das dimensões históricas, pois a dimensão do discurso determina o que é chamado de verdadeiro por um regime de conhecimento, enquanto a dimensão histórica revela o contexto político. O método utilizado é a pesquisa qualitativa, enquanto a abordagem utilizada é a abordagem interpretativa descolonizadora. Essa abordagem se concentra em três coisas, a saber: a influência crítica sobre o regime hegemônico do conhecimento, a historicidade do conhecimento criado a partir de um determinado contexto social e a economia política que determina o interesse do conhecimento. Os resultados deste estudo são: (1) existem três paradigmas hegemônicos no desenvolvimento das ciências sociais na Indonésia, a saber; o paradigma da indologia introduzido pelo governo colonial holandês, o paradigma das ciências sociais modernas introduzido pelos Estados Unidos (EUA) e, o paradigma das ciências sociais contemporâneas sob a influência do mercado (neoliberalismo); (2) como resposta aos três paradigmas, os intelectuais indonésios formularam um projeto de descolonização que se articulava em três formas, a saber; a indigenização das ciências sociais foi iniciada pelos pesquisadores do Instituto de Ciências da Indonésia, a Filosofia Nusantara foi iniciada pelos estudiosos da Faculdade de Filosofia, Universitas Gadjah Mada, e a

islamização do conhecimento ou o conhecimento integrado foi iniciada pelos estudiosos muçulmanos em as Universidades dos Estados Islâmicos.

Palavras-chave: Descolonização; Ciências Sociais; Indonésia.

Resumen
Este estudio vuelve examinar la construcción de las ciencias sociales en Indonesia. Porque la construcción determina el rostro de Indonesia hoy. El objetivo es revelar las relaciones de poder entre el régimen de poder y las ciencias sociales de la producción en Indonesia a través del discurso y las dimensiones históricas porque la dimensión del discurso determina lo que un régimen de conocimiento llama verdadero, mientras que la dimensión histórica revela el contexto político. El método utilizado es la investigación cualitativa, mientras que el enfoque utilizado es el enfoque interpretativo descolonizador. Este enfoque se centra en tres cosas, a saber: la influencia crítica sobre el régimen de conocimiento hegemónico, la historicidad del conocimiento creado a partir de un determinado contexto social y la economía política que determina el interés del conocimiento. Los resultados de este estudio son (1) existen tres paradigmas hegemónicos en el desarrollo de las ciencias sociales en Indonesia, a saber; el paradigma de la indología introducido por el gobierno colonial holandés, el paradigma moderno de las ciencias sociales introducido por los Estados Unidos (EE. UU.) y el paradigma contemporáneo de las ciencias sociales bajo la influencia del mercado (neoliberalismo); (2) como respuesta a los tres paradigmas, los intelectuales indonesios formularon un proyecto de descolonización que se articuló de tres formas, a saber; la indigenización de las ciencias sociales fue iniciada por los investigadores del Instituto de Ciencias de Indonesia, la filosofía de Nusantara fue iniciada por los eruditos de la Facultad de Filosofía de la Universitas Gadjah Mada, y la islamización del conocimiento o el conocimiento integrado fue iniciada por los eruditos musulmanes de las Universidades de los Estados Islámicos.

Palabras clave: Descolonización; Ciencias Sociales; Indonesia.

1. Introduction

European colonization subjugated not only bodies but also the mind through knowledge. In the name of knowledge (representation), the world is also partially divided into East and West. Furthermore, colonial scientists explained the East, from language to plants. This phenomenon was called by Edward W. Said (1979) as orientalism.

According to (Said, 1979), orientalism concerns three interrelated things: first, an orientalist is a person who teaches, writes about, or researches about the East, regardless of whether they are anthropologists, sociologists, philologists, or historians who claim authority to the knowledge of the East; second, orientalism is a way of thinking that is based on distinction between the West and East; the West is rational while the East is the mythical (irrational); third, orientalists have the authority legitimized by legal entities to determine the 'face' of the East, explain about them, describe, and control it. In the other words, orientalism is a system of thinking that fundamentally refers to the ontological and epistemological distinction between the West and the East. (King, 1999: 81-83).

In Indonesia, this fact is recognized by a Dutch historian, Frances Gouda (1996). According to him, the desire to know (*le désir de savoir*) by the Dutch colonial era began in the mid-19th century. This desire was accompanied by a desire for power (*le désir de pouvoir*). It is inspired by the British in India who used oriental (indigenous) knowledge to organize the colonized society (Gouda, 1996). In fact, this effort is not only effective but also more efficient. In addition, knowing (science), for them, was an intellectual mechanism needed to maintain colonial superiority. Power without knowledge will only be like the attitude of Goliath who attacks blindly. The seriousness of the Dutch towards knowledge is evidenced by the establishment of two colonial knowledge institutions; Koninklijke Akademie, an educational and training institution for the low bureaucrats in the East Indies, and Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde Van Nederlandsch-Indië (KITLV), a colonial institute of production and dissemination of knowledge about colonized societies (Samuel, 2010: 15). In fact, at Leiden University a department of Indology was also established – therefore, the colonial knowledge is also known as the social science of Indology.

Even though Indonesia became independent in 1945, traces of colonization still remain in the minds of the indigenous people. The long colonization process has embedded and internalized the colonized people so as to shape their way of thinking and behavior (Fanon, 1963; Said, 1979). The colonized people inherited colonial behavior and took over colonial jobs (Grosh,

1968). "On the new modes and forms of the old colonialist practice "and not a beyond" (Mirsha & Hodge, 2005). Therefore, Indonesia's decolonization project, post-independence, never really succeeded. Apart from being caused by the way of thinking inherited from the previous colonial era, this orientalism project was also continued by the United State (US) as the winner of World War II (Samuel, 2010). This is shown by who shows the epistemic aspect of US social science which is orientalism, putting Indonesia as an object. According to him, the characteristic of US social science is basically analogous to the Dutch Indology project. In line with Philpott et al., (2002) said that the US foreign policy in Indonesia spreads the economic ideas of capitalism.

