

Soekarno's Strategic Leadership For The World

Hasto Kristiyanto^a, Purnomo Yusgiantoro^b, Amrulla Octavian^c, Wayan Midhio^d

^{a,b,c,d}Indonesian Defense University

^ahasto66@gmail.com , ^bpurnomoys@gmail.com , ^camarulla.octavian@idu.ac.id, ^dwayan.midhio@ idu.ac.id

Article History: Received: 11 January 2021; Revised: 12 February 2021; Accepted: 27 March 2021; Published online: 10 May 2021

Abstract: Strategic leadership is a competence in formulating the strategy, mission and strategic substance of an organization, accompanied by the ability to execute and implement policies and strategic decisions in accordance with the ongoing environmental growth review of an internal team that is powerful and driven to accomplish future objectives. Indonesian proclaimer and founding father, Ir. Sukarno is an example of a leader who has exhibited strategic leadership qualities that have been tested at the national and international levels. Soekarno, as the first President of the Republic of Indonesia, has taken part in a variety of foreign positions in Southeast Asia, America and Russia, particularly in the start of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), the Asia-Africa Summit and many others. Soekarno is commonly used as the name of the main street in different countries so that he deserves to be the world's strategic king. This study employs a qualitative approach with socio-historical interpretation to uncover strategic leadership concepts that have ever been put out in the foreign community.

Keywords: Soekarno, International, Strategic Leadership and Proclaimer

1. Introduction

The basic definition of the term "leadership" and the meaning of the "strategic" component brings some focus and context (especially in the field of defense) to the understanding of its conception. Essentially, leadership means the capacity to articulate vision and purpose (visionary), to provide encouragement and inspiration, to maximize performance, to develop human resources, and develop new structures (Purnomo Yusgiantoro: Sesko TNI, 2017 & UNHAN, 2019). In other words, leadership is a system by which an individual controls a community or individual in order to accomplish shared goals. It therefore contains four components of leadership, (Olson & Simmerson, 2011), namely:

- Process : leadership is not a trait, but a process between leader and follower.
- Power : no influence (on the followers), no leadership;
- Individuals : groups must engage in order for leadership to take place
- General Purpose : emphasis and attention on the priorities of a shared future

Meanwhile, according to Olson and Simerson, the strategic leadership aspect is divided into two main parts:

1. Strategy formation: recognition the goals and objectives of the organization, including consideration of the vision and mission.
2. Strategy execution: the implementation of acts, controls, rewards and interactions designed to accomplish the strategy.

The presence of such leadership does not occur in a permanent status quo situation, but runs on socio-political waves that are both internally and externally volatile, continuously evolving, unpredictable, fluid and multi-interpreted. In the meanwhile, the strategic sense itself means at least three key points, including concentrating on priorities (priority scale of interests), thinking about the long term, and (for the future) and considering multi-factors or related elements (Adair, 2010).

As the art of becoming a "*strategos*" (commander in chief/warlord), in strategic leadership, there is a demand to be able to devise strategies, to make strategic choices and policies in order to meet external challenges and, furthermore, to achieve "victory" the aim of "war" is improvement, a better situation for the company and its adherents in the future. Understanding a strategic leadership position must also be considered to mean that its task is more than that of a commander/operating leader/manager who handles teamwork in the field.

There are a range of strategic leadership models that can supplement awareness, ranging from cross-cutting models between self-management, others, and organizations (Crossan et al., 2008). There are also full-range versions, ranging from transactional to transformational (Avolio, 2001). However, the profile of a full strategic leadership model can be outlined in a variety of ways (Yusgiantoro, 2017):

- Bravery in taking actions
- Result-oriented, do not dare to be populist
- Collaborative (persuasive) strategy
- Totality of network construction (win the heart and mind of people)
- Appointing agents for change-Pro
- Shift agent for conversion-Con

- Grasp the vision that you truly want to achieve, and be able to express it
- Management of improvements (nurture)

Therefore, it can be said that strategic leadership is not only intelligence or governance abilities, but also that leadership is also an art and a multi-dimensional wisdom that also requires intuitive sensitivity, as well as a creative perspective not just of "survival" but also of taking on tasks and opportunities for the great purpose and strategic life of both the present and the future. Strategic leadership as a science term can definitely be extended in general, but there is a restriction in complexity in which leadership implementations that generate strategic decisions and strategies can be executed in an optimal and productive manner. One of the drawbacks of depth is the magnitude of the obligation of the leadership role.

