

Falsification Test of The National Resilience Concept as Indonesian Geostrategic Doctrine

Juniawan Priyono * Herman ** Purnomo Yusgiantoro ***

* Universitas Pertahanan Indonesia

** Universitas Pertahanan Indonesia

*** Universitas Pertahanan Indonesia

Article Info

Keyword:

*National resilience;
Geostrategic doctrine;
Falsification;*

Abstract

This study aims to prove the truth of national resilience concept by using deductive phenomenological interpretive qualitative methods with epistemology of geostrategy as a main objective. Popper's falsification test is intended to gather evidence on which the geostrategic peripheral is applied to the national resilience concept, rather than reject the conception. The required data includes the national resilience concept and an epistemology of geostrategy to explain geostrategic realities in a systematic hierarchy, using historical documents, scientific publications and also interviews. This study has shown that the national resilience concept sits outside the geostrategic periphery, despite some evidence of geostrategic validity. The evidence indicating the applicability of geostrategy includes (1) Formulation of national objectives and; (2) Consideration of geography and geopolitical conditions.

Corresponding Author:

juniawan.priyono@idu.ac.id

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk membuktikan kebenaran konsep ketahanan nasional dengan menggunakan metode kualitatif interpretif fenomenologis kualitatif dengan epistemologi geostrategi sebagai tujuan utama. Uji pemalsuan Popper dimaksudkan untuk mengumpulkan bukti tentang perangkat geostrategis yang diterapkan pada konsep ketahanan nasional, dan bukannya menolak konsepsi tersebut. Data yang dibutuhkan mencakup konsep ketahanan nasional dan epistemologi strategi geostrategi untuk menjelaskan realitas geostrategis dalam hirarki sistematis, menggunakan dokumen sejarah, publikasi ilmiah dan juga wawancara. Penelitian

Jurnal Pertahanan
Volume 3 Nomor 2
May – August 2017
P-ISSN. 2087-9415
E-ISSN. 2549-9459
hh. 123-140
©2017 JP. All rights reserved.

ini menunjukkan bahwa konsep ketahanan nasional berada di luar pinggiran geostrategis, walaupun ada beberapa bukti validitas geostrategis. Bukti yang menunjukkan penerapan strategi geostrategi meliputi (1) perumusan tujuan nasional dan; (2) Pertimbangan kondisi geografi dan geopolitik

Introduction

As stated in the Appendix to Presidential Decree No. 97/2015 on General Defense Policy 2015-2019, Indonesia's geopolitics is the Archipelago's Wisdom (Indonesia: Wawasan Nusantara), which is the Indonesian perspective and attitude as a nation and its geographical form based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution.

Meanwhile, the Indonesian geostrategy is the national strategy of the Indonesian nation In exploring the territory of The Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (Indonesia: Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia (NKRI)) as a national living space in order to formulate direction on development policies and targets to achieve national interests and goals. Indonesian geostrategy is formulated in the form of National Resilience concept.

Given its history, the initial development of geopolitics and

geostrategy of Indonesia was carried out by the Army Staff and Command School and participants of the First Class Regular Course of the National Defense Institute in the form of the Concept of the Revolution Resiliency (Suradinata & Dinuth, 2001). This is a follow-up of President Soekarno's (1965) mandate at the first lecture of KRA I of the National Defense Institute (20/5/1965), which delivered "... national defense can only be maximized, if we base the national defense on geopolitical knowledge."

Speech, that according to Suradinata & Dinuth (2001), as a political strategy guidance is not equipped with the concept of geostrategy. According to Suradinata (2005), geostrategy was originally defined as geopolitics for military/war purposes.

In Indonesia, geostrategy is defined as a method to realize the independence proclamation ideals as stated in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution through the National

Development process. Therefore, the goal becomes a development doctrine and is later named as National Resilience.

On the occasion of a lecture at Chatham House, London (24/6/2010) themed Indonesian National Resilience in the Framework of ASEAN, Governor of Lemhannas (National Defense Institution) acknowledged that Indonesia National Defense is naturally more defensive, less militaristic, and inward-looking. National Resilience is simply translated as the ability to recover from unexpected conditions.

According to Lemhannas (1997), the implementation of National Resilience using the principles of welfare and security has always exist throughout the history of national life, depending on the national and international conditions and situations encountered.