The postcolonial countries constructed and categorized as developing or third countries. This category is formed by discourse in the academic space, and further disseminated in universities around the world (Haringsma, 2021). According to Haringsma (2021), this has taken place since the schools and knowledge system introduced by the colonists in the colonies. The knowledge system is built on a methodological framework and further determines the truth regime. Unfortunately, this framework excludes local/indigenous knowledge and is constructed as irrational and less valuable. Truth was controlled, in line with the colonists' will to control the indigenous people. There are three important points of the colonial heritage in universities, according to Haringsma: (1) colonialism has demolished local knowledge through dissemination of modern knowledge – local knowledge is constructed based on Western methodological standards – Asserting to Knoblauch (2021) thet "methods do not only describe how knowledge is produced; they prescribe how knowledge should be produced. This phenomenon is called epistemological genocide or epistemicide; (2) epistemic alignment formed through the colonial education system which subsequently determined the colonized society as "a non-knowledgeable subject"; (3) the geopolitics context of knowledge collocates the West as the imagination and desire that must be achieved (Haringsma, 2021).

This phenomenon is also called academic imperialism that manifested to two forms, namely; intellectual imperialism on the one hand and academic dependence on the other – this is analogous to economic and political imperialism (Amin, 2009; Barry, 2011; S. A. Farid, 2010; Smith, 2012). Furthermore according to Alatas (2010: 53) "an effort to understand the political economy of science, it is not enough to use a 'superstructure-based' argument, but also to apply it which is analogous to the market." In other words, knowledge plays to ensure the continuation of economic and political imperialism, including its evolution, the new imperialism – the relation between knowledge and political economic interests presupposes one another. Scientific knowledge plays a hegemonic role (Femia, 1981), so Ranciere (1973) and Habermas, (1971) said the ideological knowledge or scientism. In short, colonial discourse is a system of thinking that was implanted by the colonial government in order to regulate and control the world (Said, 1979).

Based on the discourse of the social sciences, developing countries are referred to as periphery, while developed countries are referred to as centers or metropolises. People in developing countries are associated as the people who lived poor, traditional, mythical, static and so on (Ghaderi & Wan Yahya, 2014; Tania Murray Li, 2002; Nagel, 1994). Contrast to developed countries are associated as the people who progress, modern, civilized, rational, dynamic and so on. This discourse becomes the reason for developed countries such as the USA to intervene in developing countries such as Indonesia. The implication is that developing countries, including Indonesia, are defined, shaped, imagined, managed, controlled, exploited, and built through. discourses and practices, which take place through academic work, government policies, national and international activism, and public understanding. Therefore, discourse is the totality of the structure of the articulation practice - the articulation practice produces the language system and determines the form of knowledge. In other words, knowledge is always produced based on certain interests (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985). In fact, interest itself precedes knowledge; Interest is the cause of knowledge (Habermas, 1971).

Based on the explanation above, it is important to decolonize the social sciences in Indonesia. Asserting to Baur (2021), decolonizing the social sciences is focussed on social theory, either discussing about how to rethink theoretical

concepts. It does not aim to fight against all Western standardization, and returning to the indigenous culture, but understanding culture in a plural manner. Decolonization is placing Western knowledge on a par with indigenous; not two versions but more than a thousand versions of knowledge (Alvares, 2011b). Wa Thiong'o (1987) said that decolonization is an attempt to escape from the grip of hegemonic culture during the colonization process, thereby destroying the cultural joints of the colonized people. Due to the European culture (colonies), during the process of colonization, had penetrated until it was deeply rooted in the culture of the colonized people. Defining our culture must also use the colonial definition, whereas the knowledge about it was not only bias, western-minded, but also produced in the context of subjugation (Alvares, 2011a; Smith, 2012). Moreover the language of the struggle of the colonized people had to be articulated in the colonial language. Therefore, this decolonization project is a united language of struggle in the context of striving for one's own culture against colonial culture. For him, "A people united can never be defeated' (wa Thiong'o, 1987: 3-7).

The previous studies related to this topic are: (1) The Illusion of Decolonization: Lacanian Psychoanalysis and the Reconstruction of Western Colonialism - *Ilusi Dekolonisasi: Psikoanalisis Lacanian dan Rekonstruksi Kolonialisme Barat* (2008); (2) Genealogy of the Power of Social Sciences in Indonesia - *Genealogi Ilmu Sosial di Indonesia* (2010); (3) The Many Faces of Indonesia: Knowledge Production and Power Relations (2013); (4) "Social Science and Power in Indonesia" (2005); (5) Reflection on the Paradigm of Social Sciences - *Refleksi Terhadap Ilmu-ilmu Sosial* (2015). However none of these studies examine the direction towards decolonization of social sciences. Although Polimpung examines this issue, its attention focuses on decolonization of political discourse. Indeed the aim is to decolonize social sciences themselves creating possibilities for alternative social science or emancipatory knowledge.

2. Methodology

This research is a philosophical study that uses qualitative research methods. The approach used is decolonizing interpretive research. Decolonizing interpretative approach focus to the relationship between knowledge and reality within the limits of rationality (Darder, 2019). Some of the focuses of this approach include: (1) critical influence that evaluating the epistemic construction of a hegemonic theory which always used for constructing reality; (2) historicity of knowledge, understanding the historicity and context of the birth of a theory so that it is used to normalize social reality by the dominant group; (3) political economy, examining how the economic and political interests intertwine with the birth of knowledge (Darder, 2019: 7-10). Based on these three approaches, the social sciences that have developed in Indonesia are reviewed and re-analyzed. The aim is decolonizing the artificial boundaries of colonial and racial formations, as well as hierarchies that have been in the discourse of the social sciences in Indonesia.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 The Hegemonic Paradigms of Social Sciences in Indonesia

The history of social sciences in Indonesia can be divided into three periods. These three periods have determined the three hegemonic paradigms of social sciences, and further create the face of Indonesian society, namely the Indological paradigm, the modern social science paradigm, and the contemporary paradigm.