Aside from being culturally diverse, bureaucracies and practitioners have distinct positions and duties. The bureaucracy that is ontologically present in the providing of public services obviously has a strategic degree that has an impact by policies that can influence people's and many people's quality of living. In the meantime, the career path at any stage is limited to organizational interests. Despite recent innovations, both are interrelated in the complexity of the VUCA, that implicitly implies there is inter-connectivity. As a result, professional backgrounds can often be interlinked and have a strategic influence that is very powerful at national, regional or even global level.

This can be understood because the dynamics of change that occur from time to time also show a shifting paradigm (Yusgiantoro, 2020), such as from a traditional society to an industrial society; from geopolitics to geoeconomics (Ronald Reagan), even related to geostrategy; traditional (family) business into a modern professional business with multiple stakeholders; innovations in the field of technology that continue to advance the development of information, communication and transportation which are increasingly sophisticated and provide convenience; even including the potential threat of conflict is developing in the potential for proxy war and cyber war.

In view of the various threats and trends set out above, strategic leadership in different strategic areas is required in terms of the needs of the times. The position of strategic leadership is becoming more and more important due to the demands of the current trends of transformation, socio-political changes, social culture, the industrial revolution 4.0, the possibility of a worldwide pandemic, and so on. At both the bureaucratic and technical level, the character of a strategic leader is important to: 1) be an agent of transformation. 2) producing breakthroughs and inventions in line with the emerging dynamics of the times. 3) making constant improvements, and 4) establishing potential conditions for the better. Thus, one of the main considerations which is often addressed in the numerous leadership books is the character of the leader itself.

The character of the leader becomes the deciding factor, with both the bureaucratic and technical history behind it. A good strategic leader with a technical experience would definitely be a good leader in the management of bureaucracy. It needs adaptation on the basis of diverse contexts but with existing characters and basic skills, it would definitely not take long to adapt and change. This conviction is also supported by the emergence of a theoretical approach to strategic leadership (Yusgiantoro, 2020): a governance approach (based on leadership characteristics); a behavioral approach (based on attitudes and habits); a situational approach (identifying the role of circumstances and conditions) and a new leadership approach (identification of leadership skills, ethics and values). In these four methods, all of them see the leading figure as a research subject.

On the other hand, the reach element or the degree of leadership accountability often places emphasis on how high the strategic level is. In his book *Strategic Leadership* (2010), John Adair unveils a number of key points surrounding strategic leadership. One of the relevant opinions to address the question is that strategic thinkers are builders of strategic thought and strategic planning. It indicates that the strategic element is one of the keys to this. Hughes and Beatty (2014) have mentioned that strategic thinking is a "machine" that drives strategy as a learning method along with strategic acting and strategic control. Hughes and Beatty (2014) have shown that both the bureaucratic and professional realms are going through the same stages in the learning process framework. Starting from an internal analysis, determine the personal status of existing industrial realities with a situation of development. From the point of departure for internal and industrial studies, move on to the concept of vision, mission and values. Affirming the destination "where the ship will sail" the alignment of vision-mission-values is placed into strategic implementation to become a central strategic catalyst that will bring back leadership and strategic thinking.

At the highest level of strategic leadership, all emphasis, reasoning and action is very broad in nature, but not many individuals are in that role. For this reason, the diagram illustrations are so well presented by Prof. Purnomo in the construction of a cone space. The more strategic, the more constrained the leadership role, but the broader the effect and power. Since a military strategist, like the Commander-in-Chief, is not only concerned about how to fight the war, but is also moving deeper. Therefore, what are the objectives to be accomplished by the victory of the war, or that the "war" must be fought. Meanings are at societal, global, regional and national level. The

emphasis is no longer on programs that control technicalities, but on structural strategies with a long-term focus and viability in the future. This understanding also underlines the distinction between a strategic leader and a boss or an organizational leader. Strategic leadership requires qualities and competencies, good character self-management, experience and leadership skills to act.