According to the researchers, the National Defense Institute uses deductive reasoning to draw the National Resilience concept into geostrategy with the following syllogistic logic: (1) the national life management strategy by utilizing

geographical conditions to achieve the National Goals is a geostrategy; (2) National Resilience is a strategy of Indonesia in its efforts to maintain its survival (national goals); Therefore (3) National Resilience is a geostrategy.

The conclusion of syllogism can not exceed the content of the premise so it must begin with the correct premise in order to obtain a reliable conclusion. Premise (1) drafted by the National Resilience Institute questionable since it imply that geostrategy is the role of the military, the aggressive nature of the offensive, and outward-looking.

The geostrategic related to: (1) strategy, involving: the military presence, the projection of military power, strategic planning, security of Military assets, warships, military stations/bases; (2) the national objectives and means to achieve the objectives; (3) foreign policy (political and military efforts, diplomatic activities) and outward-looking; (4) consideration of geographical factors to politics (strategic position, communication path, regional resource strength, lynchpin state); (5) patterns of

change; (6) has an aggressive-offensive character; And (7) geopolitical sub-fields (Gyorgy, 1943; Schnitzer, 1955; Lim, 1979; Brzezinski, 1986; Rosiere, 2001; Grygiel, 2006; de Haas, 2006; Park, 2008; Ashrafpour, 2010; Rogers & Simón, 2010; Rogers, 2011). Geostrategy combines with the geopolitical strategic considerations so that there is always a military role in it because the definition of the strategy is the use of military force to achieve the ultimate goal of public policy. However, geostrategy is not always related to geographical and geopolitical factors as it may be based on ideological, group, or leader's reasons.

Based on the background and logic of reasoning, this study will answer the question of the truth of the National Defense conception developed by the National Defense Institute as the geostrategy of Indonesia.

The study which in essence questioned the conception of National Resilience as the geostrategy of Indonesia aims to prove the truth of the conception of National Resilience

as the geostrategy of Indonesia epistemologically.

Method

Referring research methods developed by Muhadjir (2007), this study uses qualitative interpretive method of deductive phenomenology. In principle, the analysis of phenomenological philosophy is based on interpretive data, interpretive analysis, and interpretive conclusions. The data, analysis, and conclusions made are holistic and grounded in essential truth. The moral truth of phenomenology becomes acceptable because its validity is tested by triangulation to acquire truth-worthiness so that the result is not a subjective interpretation.

Adopting the mindset of Muhadjir, the falsification test was conducted to collect evidence on which peripheral applies and the geostrategy does not apply to the conception of National Resilience, not to reject the conception. Popper falsification testing will facilitate in sharpening the area of grand-theory enforcement, where it is found true and wrong area of grand-theory that is geostrategy.

The truth of the National Resilience conception as Indonesian geostrategy is tested epistemologically by Popper's falsification test to show the peripheral evidence where geostrategy prevails and does not apply in the conception of National Resilience.

Based on the geostrategic characteristics derived from the definition and scope search, the falsification test is emphasized on six main areas: (1) Strategic elements: military presence, projection of military force, strategic planning, security of military assets, warships and military stations/bases; (2) The national objectives and means to achieve the objectives; (3) foreign policy (political and military efforts, diplomatic activities) and outward-looking; (4) Consideration of geographical factors to politics (strategic position, communication path, regional resource strength, lynchpin state (Rogers, 2011); (5) Patterns of change; And (6) aggressive-offensive character.

The types of data needed are: (1) the conception of National Resilience developed by the National

defense Agency; And (2) the epistemology of geostrategy in a systematic hierarchy that explains geostrategic scholarship. The data are sourced from interviews (primary data) as well as scientific documents (secondary data) including: manuals, regulations, reference books, previous research results (dissertations, theses, journals, monogram, reports), articles, related news Mass media, and video recordings.

Results and Discussion

National Resilience Conception

The object of this research is the conception of National Resilience. With regard to its source, it belongs to a secondary object because it is obtained from a secondary source that is a document that has relevance to National Resilience. The main source referred to is a book titled *Ketahanan Nasional* published by National Defense Institutions in 1997.