The first is the Indological paradigm influenced by the Dutch colonial. Although the Dutch had controlled the archipelago since the 17th century through the Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie (VOC), they realized that important to know indigenous peoples and their knowledge since the early 19th century. It occurred after Thomas Stamford Raffles published his book, History of Java in 1817, a book that was explaining completely dan systematically the life of the people in the East Indies/Indonesia.

In 1851, the Dutch began to establish the Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde Van Nederlandsch-Indië (KITLV) (Royal Institute of Linguistics, Geography and Ethnology of the Netherlands Indies). The study of indigenous peoples has also begun to be formalized through the department of Indology at Leiden University. This department was founded in collaboration with politicians, J.C. Baud (ex-Governor-General of the Dutch East Indies and Minister of the Colonial Region), G. Simon (Physicist and Director of Koninklijke Akademie), and T. Roorda (Professor of Javanese Studies at Koninklijke Akademie) (Samuel, 2010). The Dutch realized that Oriental science was not only an intellectual mechanism to maintain colonial superiority but also as an alternative in dealing with the means of military power and political arrogance used by European nations (Gouda, 1996). In other words, knowledge is merely an instrument of power.

The Dutch government in 1889 sent Snouck Hurgronje, an Indologist who is fluent in Arabic, an expert in classical Islamic scientific tradition, and has researched Islamic life in Mecca, to research about Islam in the East Indies/Indonesia. After arriving in Batavia, his first assignment was to research Islamic education in Bogor and become an Arabic teacher in Batavia. In 1891, he was sent to Aceh disguised as Haji Abdul Ghaffar. The goal was to subjugate Aceh, which was at war with the Dutch. During the seven months he lived with the Acehnese, he wrote a report, Atjeh Verslag, the strategy to conquer Aceh. The suggestion was also quite effective because the Dutch succeeded in conquering Aceh two years later.

Cornelis Van Vollenhoven (1874-1933) and Julius Herman Boeke (1884-1956) did the same thing later. Both figures are known as experts on Adat law and East Indies economists. Van Vollenhoven managed to document 19 Adat laws, Het Adatrecht van Nederlandsch-Indië (Adat Law in the Dutch East Indies), thus being called the "Father of Indonesian Adat Law". In fact, his arrival in the Dutch East Indies in 1907 only lasted about two weeks. But time was not an important issue for the colonials, because the same thing happened to India, James Mill, the author of The History of British India (1818), never visited India. In fact, the work of Mill and Vollenhoven is a collection of records of colonial bureaucrats. In fact, according to Anderson (2010), these bureaucrats tend to come from those who are of low rank and do not have adequate academic qualifications in research. However, Koentjaraningrat, the Indonesian Anthropologists, praised the results of their research by saying that they were reliable researchers because they had academic training of high quality and were in accordance with scientific standards at the time (Samuel, 2010).

Van Vollenhoven's advocacy to Adat law, basically, like Hurgronje, because he convinced the theory of evolution. The Indonesian society must be integrated with the modern (colonial) life system gradually. Schoffer, van Vollenhoven's most authoritative commentator, said that van Vollenhoven's advocacy to Adat law was due to the influence of European romanticism. Van Vollenhoven and Leiden scientists did not agree with the westernization and the application of the European legal system in the colonies. In contrast to the Utrecht school which actually supports the unification of the legal system in the colonized country (Kahn, 2005).

Julius Herman Boeke (1844-1956) supported Van Vollenhoven's notion with the economic argument. According to Boeke, there are differences between the West and the East in the mode of production; The West uses the industrial mode of production while the East uses the agrarian mode of production - the West uses a capitalist economic system while the East uses a traditional (pre-capitalist) economic system (Samuel, 2010: 29). Therefore, he introduced the theory of Dualistic Economics in 1910. In the context of Indonesia, this is explained in his book, Economics and Economic Policy of Dual Societies as Exemplified by Indonesia. The assumption of Boeke's dual economic theory departs from his ideas about the typology of backward Indonesian society, such as primitive, communal living, traditional, and believing in superstition. Meanwhile, according to Boeke, the West has an economic system with three main characteristics, namely: (1) unlimited wants as part of the economic subject; (2) the money economy as the basis of the life of economic subjects; and (3) corporate organizations in many ways become the basis of individual economic activity (Sadli, n.d.).

Allen Sievers (1974) identified seven basic assumptions about the East in Boeke's dual economic notion, namely; (1)

reluctance to make risky investments; (2) lack of accuracy in completing their work; (3) lack of accounting and long-term business capacity; (4) lack of product standardization; (5) negative supply elasticity; (6) lack of discipline and organization in work; and (7) there is no product specifications, except in the certain case in few villages that have distinctive agricultural products (In Samuel, 2010).

Based on this fact, Zed (2017) mentioned that these are four characterizations of Indology knowledge: (1) Indology as a substitute for the term social science, because this colonial heritage science does not require expertise in one particular field (social science), but rather the ability to know/master a certain area in which they work. Colonial science tends to mix with various disciplines/fields of science, ranging from geography, social, anthropology, ethnology, customary law, linguistics to Islamic studies; (2) the Indological paradigm served or served colonial interests so that there was no question of a bureaucrat being a researcher - Indology could be referred to as 'state science', a sister discipline of orientalism; (3) Indology as an applied science that worked to legitimize colonial policies; (4) Indology tends to use a uniform approach; ethnographic and historical, so it tends to be monolithic or what Zed calls Avant-la-Lettre (earlier form). Therefore, in many cases, the process of Indological knowledge was often carried out in conjunction with military expeditions. In other words, the subjugation of indigenous knowledge resources was in conjunction with the conquest of colonized areas. As in the military expedition to Lombok in 1894, the Dutch colonial government included a philologist named Jan L. Brandes who then seized ancient manuscripts including the Nagarakertagama and Pararaton texts when they stormed the palace of King Cakranagara in Mataram (Farid, 2017). Similar incidents also occurred in the Makassar kingdom and the Bone kingdom in South Sulawesi.

