In the conclusion, the author sums up the core concern of the book: female agency and FeMs. The relationship between women's empowerment and FeM education is paradoxical. The teachings and training at FeMs aim to replace the desire for empowerment with the image of the ideal Muslim woman who submits in her relationships and prioritises her family role over socio-political or economic activities. Self-assertiveness and rebelliousness are seen as antithetical to humility, obedience and submission and are thus abhorrent for a graduate of a FeM. The liberal connotation of empowerment is the apparent opposite of what FeMs intend for the women in their spaces.

Overall, the book is timely and relevant on multiple counts. For example, in the wake of the rise in radicalisation in Pakistan, it is a helpful resource for understanding the curriculum, routines and pedagogies used at FeMs since many studies correlate madrasa education and radicalisation. However, there are almost no studies available on FeMs or that presumed relationship. Additionally, due to strict purdah and retreat from the public eye, FeMs are no-go areas for many, creating a wedge in understanding the process of self-formation and transformation of female students and the objectives and modalities of madrasa education for women. Faiza Muhammad Din speaks volumes on those topics through her observation, experience and extensive fieldwork. While the book does not address madrasa education, its pervasiveness and its modalities in Balochistan, a southwestern province, the inclusion of madrasas from significant schools of thought in major cities across Pakistan makes the study stand out in the scholarship, providing credible evidence on the subject.

Abida Bano

Sylvia Mayasari-Hoffert, *The Cold War and its Legacy in Indonesia: Literary Representation of the Red Scare*. New York: Routledge, 2024. 122 pages, £135.00. ISBN 978-1-0322-8523-8

Studying the anti-communist violence of 1965–66 in Indonesia has always been challenging. One of the reasons for this is the political tension surrounding the issue, given the dominant anti-communist stance in the country. Efforts to seek justice for the approximately five hundred thousand victims are considered as a threat to national unity or an attempt to revive communism. Publications that contest the state's anti-communist narratives risk being banned or destroyed, even in democratic times.

Another reason for the difficulty of studying 1965 is the lack of historical sources. To date, the sources produced by the Indonesian government remain

highly classified. This is in stark contrast to the steps taken by a few Western powers during the Cold War, such as the United States and the Netherlands, to gradually declassify their intelligence archives. Very few researchers in Indonesia manage to obtain access to military archives, even if they are limited to the local regions.[1] Other approaches to researching 1965, such as oral histories of survivors, have been very useful in uncovering layers of the violence. Although sources are limited, research on 1965 has been growing in the last decades. The number of university students' theses on 1965 has doubled since 2010, covering a wide range of disciplines (apart from history), including art, literature, film and media studies, although not a few of these reflect a tone of support for the anti-communist violence.[2]

Against this background, Silvia Mayasari-Hoffert's new book, *The Cold War and its Legacy in Indonesia: Literary Representation of the Red Scare*, asks how it can contribute to the rich discussion on 1965. The book focuses on literary works produced from 1966, the beginning of Indonesia's authoritarian New Order period, to the present, and the anti-communist stance they reflect. Through a close reading of popular and serious literature, Mayasari-Hoffert aims to present an analytical overview and "highlights the patterns that connect them, namely criticisms of the Left and lack of resistance against the regime's grand narrative regarding the anti-Leftist purge" (p. 8). The book consists of seven chapters, including an introduction and conclusion.

The second chapter focuses on anti-communist short stories produced during the first decade of the New Order. The author concludes that these stories serve as a propaganda tool against the communists, or what she coins the "Red Scare", by portraying the communists as a threat to society and the need to establish a "clean environment". The author further argues that even though the authors of these short stories claim to support universal humanism by criticising the New Order's anti-communist purge of innocent family members, they still legitimise violence against communists.

Chapter 3 discusses popular novels with 1965 themes written in the 1970s and 1980s, such as Ahmad Tohari's *Kubah* (Dome) and Ajip Rosidi's *Anak Tanah Air* (Children of the Homeland). The analysis of these novels points to the same conclusion of anti-communist attitudes as in the previous chapter. The next chapter looks at the *wayang* (traditional Indonesian puppet theatre) stories used in novels. The analysis reflects on how some *wayang* stories were used in novels that promoted nationalism and criticised the New Order regime, while other novels used the same stories to purge communism in Indonesia.