National Resilience as a term became known and was used in the early 1960s. The term National Resilience was first proposed by President Soekarno. Furthermore, in 1962, began to strive specifically the development of the idea of National

Defense in the Bandung Army Staff and Command School. According to Suradinata and Dinuth, until 2000, National Defence Institute had produced several conceptions, namely: the conception of 1968, 1969, 1972, and 1974. In 1968 and 1969 conception, National Resilience was a resilience and endurance, whereas in 1972 the conception was expressed as A dynamic condition that contains the tenacity and toughness that is based on Astagatra (Suradinata & Dinuth, 2001).

Indonesia National Resilience is a dynamic condition of the Indonesian nation that encompasses all aspects of integrated national life, contains tenacity and resilience that has the ability to develop national power in facing and overcoming all challenges, threats, obstacles, and disturbances both coming from outside and from within, which Directly or indirectly, that endanger national life to ensure the identity, integrity, sustainability of the nation and state, and the struggle to achieve its national objectives.

In that sense, National Resilience is a condition of national life at a certain moment or that must

be realized. The process of realizing the condition requires a concept called the National Resilience concept (Lemhanas, 1997).

Elements of Falsification Test

Strategy

The Concept of National Resilience deals with the strategy in the form of security defense. According to the National Defense Institute, the philosophy and views on the defense of the security of the state of Indonesia are reflected in the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution and the Body of the 1945 Constitution. The Indonesian people love peace and want to be friendly with all the nations of the world and do not want armed or war disputes.

Since the beginning of its development, it has been affirmed that National Resilience has principal differences with national power. According to Haryomataram (1976), national power is concentrated on power with its power politics, while National Resilience is not solely based on physical power as adopted by developed countries.

The National Defense Approach for defense and security of

the state does not use the national (military) power which is the main characteristic of geostrategy. Based on evidence that the conception of National Resilience does not emphasize elements of military-presence strategy, strategic planning, projection of military forces, security of military assets, military stations-as the main emphasis refers to Gyorgy, Schnitzer, Lim, Brzezinski, Grygiel, de Haas, Ashrafpour, and Rogers ; Then the conception of National Resilience is beyond geostrategy peripheral.

Objectives and How to Achieve

Based on reference searches, the ultimate goal of geostrategy is to strengthen security and prosperity; While the way to achieve goals is by strategy planning, political/diplomacy efforts, and military efforts. The Indonesian people aspire to realize a just and prosperous society in an independent, united, and sovereign NKRI vessel based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution.

These ideals are the direction and guidance for the implementation of National Development in the effort to realize the National Objective: to

protect the whole Indonesian nation And the whole of Indonesian culture, promoting the general welfare, the intellectual life of the nation, and participating in the pursuit of world order based on freedom, eternal peace, and social justice.

Security that wants to be realized is the ability of the nation to protect its national values against the nature of threat from wherever it comes. The welfare to be realized to achieve National Resilience can be described as the nation's ability to grow and develop its national values, for the sake of great prosperity that is equitable and evenly, spiritually and physically. The conclusion that the conception of National Resilience is included in thegeostrategi periphery because it has formulated the goals and the National Goal of strengthening security and prosperity.

If considering the approach used is to prioritize the arrangement of national life by prioritizing the domestic situation to achieve the National Goals, then the conception of National Resilience outside the geostrategy peripheral that requires a way to achieve the goal is by strategy planning, political efforts/diplomacy,

and / or military efforts. The direction and policy strategy of each gatra contained in the National Resilience concept also does not show the three efforts. Despite the direction of strategy in foreign policy, it is less significant to achieve the ultimate political-strategic objectives.

Foreign policy and *Outward-looking*

At a very elementary level, geostrategy explains the geographic direction of the foreign policy of a political community (Grygiel, 2006; de Haas, 2006; Ashrafpour, 2010; Rogers & Simón, 2010; Rogers, 2011; Chaudary & Chaudary, 2009). National Resilience prioritizes the regulation of national life by prioritizing domestic circumstances.

First, free and active foreign policy is devoted to national interests, especially for national development. Second, motivation and encouragement in directing the humanity of Indonesia to rally into unity and integrity in all dimensions and aspects of life to enhance tenacity and resilience that has the ability to develop the power to face challenges, threats, obstacles and disruptions in

all its forms. Third, national authority is a reflection of a certain level of National Security, which will have an outward impact in the form of ability (competitiveness) to influence others. Fourth, outward inspiration to anticipate, deal with, and address strategic environmental impacts; Not to actively influence and / or control the political climate in the international system.