The Second is the paradigm of modern social sciences is influenced by US. The US scholars claimed that their social sciences are objective and neutral. George McTurnan Kahin was one of the first United States (US) social scientists, a pioneer in the US social science, to research Indonesia. His book, Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia (1952), received much appreciation from a few social scientists. Meriam Budiardjo in her acknowledgemen in Indonesian translated edition (1995), said that Kahin's book was not only objective, detailed and comprehensive, but also a living testimony of the history of the Indonesian revolution (Budiardjo, 1995).

Kahin, after returning to the US, established a center for Indonesian studies, 'Cornell Modern Indonesia Project'. The institution then succeeded in attracting many students to study Indonesia for several generations. Some of them are Benedict Anderson, William Liddle, Daniel S. Lev, and Herbert Fait as the second generation; Robert Hefner and Takashi Shiraishi as the third generation; and Michael Buehler as the fourth generation (Tempo, 2011). Another Cornell, the center of Indonesian study center were also established at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), 'Indonesia Project' (MIT Center for International Studies) - Benjamin Higgins as director and Rufus Hendon as field team leader, and at Yale University established 'Indonesian Language Studies' (Council Southeast Asia Studies) (Samuel, 2010: 81-83). Clifford Geertz (1926-2006) is one of the popular Indonesianists, field researcher, in "Indonesian Project". There are two popular works, Agriculture Involution: The Process of Ecological Change in Indonesia (1964) and The Religion of Java (1976). The other popular names at 'Indonesian Language Studies' are Raymond Kennedy, Harry J. Benda, and James C. Scott.

According to Samuel (2010), the three centers for Indonesian studies each have their own focus. 'Cornell Modern Indonesia Project' focuses on political issues and the formation of a modern state of Indonesia, 'The Indonesia Project' focuses on the economic, cultural, and rural issues of Indonesia, while 'Council for Southeast Asia Studies' focuses on the history of Indonesia. Although Samuel's classification is not completely wrong, if it is seen further, the results of research from these three institutions cannot be simplified based on these three categories. However, in general, the three study institutions focus on the issues of social sciences, and more specifically, in the fields of politics, culture, Islam, and history, while the linguistics, classical literature, philosophical issues, including natural sciences were more less attention.

The influence of US social science has in turn become a magnet for students from various countries such as Australia.

A few Australian students at Cornell such as John Legge and Herbert Feith after returning to their country also established the 'Center for Southeast Asian Studies' at Monash University – this center of study became the embryo of Australian Indonesianists such as Ricklefs and Dave McRey. There are several Indonesian graduates who graduated from the US, such as Selo Soemardjan, Harsja Bachtiar, Meli G. Tan at Cornell University, and Koentjaraningrat at Yale University, after returning to Indonesia, also initiate the establishment of departments according to their focuses at universities. As Koentjaraningrat, initiated the establishment few departments of Anthropology at several universities. For his legacy, he is also called the "Father of Indonesian Anthropology".

The Indonesian studies in the US are supported by the US government through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and private companies such as 'Ford Foundation' and 'Rockefeller Foundation'. According to Viencent Houben, Head of the Asian Studies Program at Humboldt University in Berlin, Germany, the US government provided a lot of scholarships and research funds for the students who will be researched Indonesia between the 1960s and 1970s compared to other countries in Southeast Asia (Tempo, 2011: 59). Therefore, this era can be called the US social science truth regime (Philpott, 2000; Samuel, 2010).

According to Philpott (2000) who scrutinizes the notion of a few Indonesianists, that Indonesia on the US social sciences is placed as an object: studied, analyzed, imagined, and then engineered. Indonesia is analyzed not as a natural phenomenon, but is constructed based on the discourse at work; the more natural the presence of an object, the less clear its discursive construction. Inden (1990) writes,

> Theory of knowledge […] pretends to objectivity, asserting that it is 'value free' or neutral (all the while claiming to be able to predict or control events). Its specialized fields are tightly bounded, reflecting the discreteness of phenomena out there. It is atomist, believing that knowledge comes in the form of discrete sense data or fact and is increased by enquiring into small areas (new studies 'fill gaps', add a new block to an edifice). It assumes completeness (the 'exhaustive' or definitive) (in Philpott, 2000: 49).

In fact, assuming researchers act without pretensions and interests is something absurd and naive (Said, 1979).

Based on the explanation above, the characteristics of the US social sciences are: (1) in the context of political interests, the social sciences play a role in ensuring the hegemony and power of the US as a winner of World War II - Anderson (2006) said that as a global ruler, US power in Southeast Asia transcends knowledge of this place, thus requiring it to fill this knowledge gap. In addition, it also aims to prevent the growth of Marxist ideas in Indonesia, especially the flourishing development of the Indonesian Communist Party (Partai Komunis Indonesia - PKI) which has the third-largest members in the world, the first is Soviet Union and the second is China; (2) in the context of economic interests, the US modern social science guarantees social normalization so as to open up economic investment opportunities for the US in Indonesia. In this case, the paradigm of modern social sciences are the same as the indological paradigm; both show the characteristic of orientalism. The production of knowledge aims to ensure the formation of power and the accumulation of capital. Moreover, this paradigm was supported by the Suharto regime. Finally, the social sciences become ideology or pseudoscience.

The Third is the contemporary social science paradigm that is controlled by the market. It started to use in the reform order, after the new order has fallen down. Samuel & Sutopo (2013) said that there are two characteristics of contemporary social science that developed in the reform order, namely, historical-structural social science and postcolonial social science. Unfortunately, both historical-structural social science and postcolonial social science are limited to use in contemporary academic discourse in Indonesia. In contrast with modern social science which tends hegemonic, social analyzes in higher education (Nugroho, 2005). Therefore, Hadiz said that the contemporary social science paradigm is the "marketization of social science" (Hadiz, 2016).