1 See Jess Melvin, *The Army and the Indonesian Genocide: Mechanics of Mass Murder.* New York: Routledge, 2018; Ahmad Luthfi, Kekerasan Kemanusiaan Dan Perampasan Tanah Pasca – 1965 Di Banyuwangi, Jawa Timur, *Archipel* 95, 2018, pp. 53–68; Grace Leksana, Collaboration in Mass Violence: The Case of the Indonesian Anti-Leftist Mass Killings in 1965–66 in East Java, *Journal of Genocide Research* 23(1), 2021, pp. 58–80.

2 Grace Leksana / Douglas Kammen, Indonesian Student Theses on "1965": An Overview, *Indonesia* 111, 2021, pp. 45–55.

A different angle is taken in Chapter 5, which focuses on the literature produced by former political prisoners after the fall of the New Order regime, following mass movements for transitional justice. The author covers fiction and autobiography, such as works written by Putu Oka Sukanta, Hersri Setiawan, Martin Aleida, Pramoedya Ananta Toer and others, including anthologies such as *Menagerie 6* and *Silenced Voices*, a special issue in *Manoa: A Pacific Journal of International Writing*, both edited by John McGlynn. The chapter title, "Short stories by 'Leftist' writers: Who's Left?" tries to ask what it actually means to be Leftist. But in doing so, Mayasari-Hoffert seems to become entrapped in the categorisation and labelling of the Left, rather than looking at how the label is constructed and influences literary work, or vice versa. She points out that the writers in the anthology *Menagerie 6* are former members of Lekra,[3] but they are not "staunch Leftist" (p. 78).

She then gives examples of Lekra figures such as the filmmaker Bachtiar Siagian, who was a member of Lekra but never produced films that promoted communism or social realism. Another example is Martin Aleida, who first was a journalist for *Zaman Baru* and *Harian Rakjat* – both Leftist newspapers – but then worked for *Tempo*, which was founded by Goenawan Mohamad, an anti-communist cultural activist (p. 78). The author backs up this argument with another example: Sobron and Asahan Aidit, brothers of the PKI chairman D. N. Aidit, never gave any evidence that they were Leftists. She then concludes that the short stories written by these former political prisoners follow the same pattern, recounting the ordeals of individuals mistaken for Leftists, and thus conforming to anti-Leftist narratives because they leave unclear whether or not real Leftists deserved persecution (p. 80). This act suggests self-censorship, Mayasari-Hoffert argues.

However, these examples illustrate the complex interrelatedness of individual decisions and socio-political contexts that cannot simply be identified as characteristic of the Left and should thus have been examined further on several fronts. First, self-censorship applies beyond these Lekra writers. In the 1980s, even large publishers such as Gramedia also applied self-censorship to select publications so as not to put themselves at risk.[4] Second, those examples may actually point to the malleability of the category of the Left itself, rather than about being a committed Leftist. In other words, there is no clear-cut division that defines a Leftist. A person can be a Leftist but also a nationalist or even an Islamist. Furthermore, one should not label a person as a Leftist without ever examining his or her life history. The choice of literary works by Leftists in this chapter also raises the question of objectivity, as the author mixes fic-

3 Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat – Institute for the People's Culture; a leftist cultural organisation closely connected to the Indonesian Communist Party.

4 See Taufiq Hanafi, *Writing Novels under the New Order: State Censorship, Complicity, and Literary Production in Indonesia, 1977–1986*, Leiden: Leiden University, 2022.

tional works with autobiographies. If other biographies were included, even from later decades, the author might reconsider her conclusion about self-censorship.[5] This also illustrates the overall limited justification of the author's research method.