Therefore, National Resilience is inward-looking, in which the terminology of national power is not used in discussing the domestic problems of the country. This is the opposite of using the concept of Outward-looking national power, which is very important when discussing the relationship between countries. The conclusion is that the conception of National Resilience is outside the peripheral geostrategy that strictly requires the existence of a strictly political policy representing the interests of the nation-state and is outward-looking.

Geographical and Geopolitical Considerations Strategists-Gyorgy, Lim, Brzezinski, Grygiel, Rogers, Simón, Chaudary, and Ashrafpour-agree that

geostrategy takes into account the geographic and geopolitical factors of a region. Geostrategy is a country's foreign policy influenced by geopolitics and, of course, strategic considerations.

National Resilience basically depends on the ability of the nation in using and utilizing the natural aspect as the basis of the implementation of national life. Based on the conception of National Resilience, there are three aspects of nature (*Trigatra*) namely geography, natural wealth, and population.

In addition to aspects of Trigatra, the conception of National Resilience consider many geographical and geopolitical aspects, such as the territory of the Republic of Indonesia is an archipelagic country with water area three times larger than the land area and consists of thousands of islands so that communication and transportation problems becomes very vital. International traffic across Indonesia's air and sea areas. This allows Indonesia to play the role of 'watchdog' and 'regulator' of traffic in accordance with Indonesia's national interests.

Based on the evidence of disclosure of geographical and geopolitical considerations it means that the conception of National Resilience is included in peripheral geostrategy.

Change Pattern

One way to conceptualize geography, geopolitics, and geostrategy is to examine the pattern of change. According to Grygiel (2006), there are three different levels of change, ranging from tectonic (no change) in terms of geography potentially changing the speed of geostrategic problems. Geographical changes are measured in the geological age of thousands of years, while geostrategic changes are measured in days, months, and years. Geography is constant-with the exception of rare and unexpected catastrophic events.

Geopolitics change with increasing and decreasing resource centers and shifting routes. This is a slow, often unnoticed change, and usually spans decades to centuries. According to Grygiel (2006), geostrategy is the most flexible of the three concepts. Geostrategy can

change rapidly in a few weeks or months, following a bureaucratic process or a change in leadership. The US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 is an example of a dramatic change in the geographic focus of US foreign policy. A battlefield that has been considered irrelevant for decades by the United States has suddenly become the center of attention.

When considering the conception, National Resilience is a National Basic Pattern of Development which is carried out in stages and continues in the form of Medium / Long Term Development, then the conception is outside the geostrategy peripheral. Referring to Grygiel (2006) and strengthened Mustopadidjaja's (1990) opinion on the long-term perspective of development, the National Defense conception is more appropriate as geopolitics, where changes take place over a long period of time.

For a similar comparison, Grygiel (2006) exemplifies the current economic growth in East Asia and China in particular, in a few years may indicate a geopolitical shift.

Aggressive-Offensive Character

As the Wehrgeopolitic reference developed by Karl Haushofer, geostrategy also has an aggressive and offensive character. The following three evidences shows this. First, Blitzkrieg's strategy and tactics initiated by Professor Ewald Banse is to develop an invasion plan to England and insulate Poland alliance with Russia, suggesting how to break through the Maginot Line (Gyorgy, 1943).

Secondly, Spykman opposes the fallacy of American isolationism in America's Strategy in World Politics. Spykman believes that the search for security for each country will lead to conflict because "the security boundary of one country is the boundary line of danger for another. Therefore, the alliance must meet counter-alliances and weapons with counter-weaponry in an enduring competitive struggle for power" (Sempa, 2002).

Third, the definition of "Geostrategy Players and Geopolitical Axis" from Brzezinski (1997) Active geostrategic players are countries that have the capacity and

national will to exercise power or influence beyond their borders in order to change the prevailing geopolitical situation. They have potential and or geopolitical tendencies to fluctuate. For whatever reason-the search for national greatness, ideological fulfillment, religious messianism, or economic expansion; Some countries seek to achieve regional domination or global standing (Brzezinski, 1997).

The conception of National Resilience does not rely on physical power and strength. First, Indonesia has the ability to transform external forces and influences into a national power that is controlled and used as a centrifugal force.