Hughes and Beatty (2014) claim that strategic thinking is driven by two other "machines" namely strategic acting and strategic control. These three pillars of thinking, behavior and power are also core characteristics of the leadership's strategic degree at their respective stages. Effective public policy does not generally succeed in its execution because discipline has not been developed, when approaching re-engineering of the corporate process, each process chain in the bureaucracy provides added value. The culture of accountability through e-government was not completely enforced. In basic words, it can be inferred that there is no strategic community capable of cultivating dedication and continuity to transition.

Colin Gray (in Smith, 2012) has described the strategic culture as concepts, beliefs, traditions, behaviors, thoughts and strategies employed by some societies that include specific historical experiences. In addition, there is also the opinion that strategic culture is an evolution of the political culture that emerged in the 1960s. The disparity between the two is due to the extent of their opinions. Political culture refers to the group's view of the proper position of government power, while strategic culture refers to the group's view of how government can be handled (Smith, 2012: 41).

Indonesia needs mental transformation in order to steadily form a strategic community that is prepared to embrace change, to be ambitious in creativity and to live the nation's ideology of deep nationalism. This can be developed with 8 steps of a big improvement from John P. Kotter (1996). Starting with the building of urgency, the coordination of vision and mission, the convergence of successes, eventually developing a new strategic cultural strategy that is more sensitive to modern trends but stays strong on the philosophy of Pancasila and the cultural origins of the country.

The inability to execute effective public policy is probably attributed to a lack of awareness of political leadership. For this purpose, a transformative strategic leader is capable of: providing individual attention, improving human capital, stimulating the advancement of research and knowledge, providing encouragement and inspiration, and providing ideal influence (Full Range of Leadership Model in Yusgiantoro, 2020) is needed.

By cultivating an appreciation of strategic leadership, it is expected that breakthroughs will occur in strategic policies where any success that changes slowly will crystallize into one nation's strategic culture. A strategic society, which is not anti-change, but embraces it with courage, hope and confidence to preserve the life of "independence" and a better future for the people, since the country of Indonesia is still a leading nation.

2. Research Methods

This study uses a qualitative approach with the Socio-historical method. Socio-historical analysis is a social concept to assess historical events from society and events in the past. This analysis explores past events with social concepts such as the industrial revolution, urbanization, democratization and others. Socio-historical analysis also explains incidents that were unknown to the public at that time, such as agreements between countries on international law of the sea, bilateral / multilateral agreements between countries. (Wisnu Jatmiko, 2015). This research evidence comes from content repositories in the form of books, science articles, and news from mass media or trustworthy blogs that demonstrate Soekarno's strategic leadership. was before and after his tenure as President of Indonesia.

3. Discussion And Explanation

3.1 'Why', 'How' and 'When' Strategic Leadership formed

At the beginning of its historical development, leadership was required due to the urgency to deal with Threats, Challenges, Obstacles and Disturbances (ATHG), both from external factors (group of humans, animals and nature) and internal factors (heterogeneity and motivation of human groups) which could existentially threaten any time. According to Charles Darwin's theory of evolution "survival of the fittest", it is believed that only the "fittest" (change and adapt) who can survive. Therefore, Strategic leadership is demanded especially in a competitive and changing reality, even from the paradigm side (Yusgiantoro, 2020).

Due to its reason, a leader who has basic leadership characteristics is expected to be able to bring his followers not only to "survive" but also to achieve the glory. In the monarchy era, only those who has "blue blood" descendants of the nobility have the right to occupy the throne (leadership). Along with the development of history, especially after stepping on the enlightenment era (renaissance), the process of leadership regeneration has changed. Public awareness and socio-political understanding develop. The community realizes that the leader is the spearhead of a group, so it needs a mutual agreement. Therefore, it is necessary to seriously conduct a selection process with various strict requirements.

The historical process in leadership is not only aware of the importance of strategic leadership but also shows how leadership is formed. There are at least two classical theories that are often on one dialectical stage, namely the theory of leadership: *Born vs Formed* (Made):

a) Trait Theory (Theory Genesis: birth). This means that this theory holds that leaders are destined to be born as leaders. Leaders are born with the innate character of a leader. Leaders cannot just be formed. This notion specifically legitimizes the leadership of the monarchical government. The trait group believes that it cannot be duplicated constructively because the charisma of leadership is part of laws of nature.

b) Behavioral Theory (Social Theory: formed). Contrary to the theory of genesis. Adherents of this theory believe that leaders are not just born, but are formed, honed, trained through social construction. Character and behavior are the result of social construction, environmental forging. They do not believe in the destiny of a leader. Therefore, a leader must go through a process of regeneration and also a rigorous selection to find a mature and worthy character to become a leader.