Nugroho (2005; 2012), a sociologist at Gadjah Mada University, shows how the market determination of

contemporary social science. According to him, the market determintation is marked by four current campus intellectual phenomena, namely: (1) the intellectual pragmatism in campus - teaching and research orientations are more emphasized on things that are profitable; (2) campus intellectuals tends to appear the abilty in media, he calls the phenomenon as the intellectual of spectacle; (3) the academic involution caused by the unclear aim of the science production; (4) the campus intellectuals do not have the academic asceticism and militancy. The phenomena, according to Hadith, are the implications of the global neoliberalism system. The intellectual motivation becomes a consultant in a government institution or a intellectual of spectacle caused not only for social recognition, but also a demand for a higher fee. So, it is not surprising if many intellectuals are in the circle of bourgeois, either as consultants or negotiators in relation to the State.

Based on the explanation above, the sosial sciences in Indonesia can be simplified as follows: (1) the production of knowledge is always analogous to political and economic interests; Indology is analogous to Dutch colonial interests, modern social science presupposes US interests, and contemporary social sciences presuppose the interests of the market and the bourgeoisie; (2) the social sciences is built from a paradigm that is Eurocentrism, orientalism; (3) the social sciences is always historical and contextual. Based on these three paradigms of social sciences Indonesian society is constructed, analyzed, imagined, regulated, and engineered, and thus determines the face of Indonesian society today; social science determines the ontological condition of Indonesian society.

3.2 The decolonization Projects of Social Sciences in Indonesia

The implication of orientalism and eurocentrism has recently been realized by several social scientists in Indonesia and resulting in various responses. Farid Alatas (2010) formulates four decolonization agendas, namely: (1) questioning the epistemological status of social science concepts, including the concept of indigenous territory, native, Western, non-Western; (2) contextualizing social theory based on the political and socio-cultural conditions of a locality, without having to reject western social science; (c) Theorizing global politics of academia with a view that reveals the role in the division of labor in the academic world where non-Western scientists are the collectors of empirical data, while Western scientists are theorists; (4) recognizing the diversity of centers and sources of social theory, i.e. respecting all civilizations as potential sources for social science (Farid, 2010). In this context, there are three forms of decolonization is articulated by Indonesian scholars, namely: the indigenization of social sciences, Nusantara Philosophy, and Scientific Integration.

The first is the indigenization of social science initiated by the researcher group in Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) in the 1980s. Although this project was dim, it has resurfaced in the last decade. One of the leading figures in this project is Ignas Kleden. According to Kleden (1987), there are two reasons why the indigenization of social sciences must be carried out: (1) the social sciences in Indonesia are influenced and shaped by the West, Eurocentrism, starting from their philosophical principles to technical methods, thus the aims and its interests as an academic reason; 2) liberating the mind of colonized society from Eurocentrism and become the subject of knowledge, as an ideological reason (Kleden, 1987: 14-17).

The second is "Nusantara Philosophy" initiated by the scholars at Faculty of Philosophy, Universitas Gadjah Mada. Like the indigenization of social science, this project was undetaking to create alternative discourses which is the way of the western thinking. 'Nusantara Laboratory' (Laboratorium Nusantara), center for Nusantra studies, established to support the konstruction of indonesian knowledge. The institution organizes an international conference on Nusantara philosophy regularly every year. In 2009, for example, the nusantara laboratry organizes an international conference entitled Local Wisdom & Ideology Resilience: Reinventing A Cultural Strategy.

Although trying to find alternative notions, the intellectuals of Nusantara Philosophy are still out of the influence of Eurosentrism. In many research, western philosophy is used as a approach - in this intitution, it is called the formal object. Based on this approach, local culture related to Archipelego is interpreted and named as "Local Philosophy" (often

synonymous with "Local Wisdom"), such as; "Bugis philosophy", "Javanese philosophy", "Sumatra philosophy", and so on. The Third is "Scientific Integration" initiated by the Muslim scholars at Islamic State Universities (Universitas Islam Negeri - UIN), such as UIN Jakarta, UIN Yogyakarta, UIN Malang, and UIN Makassar. The Muslim scholars realize that eurocentrism brings forth positivism on the one hand and secularism on the other hand. Both can be harmful to religious existence, especially Islam, and dwarf the religious sciences.

The idea of scientific integration in Islamic higher education was inspired by Ismail Raji Alfaruqi through his book entitled Islamization of Knowledge: General Principles and Work Plans (1997), and Syed Nuqaib Al-Atas, Islam and Secularism (1993). Among the intellectuals who developed these notions were Mulyadhi Kartanegara at UIN Jakarta through his book Integration of Science: A Holistic Reconstruction (2005) and Amin Abdullah at UIN Yogyakarta through his book, Islamic Studies in Higher Education: Integrative-Interconnection Approach (2006). In fact, Kartanegara's idea tends to continue the project of Islamization of knowledge by Alfaruqi and Alatas, tend a romantic approach and glorifying the golden age of Islam, while Abdullah offers a reconstruction of knowledge which integrated and interconnected.

Amin's notion was inspired by Imre Lakatos about the research program and Muhammad Abed Al-Jabiri's about three types of Islamic epistemology. In this context, Abdullah places the Koran and Hadith as 'Hard Core', while social sciences as the protective belt – the research program has the characteristics of scientific unity (Rizal, 2007: 257). Meanwhile, from Al-Jabiri, Amin took three epistemological frameworks, namely: Bayani (text) to examine the source of text knowledge (hadharah al-Nash), burhani (ratio) as a source of rational knowledge (hadaharah al-'ilm) and irfani (intuition) as a source of philosophical knowledge (hadharah al-falsafat) (Abdullah, 2006).