The final chapter presents contemporary novels set in 1965 by writers such as Eka Kurniawan, Nusya Kuswantin and Ratih Kumala. According to Mayasari-Hoffert, these novels, written in the post-authoritarian period, still perpetuate anti-Leftist grand narratives by portraying the Left in a negative light and bringing about the clean-self policy[6] through the lives of their characters. The author states that "the fact that these novels were written by authors who were not yet born or were only a child in 1965, and their portrayal of the Left is based on the New Order regime's official history, suggests an inter-generational trauma that prevents new writers from explicitly and critically engaging with the topic of the anti-leftist purge in their writings" (p. 94). However, intergenerational trauma is never a linear process. Experiences and memory from the first generation are not remembered straightforwardly by the generations that follow. Memories can be forgotten, silenced, reinterpreted and modified, as well as being remembered and expressed.[7] Trauma itself is also a contested concept, which is often confined to mere psychological problems and detached from its socio-political dynamics of violence.[8] It would have been very interesting to incorporate these views in greater detail in relation to literary work.

Furthermore, some terminologies in this book could have been fruitful if elaborated further. For example, Mayasari-Hoffert uses two related terms – "the clean environment" and "clean-self policy" – but does not discuss these concepts thoroughly. Additionally, the concept of cosmopolitanism, which seems significant in the introduction, is only superficially mentioned in the chapters and conclusion, leaving readers unclear on how it contributes to our understanding of literary works that address the theme of 1965.

From the introduction onward, the author consistently concludes – in every chapter – that literary works produced in each decade following 1965, from the early Suharto regime through post-authoritarian Indonesia, adhere to the same anti-communist stance constructed by the New Order. Mayasari-Hoffert

5 For example, the work of Ribka Tjiptaning *Aku Bangga Jadi Anak PKI* (I am Proud to be the Child of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI)), 2002, is based on her experiences as a descendant of a PKI activist. Another example is Hersri Setyawan's *Memoar Pulau Buru* (Memoir of Buru Island), 2004, which is based on his experience as an ex-political prisoner in the anti-communist internment camp on Buru island.

6 This term used by Mayasari-Hoffert refers to the authoritarian New Order's policy of being "clean" from communist influence at the individual and societal level. For example, in 1990 Suharto's government released a Presidential Decree no. 16 on Special Examination, which was used to screen all government officials to ensure that they were not connected to any forms of Communist ideology. This prevented family members and descendants of communist or leftist activists from working as government officials.

7 See Marianne Hirsch. *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

8 See Nicolas Argenti / Katharina Schramm, *Remembering Violence: Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books, 2012.

briefly touches on the underlying reasons for this highly consistent pattern in the final chapter, suggesting intergenerational trauma and her concept of the "Red Scare" as possible explanations. However, these two possible explanations seem isolated from Indonesia's changing socio-political landscape from the New Order to post-Reformation.

The "Cold War" in the book's title appears to refer only to the conflict between Leftist writers and the liberal Cultural Manifestos in the 1950s. Here, the author seems to undermine the US-led cultural intervention during the early New Order years, carried out through institutions like the Ford Foundation or Obor. This intervention was key in shaping a specific genre of anti-communist literature during that period.[9] Although Wijaya Herlambang is mentioned in relation to one of the anti-communist literary works, the author does not discuss Herlambang's contribution to highlighting Western intervention in Indonesian literature. By lacking the authors' perspectives, the analysis fails to consider the creative processes and the choices authors made in producing such work.

As Taufiq Hanafi's study shows, many factors influence an author's considerations beyond mere anti-communist ideology, including economic factors, survival strategies and even empathy (Hanafi 2022). In other words, what is written in novels or short stories may not fully reflect the author's anti-communist stance but rather an expression of intertwined influences. In my opinion, the arguments in this book are drawn rather hastily and overlook numerous aspects that could have enriched the discourse on literary work on 1965.

Still, Mayasari-Hoffer's work deserves recognition for addressing the complex challenges of studying the 1965 violence in Indonesia, as I noted at the beginning of this review. Despite the areas for improvement, her efforts contribute to an important discourse and invite further exploration into this significant historical moment.

Grace Leksana

9 See Wijaya Herlambang, *Kekerasan Budaya Pasca 1965: Bagaimana Orde Baru Melegitimasi Anti-Komunisme Melalui Sastra Dan Film*, Tangerang Selatan: Marjin Kiri, 2013; Giles Scott-Smith, Liminal Liberalism? Ivan Kats, The Congress for Cultural Freedom, and the Obor Foundation in Cold War Indonesia, *Journal of Contemporary History* 57(4), 2022, pp. 1051–71.