In scientific development, ecological theory emerged which attempted to bridge the debate over beliefs between genesis theory and social theory, so-called ecological theory. This means that this theory is a combination of the two classical theories above. Instead of assuring that an innate leadership character is necessary, to become a successful leader, a character needs to be developed through education, experience in accordance with ecological demands, and having achievement motivation.

Strategic leadership will be optimally exposed when the point is exactly in the quadrant of the mix between three elements, which are cognitive psychology, systems thinking and game theory (Olson and Simerson, 2015). Cognitive psychology refers to the internal-personal aspect, which includes the mental process of how to interpret perceptions, solving problems creatively, making decisions and self-motivation. In short, it is the ability to "reflect" or harmonize self-awareness and environmental awareness.

Systems thinking is an element related to the ability to understand how the system behaves. In this sector, high order thinking skills are needed to "interpret" patterns of environmental interactions that form a causal relationship systematically. A leader is required to be able to think multi-dimensionally and clearly map the complexities of reality in order to understand how things move and work. Thus, it can degrade relevant and contextual knowledge as a basis for decision making.

Whereas in game theory, a leader has careful calculations of every step and movement. Like in a chess game, a strategic player counts every step of the opponent's movements and tries to provide anticipatory moves, while at the same time devising a strategy to "attack". Thus, game theory is a social point of view (social framework) between competing players where each strategy chosen has a payoff.

This game theory is strategic because it is sequential, simultaneously with the awareness that every move will affect "other players", and the "other players' actions" will also combine or contradict with their own actions to create a new condition.

Executive, legislative and judiciary, carry out their duties and authorities in accordance with the constitution and laws. All decisions taken have an impact on the lives of the people, nation and state. In this perspective, strategic leadership is mandatory to be understood, so that it can be better formed in all aspects of the duties, principals and functions of all state administrators. However, strategic leadership can also be formed in other strategic areas. One of the obvious strategic areas is the field of national defense.

Leadership at the strategic level occupies the highest level in the leadership layer. The top leadership must be described in the following command, which includes the tactical level leadership and there is the operational level leadership at the basic level (Yusgiantoro, 2006).

According to Prof. Purnomo, the concept of strategic leadership is in line and also emphasized at the military leadership level of the American Armed Forces (ADP-22, 2019) where it is understood that there are three levels of leadership, namely:

- 1) Direct leadership – basic level: connecting with individuals / small groups and a task completion oriented perspective.
- 2) Organizational leadership– middle system: linked to the organizational domain with a system and process perspective.
- 3) Strategic leadership – top level: linked on a global or regional scale with the national community perspective.

Furthermore, the realization of strategic leadership depends on the scale of leadership responsibilities. How strategic is the responsibility that will be accomplished and the influence on the policies and the decisions taken. So, basically, all strategic fields at a global-regional scale from a national scale perspective, also from the command level at the strategic level become a scope that requires strategic leadership.

In the perspective of national defense (Hanneg), the terrestrial terrain (geo) is an important aspect. Therefore, both politics and strategy are required to take geography into account, then it becomes geopolitical and geostrategic (Joesoef, 2014). Thus, geopolitics can also be the scope of strategic leadership. Geostrategy as a way to achieve the objectives contained in geopolitics. Indonesia's geostrategy is national resilience which includes the aspects of national life (ideology, politics, social, culture, defense and security). Hence, strategic leadership in the geopolitical space aims to adopt strategic policies at both the military and non-military levels in order to actualize national interests. (Yusgiantoro, 2020).