The power intended here is a force that contains non-expansive physical and mental properties. Second, the conception of National Resilience does not favor confrontational and antagonistic attitudes, but rather the attitude of consultation and cooperation and mutual respect, especially by relying on abilities based on the power or moral strength and personality of the nation. In this case, it can be concluded that there is no aggressive-

offensive character that characterizes the geostrategy so that the conception of National Resilience is beyond geostrategy peripheral.

Straighten the Concept According to History

According Notosusanto (1970), the ability and identity as a nation in the present and the future can only be known if we recognize the national history. National history that shows the strengths and weaknesses that provide wisdom or insight about ways to build National Resilience with various elements or aspects.

National Resilience plays a decisive role in the nation's struggle of the Indonesian nation in all spheres of life-ideological, political, economic, social, cultural, and defense of security. Throughout the history of the struggle, Indonesia has proven its resilience and endurance in the face of all challenges; And this is what Wirjosaputro (1970) believes to be the core strength of the nation's struggle.

National Resilience began to emerge as an answer to the question, "What is the cause of the Indonesian nation after declaring its

independence on August 17, 1945 is still 'survive' despite facing all kinds of difficulties that are most severe?" The answer given briefly, "Indonesia can survive because it has National Defence." (Haryomataram, 1970)

At that time, it was warmly discussed the formation of military pacts between Thailand, Cambodia and South Vietnam. Three countries are directly involved in the fight against communist guerrillas. According to Foreign Minister Adam Malik, Indonesia is unlikely to join any military pact.

"Adam Malik's assertiveness does not mean Indonesia is indifferent to the development of war in Indo China. The country remains restless and anxious. Only the way of handling it is different. Our way is not through a military pact, but National Resilience." (Oetama, 1970)

According to Indonesian authorities, the fall of Phnom Penh and Saigon was due to Cambodia and South Vietnam lack of national resilience. In addition, the two countries also rely too heavily on the help of other countries.

"Both countries are trying to stem communism by using only the armed forces." (Haryomataram, 1976)

The core of National Resilience is the good relationship

between power and the people, between the military and the people. National Resilience means people's participation in governance, development and defense processes that make political stability for the functioning of governance and development.

"But political stability can not be supported only by physical strength, insufficient support and confirmation of constitutional procedures and principles. The political stability must be supported by authority, by the moral support of the masses, by participation" (Oetama, 1970)

It is only under such circumstances that subversion in any form-including communist subversion - will have no place to flourish.

Since the beginning, the development of the Revolution Resilience conception has been jointly initiated by thinkers in National Defence Institute, Army Staff and Command School and KRA I participants since 1965. However, as a result of the G.30.S / PKI incident, all layers of society including National Defense Institute were mobilized to consolidate Order to enforce New Order government. Therefore, all of National Defens

Institute's assessment activities were focused on solving national problems in order to support Supersemar's duties, and to play a role in fostering MPRS Decree 1966 (Suradinata & Dinuth, 2001).

Indeed, was what President Suharto did considered as the greatest danger to Indonesia at the time? Yudha News Daily (4/8/1969) writes the question of President Nixon, and the following answers from President Soeharto:

“For Indonesia, the most important thing today is not the danger of defense against communism, but the success of Repelita (Five Years Development Plan). If Repelita does not achieve its objectives, then Indonesia's National Resilience against any harm is also reduced” (Sanggar Strategi Lemhannas, 1970)

How important it is to have National Resilience, once again given the emphasis by President Soeharto in the State Address to the House of Representatives Meeting on August 16th 1969,

“...That is why some of us sometimes ask why Indonesia overseas is no longer 'great' as it once was, as if we had let go of our ideals and role in realizing world peace. No. Our ideals should not change and the role we must still contribute. The problem is that we will be able to play a more effective role if we have our own

National Resilience” (Sanggar Strategi Lemhannas, 1970)

Armed with historical experience, National Resilience is formulated as the resilience and endurance of a nation that contains the ability to develop national power in facing all challenges and threats, both from within and from outside that directly or indirectly endanger the nation's livelihood.

In contrast to the national defense that in its rationale is always adressed or directed against a threat, the National Resilience is not. National Resilience is introversive or "inward", not extroversive or "outward". Therefore, National Resilience encompasses the whole life and livelihood of the people that is centered on the appreciation of every citizen. Just as Mr.Harto said that Resilience can not be separated from the national personality which is the main element. The Indonesian personality has evolved over the centuries through the history of the archipelago.