Each project of decolonization above has the problem itself. For example, the indigenization of social science project questioned by Hadiz, that is indigenization a model feudalization of social science? How can avoid eurocentrism if the notion is already so hegemonic as Althusser explained about ideology? For example, the contextualization of Islam in the 1980s which was formulated by Nurcholis Madjid has trapped the circle of Eurocentrism and the developmentalism of the Suharto regime. However, indigenization as a scientific project still becomes hope as long as it is built on a strong methodological basis.

Regarding the archipelago philosophy project, Tjahyadi who is a lecturer at the Faculty of Philosophy, Universitas Gadjah Mana, said that if the archipelago philosophy is assumed to be an authentic living building and a unique culture of the Indonesian people, uses the western philosophical approach, genetivus objectivus, for constructing indigenous knowledge is colonization (Tjahyadi, 2011). Although methodologically, the western philosophical approach can be used to construct local knowledge, this effort is a form of epistemic violence (Bunch, 2015; Spivak et al., 1996). Therefore, Tjahyadi said that Nusantara philosophy as a project of thought, a new philosophy, is a process that cannot be stopped. Because it can open many possibilities in the future(Tjahyadi, 2011).

While the scientific integration in Islamic higher Education has three main problems: (1) the concept of scientific integration is ambiguous which can be proven each university has a scientific integration model. Such as UIN Yogyakarta has the scientific spider web (Integration-Interconnection), UIN Jakarta has the integration of knowledge, UIN Malang has the tree of knowledge, UIN Makassar has the house of civilization, and so on; (2) the implication is methodological anarchism because each institution is busy to develop the right integration model; (3) there is a tendency to romanticize the golden age of Islam, including the achievements of Muslim scientist in the past. It is the historical amnesia about the Muslim experience colonized for hundreds of years. On the other side, the tendency was implicating two faces of knowledge; firstly, the glorification of Islamic history, and secondly, the essentialization of Islam. Furthermore, it will bring the spirit of "Islamization" and Islam-minded, Islam is analog with ideology and equivalent with Eurocentrism.

3.3 Reflection on Social Sciences in Postcolonial Countries

Based on the explanation above, the decolonization of social sciences is the project that spread a wide range, from science to religious issues, from economics to cultural issues, shortly, from epistemology to axiology. As a result, many intellectuals in postcolonial countries see this project as ambiguous and confusing. Therefore many intellectuals are actually pessimistic and call a splinter movement on the one side, the other intellectuals said that it is an opportunity and futurable project for colonized society in postcolonial countries.

In my point of view, knowledge can never be produced from empty spaces but from a certain social context so that knowledge always presupposes its social interests. Because knowledge is always a constitutive part of human interests themself, and vice versa (Hardiman, 2009; Kleden, 1987). Habermas (1971) said "Interest, in general, is the pleasure that we connect with the idea of the existence of an object or of an action". On the other hand, knowledge is produced by the subject based on the context in which he thinks. Asserting to Mignolo (2012) "I am where I think". Therefore, truth itself is always discursive and historical (Talal Asad, 1993).

Habermas categorized three types of knowledge based on their respective interests, namely: empirical-analytical sciences for technical purposes, historical-hermeneutical sciences (social sciences) for practical interest, and critical sciences for emancipatory interests. The characteristics of the empirical-analytical sciences are monolog, the historical-hermeneutical sciences are dialogue, and the critical sciences are liberating and emancipation. In this context that the critical sciences are the same as the decolonization of the social sciences, both of which aim to liberate (Habermas, 1971). "We need an integrative holistic approach that combines an understanding of the physical and material conditions, the situatedness in a specific political economy, and the embedded knowledge of the users engaged in informal construction and self-provisioning practices" (Dirnagl, et al., 2021).

In the experience of the colonized societies, the social sciences became an ideological tool so causing the consensus process does not take place. Habermas said "the language of empirical-analytic statements about reality is formed under the some conditions" (Habermas, 1971). In fact, the role of language is hermeneutical and intersubjective understanding – language is expression, action, and experience. In this context, the critical sciences play to reveal power relations intertwined between interest and knowledge and so determined the knowledge production.

There are two methodical ways that needed to be carried out in the decolonization project, namely through historical materialism (Marx) and psychoanalytic interpretation (Freud). Because both Marx and Freud understood that pressure came from outside. Reflection in psychoanalysis aims to analyze the experience of the colonized subject, while historical reflection allows the class struggle of the colonized society. Habermas wrote, "The birth of psychoanalysis open up the possibility of arriving at the dimension that positivism closed off, and of doing so methodological manner that arises out of the logic of inquiry […] He (Freud) became involved in methodological discussions to the extent that the foundation of a science necessitates reflection about the new beginning" (Habermas, 1971), therefore reflexivity as a methodological tool (Dean, 2021). While the class struggle is a synthesis of the theoretical-practical relationship of two different classes. In summary, the psychoanalytic method of interpretation produces reflective knowledge, while the historical method produces class struggle.

Freud's interpretation is a model of interpretation of subject experience that has similarities to the philological method - the philological method interprets (ancient) texts and artifacts, while the psychoanalytic interpretation method interprets memory (memory) in the past. The wolds from memory is not a normal text because it is originally from unconscious order, so Habermas calls as Tiefenhermeneutik (Hardiman, 2009: 191-193). Although these words are the outermost layer of meaning, they are the gate to open the subject's experience. It is a memory deposit due to the repression the subject has experienced in the past.

The repressive pressures experienced by the colonized societies, both through institutions and rationalization, were

determined by two things, namely: the development of technical control over natural forces, and the process of production and distribution of goods produced by power. The greater the colonial control over the technical field, the arrangement of production and distribution, the stronger the pressure of repression experienced by the people. On the other hand, the weaker the technical force, the wider the production and distribution process, the weaker the repression against the subject. If what happens is the first model, it will produce a collective neurosis. This is then manifested in social institutions which Freud called pathological social institutions (Hardiman, 2009).