3.2 Soekarno's Strategic Leadership

Proclaimer and Founding Father of the Indonesian nation, Ir. Soekarno is an example of a leader who demonstrated strategic leadership qualifications that were tested at the national and international level. Based on the nature of strategic thinking according to Aaron K. Olson, and B. Keith Simerson (2011), strategic thinking is an intersection between cognitive psychology, system thinking, and game theory. By utilizing this approach, Sukarno's strategic leadership can be analyzed as follows:

a. Cognitive Psychology

Sukarno was a figure of a statesman leader. Sukarno was also a good learner. Cognitive psychology is the study of perception, creativity, decision-making processes, and is related to strategic thinking itself (Olson & Simerson, 2011). Sukarno really understood the psychological aspects of his nation which was well known for its formulation of the nation's philosophy as well as the Indonesian perspective (*weltanchnung*) for the world, so called 'Pancasila'. For Sukarno, Pancasila was the soul of the Indonesian nation, which was extracted from its Indonesian ground. Pancasila is the essence of the history of Indonesian civilization.

Understanding the aspects of cognitive psychology can be seen from the main essence of each principle contained in Pancasila. The example in the second principle, 'Just and civilized humanity'. Through this principle, Sukarno made ideological contemplation after having a dialogue with a farmer named Pak Marhaen. This farmer has his own land, hoes himself, and has sovereignty over what is planted. However, why was this farmer poor? Sukarno in his understanding of the psychological aspects of the colonized people of Indonesia, and his understanding of the mandate of the people's suffering, made peasants a symbol of struggle. His dialogue with Pak Marhaen, who represents millions of peasants and millions of other poor people, created the idea that the so-called principle of struggle for Indonesian independence, must originate from society itself. Sukarno then introduced socio-nationalism and socio-democracy. Both are the principles of struggle in organizing the people. Socio means society, while democracy and sense of the spirit of patriotism that grows in people's mind, raises national awareness, awareness of the fate of the colonized people by examining all aspects of cognitive psychology. What Sukarno felt was examined critically through dialectics by grounding all the knowledge that was read, and being critically collided with the realities of the life of the colonized people.

In the cognitive psychology aspect, Sukarno often compared, let alone a colonized nation, a worm that is trampled on will move, cluck, fight back. Moreover, a nation that is aware of the same fate. For this reason, the strategic leadership aspect based on cognitive psychology is able to explore the subconscious of the nation, which longs for the figure of Ratu Adil. Ratu Adil's conception grew into a living hope; became an energy that makes it endure various colonial suffering.

For Sukarno, this awareness was transformed into a character not to accept conditions, a non-trivial character (surrender to fate), not to wait for fate, but to become a struggling energy to educate the people, lead the people's movement, to realize that the Indonesian nation is one soul who wishes to be independent. What Sukarno did, in the perspective of the nature of strategic thinking (Adair, 2010), characterized three things. First, **focus on what is important**, namely building people's awareness for independence; Second, **the long-term orientation** affirms that the struggle for the nation will never end. For the struggling of the nations, there is no journey end (Sukarno, 1930). Third, **considering the multi-relevant factors**. Indonesian independence was carried out by building national awareness; seeing the mentality of the Indonesian people who were colonized for more than 350 years; see the economic structure of the colonized and how the people were constrained by their political rights; and also the awareness of history that the archipelago has an extraordinary historical track record of civilization through Sriwijaya and Majapahit, so that an archipelago called Indonesia could become independent by the struggle of its own nation etc. The understanding of the relevant multi-factors led Sukarno to make a strategic decision by establishing the Indonesian National Party by adopting the spirit of the independence of the United States on July 4, 1927. What Sukarno did was also in line with Adair's theory which states that strategic leaders combine two things, reflective thinking and action thinking. Because of this, Sukarno promoted a 'National Geist', a national spirit; National Will, or national ideals, and National Daad, or national action. These three things are known as the Trilogy of Struggle, and they are in accordance with what was conveyed by Adair.

With a strategic thinking framework based on cognitive psychology, Sukarno described the philosophy of humanitarian principles into two sides: *inward*, containing the determination that Indonesian independence should be aimed at liberating Indonesian people from the shackles of colonialism, from the exploiting life order, namely capitalism and imperialism; while on the *outward*, the humanitarian principles contain the philosophy of internationalism, how Indonesian independence is aimed at building world brotherhood.