The concept of national interest, according to Perwita & Yani (2005), is very important to explain and understand international

behavior, the basis for explaining the foreign behavior of a country. The national interest is the fundamental goal and the final determinant that directs the decision-makers of a country in formulating its foreign policy. The national interests of a country are typically the elements that make up the vital needs of the state, such as defense, security, military and economic welfare.

Based on the disclosure of historical facts that the national interest of Indonesia during the time of the change of the Old Order to the New Order is the survival of the nation and the success of economic development (Repelita) so that the national doctrine needed at the time was geopolitical. This is in Grygiel's opinion that the state is trying above all to protect their territory from invasions and attacks and must concentrate on maintaining its territorial security and not having the ability to pursue a strategic-political foreign policy.

Indonesia's diplomatic, economic and military resources are diverted to protect regional sovereignty from the threat of communist entry from Indo China and

the success of economic development.

Indonesian Geostrategy as geopolitical in the implementation, or interpreted that geostrategy is the implementation policy in determining the purpose, means, and the way in utilizing of such means to achieve national goals by utilizing the geographical constellation of Indonesia does not have the characteristics of geostrategy doctrine.

According to Joesoef (2014), geopolitics is a project study whereas geostrategy is an implementation study, usually with the conduct of warfare. Since battles usually rage within a space, geostrategy has made "space" as a major category of strategic thinking since its inception, which is clearly recorded in the "geo" dimension. However, it does not mean that every strategy-in this case the conception of National Resilience-is a geostrategy.

Based on the examination of the syllogism building raised in the research problem, it is evident that the premise (1) prepared by National Defense Institute is less precise. Since

the development of the National Resilience conception has been largely undertaken by National Defense Institute, the conception of national power is transformed into National Resilience.

According to Haryomataram (1970), National Resilience prioritizes the regulation of national livelihood by prioritizing domestic circumstances. National Resilience is inward-looking, though it does not mean that foreign relations are ignored. The notion of national power is never used in discussing the domestic problems of a country because it is known to be outward-looking. The national strength of a country becomes important in regards to the relationship between countries.

The conception of National Resilience is more suitable for developing countries because of its inability to base its policy on physical strength. Therefore, policies must be based on other forces, especially those that are nonphysical. The conception of national power is more suited to a superpower country, capable of basing its policy on the physical-military power it possesses.

Conclusion

Based on the results of testing that the conception of National Resilience outside the geostrategy periphery, although evidence found shows the validity of geostrategy.

Evidence demonstrating the improbability of geostrategy: (1) in contrast to the National strength approach, the conception of National Resilience does not place emphasis on strategy (military); (2) to prioritize the regulation of national livelihood by prioritizing domestic circumstances to achieve the National Objectives and not to demonstrate strategic planning, political/diplomacy efforts, or military efforts; (3) inward motivation and encouragement to improve tenacity and resilience that has the ability to develop the power to deal with threats, not actively influencing strategic politics; (4) is a Base Pattern of National Development carried out continuously so that changes occur over a long period; And (5) defensively prioritizes the attitude of consultation and cooperation by relying on the moral strength and personality of the nation.

Evidence showing the validity of geostrategy in the conception of National Resilience are: (1) to formulate the National Objectives of strengthening security and prosperity; And (2) taking into account geographic and geopolitical geographical conditions and constellations.

Recommendation

For further research, could examine national security concept as a geostrategic Doctrine Indonesia by using a different method to find geostrategic strategy concept so that the truth of national resilience concept proved effective to geostrategic device implementation on national security concept

Reference

- Ashrafpour, Ashraf. (2010). *Geostrategic Importance of Persian Gulf*. Disertasi. Department of Defence and Strategic Studies, University of Pune-India.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew. (1986). *Game Plan: A Geostrategic Framework for the Conduct of the U.S.-Soviet Contest*. Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew. (1997). *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperative*. New York: Basic Books.
- Chaudary, M. A. & G. Chaudary, (2009). *Global Encyclopaedia of Political Geography* New Delhi: Global Vision Publishing House
- de Haas, Marcel. (2006). *Geostrategy in the South Caucasus: Power Play and Energy Security of States and Organisations*. The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael.
- Grygiel, Jacob J. (2006). *Great Powers and Geopolitical Change*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gyorgy, A. (1943). The geopolitics of war: Total war and geostrategy. *The Journal of Politics*, 5(4), 347-362.
- Haryomataram, G. P. H. S. (1970). "Mengenali Tiga Wajah Ketahanan Nasional". Panitia Lemhannas (ed.). *Bunga Rampai Ketahanan Nasional, Buku I: Konsepsi & Teori*. Jakarta: PT. Rineke Cipta.
- Haryomataram, G. P. H. S. (1976). "Percobaan untuk Merumuskan Perbedaan Antara Ketahanan Nasional dan National Power". Panitia Lemhannas (ed.). *Bunga Rampai Ketahanan Nasional, Buku I: Konsepsi & Teori*. Jakarta: PT. Rineke Cipta.
- Joesoef, Daed. (2014). *Studi Strategi: Logika Ketahanan dan Pembangunan Nasional*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku KOMPAS.