In this context, Freud and Marx took different ways; Marx saw social institutions as an arrangement of interests that allowed the social division of labor to take place, while Freud saw social institutions would determine the pressure on the social division of labor (Hardiman, 2009: 198-9). In other words, Marx emphasizes the arrangement of work, instrumental rationality, while Freud emphasizes the arrangement of work pressure, interaction. Based on this framework, Habermas has formulated communicative action as a work arrangement and work distribution. This formulation, in my view, is a weakness of Habermas, because how to imagine the communicative action if the subject relation is not equal?

Furthermore, the problem in the colonized society is not only about the division of labor and the pressures of the division of labor in the economic context, but also in the context of knowledge. Farid Alatas explains that there is a division of intellectual work between western intellectuals and eastern intellectuals; The West works within a conceptual framework and creates theory while the East works in a practical framework, collecting information and field data (Farid, 2011). This fact is referred to as academic imperialism – the asymmetric relation between European intellectuals and non-European intellectuals (including Asia and Africa). Because of unequal relationship, we need a class struggle on the one hand, decolonizing the social sciences on other hand.

4. Conclusion

In summary, colonization is not only about control over economic and political resources, but also control over knowledge resources. In fact, knowledge resources (social sciences) are used to legitimize the control of economic and political resources. In other words, economic and political imperialism is analogous to knowledge imperialism. Within the framework of social science, colonized people are placed as objects such as objects and animals in the laboratory; imagined, analysed, engineered and orchestrated. which inhibits colonization. Based on the Indonesian experience, the social sciences play to engineer society, construct it and determine its ontological condition. Although the social sciences are biased against eurocentrism, they are still used as a tool to legitimize the regime of power. Based on this fact, the decolonization project of the sciences plays a role in dismantling the interests of knowledge and intertwined power relations. The goal is none other than for emancipatory interests. Because, this interest is a constitutive need of man himself. Therefore, the decolonialization of the social sciences must be articulated continuously so as to give birth to emancipatory social sciences. In short, the project of decolonization of the social sciences is an endless project.

References

Abdullah, A. (2006). *Islamic Studies di Perguruan Tinggi: Pendekatan Integratif-Interkoneksi*. Pustaka Pelajar.

Al-Attas, S. M. N. (1993). *Islam and Secularism*. International Institute of Islamic Thouhgt and Cilivation.

Alfaruqi, I. S. (1997). *Islamization of Knowledge: General Principles and Work Plan*s. The International Institute of Islamic Thought.

Alvares, C. (2011a). A critique of Eurocentric Social Science and the Question of Alternatives. *Economic and Political Weekly*, *46*(22), 72–81. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23018594.

Alvares, C. (2011b). Steeped in Eurocentrism. *Economic and Political Weekly*, *46*(42), 77–79. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23047309

Amin, S. (2009). *Eurocentrism* (Secon Edit). Monthly Review Press.

Anderson, A. (2010). *Nasionalisme Indonesia: Kini Dan Di Masa Depan*. Penerbitan Anjing Galak.

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spred of Nationalism*. (Revised Edition). Verso. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429346880-3

Barry, J. (2011). Knowledge as Power, Knowledge as Capital: A Political Economy Critique of Modern "Academic Capitalism." *The Irish Review*, *43*(43), 14–25. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23350111

Baur, N. (2021). Decolonizing Social Science Methodology: Positionality in the German-language Debate. *Historical Social Research*, *46*(2), 205–243. https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.46.2021.2.205-243

Budiardjo, M. (1995). Pengantar. In Kahin. *Nasionalisme dan Revolusi Indonesia* (Indonesian Language Edition). UNS Press.

Bunch, A. J. (2015). Epistemic Violence in the Process of Othering: Real-World Applications and Moving Forward. *Scholarly Undergraduate Research Journal at Clark*, *1*(2). https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26529454

Darder, A. (2019). Decolonizing Interpretative Research. In A. Darder (Ed.), *Decolonizing Interpretative Research: A Subaltern Methodology for Social Change* (1st ed., pp. 1–36). Routledge.

Dean, J. (2021). Reflexivity and Its Limits in the Study of Social Inequalities. *Historical Social Research*, *46*(2), 178–185. https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.46.2021.2.178-185

Dhakidae, et. al. (2005). *Social science and power in Indonesia* (D. Dhakidae & R. V. Hadiz). Equinox Publishing.

Dirnagl, U., Misselwitz, P., Ruhrort, L., & Simon, D. (2021). Crossing Borders, Creating Together: An interdisciplinary Dialogue on Transdisciplinary Knowledge Production. *Historical Social Research*, *46*(2), 287–312. https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.46.2021.2.287-312

Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the Earth* (T. C. Farrington (ed.)). Grove Press. http://books.google.com/books?id=-XGKFJq4eccC

Farid, H. (2017). Agenda Dekolonisasi Kebudayaan Nasional dalam Perspektif Ki Hadjar Dewantara. *Abad: Jurnal sejarah*. *1*, 34–50.
Farid, S. A. (2010). *Diskursus Alternatif Dalam Ilmu Sosial Asia: Tanggapan Terhadap Eurosentrisme* (trans.). Mizan.

Farid, S. A. (2011). Teaching Social Theory as Alternative Discourse. *Economic & Political Weekly*, *46*(46), 48–54. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41319405 JSTOR

Femia, J. V. (1981). *Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciusness, and Revolutionary Precess*. Oxford University Press.

Ghaderi, F., & Wan Yahya, W. R. (2014). Exoticism in gertrude Bell's persian pictures. *Victorian Literature and Culture*, *42*(1), 123–138. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1060150313000247

Gouda, F. (1996). *Dutch Culture Overseas: Colonial Practice in the Netherlands Indies, 1900-1942* (4th ed.). Amsterdam University Press.