For this reason, the feeling of being a colonized nation finally raises the awareness that Indonesia is the world's essence park, and therefore has the responsibility to build a new world order. A new world order that places freedom as the right of all nations, so that colonialism in the world must be abolished because it is incompatible with humanity and justice.

b. System Thinking

System thinking is a key element of strategic thinking. According to Barry Richmond, the various challenges faced in this thinking system appear multidimensional, have many forms, correlated, interact to each other, and show a constant change. This system of thinking also appeared in Sukarno's leadership. In the effort of liberating West Irian, Bung Karno saw that this effort could not be carried out by the Indonesian nation itself based on military strength or capital.

Awareness of the system thinking on how the relations and interactions between nations have created smart ideas, and an out of the box idea so that Sukarno initiated the Asian-African Conference (KAA). The conference held in 1955, only 6 (six) years after Indonesia gained full sovereignty in 1949. By holding the KAA, Indonesia's leverage power in the international world could be seen. Sukarno articulated what was called the power of strategic thinking.

The Asian-African Conference in the middle of the start of the cold war shook the world. The success of the KAA has made Indonesia legitimate a strong leadership in Asia Africa. With the legitimacy of this leadership, Sukarno then ordered Prime Minister Djuanda to issue the Djuanda Declaration on December 13, 1957. The Djuanda Declaration emphasizes that Indonesia is an archipelagic country, where all the islands are joined together by the sea. Indonesia is a maritime country dotted with islands, stretching out as the Emerald Equator (Sukarno, 1957). With this one unit of land and water territory, Indonesia's geographic area will double and Indonesia will become the largest archipelagic country in the world.

Sukarno's dialectic of thought developed continuously. Sukarno realized that with the spirit of 'Dasa Sila Bandung', new nations would be independent, such as Morocco, Aldjazair, and Tunisia, etc. The newly independent countries will deal with a geopolitical battle between the Western Bloc led by the United States and the Eastern Bloc led by the Soviet Union. In Sukarno's view, the two conflicting blocs shared the seeds of colonialism and imperialism, something the Indonesian people opposed. On the basis of this, the Non-Aligned Movement (GNB) was initiated. GNB is an alliance of independent and fully sovereign countries that do not combine in the two warring blocs.

Sukarno's system of thinking remained dedicated to the national interest of the nation. West Irian is a colonial part of Indonesia. Due to its reason, Sukarno's strategic thinking was driven by his geopolitical view that was pro to world peace and integrated with foreign diplomacy, and at the same time defense diplomacy to build military power, Indonesia's defense force.

c. Game Theory

The game theory approach was first introduced by a French mathematician named Emile Borel in 1921. This game theory is very useful for explaining how strategic thinking works. With this game theory, we can understand the social framework between competing parties. In addition, we can also understand how parties interact, respond, in the form of actions that are different, or contrary to what is done (Olson and Simerson, 2015).

Learning from Sukarno's strategic leadership, history records Sukarno's strategic diplomacy, communication, and negotiation in seeing all the foreign policy motives of the United States and the Soviet Union. With this game theory, Sukarno drew the rivalry of the two opposing blocs for the national interests of Indonesia and also the nations of Asia Africa and Latin America. Sukarno was very good at using the game theory for the liberation of West Irian. Furthermore, his view of 'freedom is the right of all nations', is actively used for the independence of other nations such as Palestine, Morocco, Pakistan, Tunisia, Algeria, and also defends Vietnam, China, Korea, Sudan, Cambodia etc. With an understanding of game theory as presented by Richard L. Hughes & Katherine C. Beatty (2014), strategic thinking refers to the cognitive processes required for the collection, interpretation, generation, and evaluation of information and ideas that shape sustainable organizational competitiveness. In his book 'Becoming A Strategic Leader: Your Role In Your Organization's Enduring Success', he emphasizes how the "artful" nature of strategic thinking in dealing with the problem complexity.

Although various books and studies on strategic leadership were released after Sukarno's death, what Sukarno had done can be explained in various perspectives of these strategic leadership theories. Regarding this game theory, Sukarno really understood the state of the art in the rivalry between the West Bloc and the East Bloc. The two blocs in their defense strategy also follow what is meant by the security dilemma. The security dilemma is a term in international relations which refers to a situation when actions taken by a country to improve its security, such as strengthening the military or making alliances, also forcing other countries to take the same action. Therefore, the security dilemma is also known as the spiral model.