- Lemhannas. (1997). *Ketahanan Nasional*. Jakarta: PT. Balai Pustaka dan Lemhannas.
- Lim Joo-Jock. (1979). *Geostrategy and the South China Sea Basin: Regional Balance, Maritime Issues, Future Patterns*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Muhadjir, Noeng. (2007). *Metodologi Keilmuan: Paradigma Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mixed*. Yogyakarta: Rake Sarasin.
- Mustopadidjaja, A. R. (1990). *Konsep-Konsep Dasar Pembangunan Nasional*. Pengantar Uraian Pada Kursus Staf Senior TNI AD. Bandung.
- Mustopadidjaja, A.R. (1990). *Konsep-Konsep Dasar Pembangunan Nasional*, Bandung: Sesko TNI
- Notosusanto, Nugroho. (1970). *Sejarah Ketahanan Nasional*. Panitia Lemhannas (ed.). *Bunga Rampai Ketahanan Nasional, Buku I: Konsepsi & Teori*. Jakarta: PT. Ripres Utama.
- Oetama, Jacob. (1970). *Ketahanan Nasional: Beberapa Masalah Kini, Harus Dicegah Alienasi*. Panitia Lemhannas (ed.). *Bunga Rampai Ketahanan Nasional, Buku I: Konsepsi & Teori*. Jakarta: PT. Ripres Utama.
- Park, C. (2008). Why China attacks: China's geostrategic vulnerability and its military intervention. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 20(3), 263-282.
- Perwita, A. A. B. & Y. M. Yani. (2005). *Pengantar Ilmu Hubungan Internasional*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Presidential Decree No. 97 of 2015 on General Defense Policy 2015-2019
- Rogers, J. dan L. Simón. (2010). *Think Again: European Geostrategy*, dalam <http://europeangeostrategy.idea.soneurope.eu/2010/03/14/think-again-european-geostrategy/>, diunduh pada 11 Desember 2015.
- Rogers, James. (2011). *A New Geography of European Power?* Egmon Paper 42. Gent: Academia Press.
- Rosière, S. (2001). Géographie politique, géopolitique et géostratégie: distinctions opératoires. *L'information géographique*, 65(1), 33-42.
- Sanggar Strategi Lemhannas. (1970). *Konsepsi Ketahanan Nasional dalam Pertumbuhan Masyarakat Samudra Indonesia*. Panitia Lemhannas. (ed.). *Bunga Rampai Ketahanan Nasional, Buku I: Konsepsi & teori*. Jakarta: PT. Ripres Utama.
- Schnitzer, E. W. (1955). German geopolitics revived. *The Journal of Politics*, 17(3), 407-423.
- Sempa, Francis P. (2002). *Geopolitics: From the Cold War to the 21st Century*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Soekarno. (1965). *Pertahanan Nasional Dapat Berhasil Maksimal Jika Berdasarkan Geopolitik*. Persepsi. 1992.

- Suradinata, E. & A. Dinuth. (2001). *Geopolitik dan Konsepsi Ketahanan Nasional: Pemikiran Awal, Pengembangan, dan Prospek*. Jakarta: PT. Paradigma Cipta Yatsigama.
- Suradinata, Ermaya. (2005). *Hukum Dasar Geopolitik dan Geostrategi dalam Kerangka Keutuhan NKRI*. Jakarta: Suara Bebas.
- Wirjosaputro, I. S. (1970). *Ketahanan Nasional. Panitia Lemhannas (ed.). Bunga Rampai Ketahanan Nasional, Buku I: Konsepsi & Teori*. Jakarta: PT Ripres Utama.