Gouda, Frances, & Brocades Zaalberg, T. (2002). *American Visions of the Netherlands East Indies/Indonesia: US Foreign Policy and Indonesian Nationalism, 1920-1949*. Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9789048505036

Grosh, G. K. (1968). Frantz Fanon and the African Revolution. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, *6*(4), 543–556. //www.jstor.org/stable/159334

Habermas, J. (1971). Knowledge and Human Interests. In *Beacon Press* 23(4). Beacon Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/588338

Hadiz, R. V. (2016). Ilmu Sosial dalam Konteks Otoritarianisme, Demokrasi, dan Tuntutan Pasar. In M. S. Santoso (Ed.), *Ilmu Sosial di Indonesia: Perkembangan dan Tantangan*. Penerbit Obor.

Hardiman, F. B. (2009). *Kritik Ideologi: Menyingkap Pertautan Kepentingan Bersama Jurgen Habermas* (Ketiga). Kanisius.

Haringsma, P. (2021). University and the Legacy of Colonial Epistemicide. *University World News (African Edition)*, 1. https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20210908100721929

Kahin, G. M. T. (1952). *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia*. Cornell University Press.

Kahn, J. S. (2005). Culturalising the Indonesian Uplands. In T.M. Li (ed.), *Transforming the Indonesian Uplands* (2nd ed., pp. 81–106). the Taylor & Francis e-Library. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203986127

Kartanegara, M. (2005). *Integrasi Ilmu: Sebuah Rekonstruksi Holistik*. Mizan.

King, R. (1999). *Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial Theory, India and the "Mystic East."* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1006/reli.2000.0252

Kleden, I. (1987). *Sikap Ilmiah dan Kritik Kebudayaan*. LP3ES.

Knoblauch, H. (2021). Reflexive Methodology and The Empirical Theory of Science. *Historical Social Research*, *46*(2), 59–79. https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.46.2021.2.59-79

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards A Radical Democratic Politics*. Verso.

Li, Tania Murray. (2002). Keterpinggiran, Kekuasaan dan Produksi: Analisis Terhadap Transformasi Daerah Pedalaman. In Tania Murray Li (ed.), *Proses Transformasi Daerah Pedalaman di Indonesia*. Penerbit Obor Indonesia.

Mignolo, W. D. (2012). Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking. In *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking* (pp. 1–371). https://doi.org/10.1215/0961754x-9-3-551

Mirsha, V., & Hodge, B. (2005). What Was Postcolonialism? *New Literary History*, *36*(3), 375–402. https://doi.org/10.1353/nlh.2005.0045

Nagel, J. (1994). Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture. *Social Problems*, *41*(1), 152–176. https://doi.org/10.2307/3096847

Nugroho, H. (2005). The Political Economy of Higher Education: the University as an Arena for the Ttruggle for Power. In D. Dhakidae & R. V. Hadiz (eds.), *Social science and power in Indonesia* (1st ed., pp. 145–165). Equinox Publishing.

Nugroho, Heru. (2012). Negara, Universitas, dan Banalitas Intelektual: Sebuah Refleksi Kritis dari Dalam. *Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar*, 1–25.

Philpott, S. (2000). *Rethinking Indonesia: Postcolonial Theory, Authoritarianism and Identity*. Macmillan Press & ST. Martin's Press. https://doi.org/10.20885/millah.voli.iss1.art12

Polimpung, H. Y. S. (2008). Ilusi Dekolonisasi : Psikoanalisis Lacanian dan Rekonstruksi Kolonialisme Barat. *Global & Strategi*, *2*(1), 98–125.

Ranciere, J. (1973). On the Theory of Ideology: the Politics of Althusser). *Radical Philosophy*, 1–14. http:// https://www.radicalphilosophy.com/article/on-the-theory-of-ideology

Rizal, M. (2007). Program Riset Ilmiah Imre Lakatos. *Filsafat*, *17*(3), 254–273. https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.23086

Sadli, M. (n.d.). *Reflections on Boeke ' s Theory of Dualistic Economies* (pp. 99–115). https://staff.blog.ui.ac.id/The-Economy-of-Indonesia_-Selected-Readings-2007-Equinox-Publishing-111-135.pdf

Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism* (2nd ed.). Vintage Books. https://doi.org/10.2307/2536347

Samuel, H. (2010). *Genealogi Kekuasaan Ilmu Sosial Indonesia: Dari Kolonialisme Belanda hingga Modernisme Amerika*. Kepik Ungu.

Samuel, H., & Sutopo, O. R. (2013). The Many Faces of Indonesia: Knowledge Production dan Power Relations. *Asian Social Science*, *9*(13), 289–297. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/ass.v9n13p289

Smith, T. S. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (2st editio). Zed Books. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315700779-29

Spivak, G. C., Landry, D., & MacLean, G. M. (1996). The Spivak reader: Selected works of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. In *New York*. http://www.amazon.com/Spivak-Reader-Selected-Gayati-Chakravorty/dp/0415910013

Talal Asad. (1993). *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (1st ed.). the Johns Hopkins University Press. https://doi.org/10.1086/204312

Tempo. (2011, November). Republik di mata Indonesianis: Pasang-surut peran peneliti asing dalam sejarah Indonesia (Special Edition). *Tempo*, 1–68.

Tjahyadi, S. (2011). Filsafat Nusantara: Gagasan Awal Membangun Metodologi Filsafat Indonesia. *Lafinus Newsletter*. https://lafinus.wordpress.com/2014/06/15/filsafat-nusantara-gagasan-awal-membangun-metodologi-filsafat-indonesia/

Tjahyadi, S. (2015). Refleksi Paradigma Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial. *Humanika*, *22*(2), 47. https://doi.org/10.14710/humanika.22.2.47-57

wa Thiong'o, N. (1987). *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Zimbanwe Publishing House. https://doi.org/10.2307/524049

Zed, M. (2017). Konstruksi Historis Ilmu Sosial Indonesia Perspektif Komparatif. In Kleden, Ignas & Abdullah (Ed.), *Paradigma Ilmu Pengetahuan dan Penelitian: Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial & Humaniora di Indonesia* (1st ed., pp. 193–224). LIPI Press.