Learning from Soekarno's effort in liberating West Irian was the core of game theory by utilizing the security dilemma that occurred. Sukarno in his international diplomacy, always explained that West Irian was part of Indonesia with a long cultural track record. The spirit of liberating West Irian from Dutch colonialism is analogous to the spirit of the United States who wanted to break free from Britain. West Irian, in Sukarno's view, was like the "back knife of capitalism" which ready to stab Indonesia. Throughout Sukarno's struggle, it appears that a strategic frame of mind born through synthesis and analysis; non-linear and linear; visual as well as verbal; implicit as well as explicit; and using heart as well as mind that is in the head as stated by Hughes and Beatty (2014).

As a result, Sukarno's strategy was able to bring the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union in the Indonesia's national interests. For instance, in his collaboration with John F. Kennedy, Sukarno had access to strengthen 'ALUTSISTA' (equipment of the Indonesian Army) by presenting the most advanced combat aircraft of that time, and also designing nuclear use for peaceful, charity, and humanitarian purposes.

Through his strategic leadership, Soekarno was able to create counter-action between the US and Soviet foreign policy. This also happened when Sukarno came to the US for the first time in 1956. With a reliable communication strategy, Sukarno persuaded the United States Congress and the House of Representatives to gain support for the liberation of West Irian, Sukarno praised the US as a revolutionary mix between Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Alfa Edison (Sukarno, 1956). When stepping his foot at Washington Military Airport, Sukarno also emphasized that America is not just a country, or nation, or people, but America as a frame of mind, America as the center of ideas. A statement using the heart and mind.

However, on a different occasion, Sukarno showed his anger when he had to wait for Eisenhower to arrive 30 minutes late and this had offended Sukarno's pride as President of the Republic of Indonesia. Strategy, diplomacy, communication, and negotiation as forms of Sukarno's strategic leadership ultimately made Sukarno widely accepted in the United States. This raised concerns of the Soviet Union, so that the Soviets also accelerated cooperation support with Indonesia and provided the military equipment needed by Indonesia for the liberation of West Irian. In addition, in order to maintain the United States sentiment, Sukarno made severe conditions for his presence by asking Nikita Khrushchev to find the tomb of the Islamic poet Imam Al Buchari.

How did Sukarno use a strategic leadership model in terms of thinking skills? Simon Wootton & Terry Horne (2010) mention 5 basic skills (thinking skills) that a strategic leader must have, which are: 1) memory; 2) imagination; 3) empathy and emotion; 4) numerical thinking numerically; and 5) verbal thinking. Of these five basic skills, it appears that Sukarno also developed them.

What Sukarno delivered in his speech "Indonesia Sues" in 1930 touched all aspects related to the Five Basic Skills. In his pleading, Sukarno emphasized the theory and principles of the struggle of the Indonesian National Party (PNI) and the ideals of Indonesian independence by using imagination, numerical calculations, verbal thinking, and full of imagination about Indonesian independence that would happen "when the Pacific burns, the consequences of capitalism create crisis, and developed nations compete to find regional ranks in order to get sources of raw materials and market their products due to over-production (Sukarno, 1930)".

By utilizing a different theoretical framework, strategic thinking requires discipline in thinking method by paying attention to time perspectives on the past experiences, future challenges, and based on ideas in the present, then formulate a strategy to build it according to future imaginations as presented by Simon Wootton and Terry Horner, in their book *Strategic Thinking, A Nine Step Approach to Strategy And Leadership For Managers and Marketers* (2010). With this approach, Sukarno struggled from three perspectives of time: based on the history of the nation's civilization; map all the problems caused by colonialism; and to inflame the spirit of struggle and imagination for Indonesian independence.

The approach presented by Wootton and Horner can be seen from Sukarno's geopolitical view. This view emerges from the awareness of Indonesia as a single soul, which extends from Sabang to Merauke, and presents as an "imaginary creation" of the nature of Indonesian nationality. It is proven by the existence of Indonesian unity. All of them mixed with basic skills toward the importance of the emotional aspect, that Indonesia is a country with a large civilization, coloring the world civilization during the Srivijaya and Majapahit Era.

Through this history, Sukarno generated optimism, a form of strategic intelligence, strategic capability, create strategic knowledge, make strategic predictions, develop strategic vision, until step 9, plan and manage projects to implement change in a conception that is later known as the 9S approach. It is proven that Indonesia's national interest has been achieved with the integration of Papua and Indonesia as a country with the strongest military power in the southernmost hemisphere under the Equator.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, from the discussion of the relevance of various approaches and theories of strategic leadership, it is proven that Sukarno through his ideas as well as communication and strategic diplomacy (actions) fulfills the qualifications of strategic leadership that have been tested not only at the national level but also received international recognition.

References

1. Aaron K. Olson & B. Keith Simerson. (2011). *Leading with Strategic Thinking: Four Ways Effective Leaders Gain Insight, Drive Change and Get Results*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
2. ADP 6-22. *Army Leadership and the Profession*.
3. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage.
4. Bose, Meena. (1998). *Shaping and Signaling Presidential Policy: The National Security Decision Making of Eisenhower and Kennedy*. Texas A&M University Press.
5. Crossan, M.M., Fry, J.N. and Killing, J.P. (2004). *Strategic Analysis and Action*. Pearson Prentice Hall.
6. Elinor C. Sloan. (2017). *Military Strategy: The Politics and Technique of War*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
7. Frances Hesselbein. (2004). *Be-Know-Do: Leadership the Army Way* (adapted from *The Official Army Leadership Manual*). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
8. Greenstein, F. I. (2009, April). *The leadership style of Barack Obama: An early assessment*.
9. In *The Forum* (Vol. 7, No. 1). De Gruyter.
10. *Harvard Business Review*. (201x). *HBR's Must Reads on Strategy*.
11. J.S. Prabowo. (2009). *Kepemimpinan Strategis dalam Organisasi Militer*.
12. James Kouzes & Barry Z. Posner. (1987). *The Leadership Challenge*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
13. Joesoef, D. (2014). *Studi Strategi: Logika Ketahanan dan Pembangunan Nasional*. Penerbit Buku Kompas.
14. John Adair. (2010). *Strategic Leadership: How to Think and Plan Strategically and Provide Direction*. London: Koganpage.
15. John P. Kotter. (2012). *Leading Change*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard School Press.
16. Kaplan and Norton. (1996). *The Balance Score Card, The President and Fellows Harvard College*.
17. Leanne, Shelly. (2010). *Leadership The Barack Obama Way: Lessons on Teambuilding and Creating a Winning Culture in Challenging Times*. New York: McGraw-Hill
18. Marshall Goldsmith et al. (2003). *Global Leadership: The Next Generation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
19. Meena Bose. (1998). *Shaping and Signaling Presidential Policy: The National Security Decision Making of Eisenhower and Kennedy*. Texas A&M University Press.
20. Mashhour, M. J.-R. (2017). *Strategic Leadership*. "Ovidius" University Annals, Economic Sciences Series , 325-329.
21. Nathan Finney et al. (Ed.). *Military #Leadership in the 21st Century*. <http://thestrategybridge.com>
22. Navneet Bhushan & Kanwal Rai. (2004). *Strategic Decision Making: Applying the Analytic Hierarchy Process*. London: Springer-Verlag.
23. Richard L. Hughes & Katherine C. Beatty. (2014). *Becoming a Strategic Leader: Your Role in Your Organization's Enduring Success*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
24. Robert Elgie. (2015). *Studying Political Leadership: Foundations and Contending Accounts*.
25. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
26. Robert N. Lussier & Christopher F. Achua. (2010). *Leadership: Theory, Application & Skill Development*. Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning.
27. Simon Wootton & Terry Horne. (2010). *Strategic Thinking: A Nine Step Approach to Strategy and Leadership for Managers and Marketers*. 3rd Edition. London: Kogan Page Limited.
28. Soekarno (1930). *Indonesia menggugat*. Departemen Penerangan Republik Indonesia.

29. Stephen J. Gerras (Ed.). (2010). *Strategic Leadership Primer*. 3rd Edition. Carlisle Barracks, PA: Department of Command, Leadership and Management, US Army War College.
30. Wisnu Jatmiko, d. (2015). *Penulisan Artikel Ilmiah*. Depok: Universitas Indonesia.
31. Yusgiantoro, P. (2020). *Materi Kuliah Kepemimpinan Strategis*. Universitas Pertahanan.