

WORKING TITLE (FOR ARTICLE)

Play and prestige: re-enacting the *Serangan Umum 1 Maret* in Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

ABSTRACT

*Representations of history have become of increasing interest in social research, especially how these are altered in the context of changing political landscapes. While much emphasis has been laid on literary texts, bodily social memory has been neglected. This anthropological study explores the re-enactment of the Serangan Umum 1 Maret in Yogyakarta,, Indonesia, a battle between the Indonesian freedom fighters and the KNIL (Dutch army). It has sought to explore the sensory aspect or re-enactment and role-play, documented in a film called: 'title'. This article that accompanies the film will focus on the process of 'history writing' by providing the reader with explanatory knowledge, seeking to place the historicizing practices of its organizers, the Komunitas Djokjakarta 1945, into the changing landscape of representations of history in Indonesia. I will argue that, despite the controversies surrounding the Serangan Umum 1 Maret, the Komunitas chose to promote a **standardized**¹ narrative their (financial) dependency upon various state-sponsored institutions who have no interest in alternative views or reading against the grain. In contrast to earlier studies on re-enactment, I argue that in the case of the Komunitas, there seems to be little room critical re-examination of the past. Yet, individual motivations to participate in the Komunitas and re-enactment illustrate a desire for patriotism and nationalism that, according to my protagonists, is lacking in contemporary Indonesian society. In that sense, re-enactment can be described an expression of nostalgia that is not necessarily concerned with the past but rather with the present; a method by which some of my participants has sought to distinguish themselves from others of their generation by showing both their pride as well as concern with the Indonesian nation today.*

¹ I am still seeking for another term rather than 'standardized.'

STRUCTURE

Section	Form	What is in it?	Words
	Abstract		150
	Introduction	<p>A. Vivid vignette on the re-enactment</p> <p>B. Introduction to the my research population and their activities (especially the re-enactment)</p> <p>C. Summarize research objectives, research questions, relevance and methodology</p>	600
1	Theoretical framework	<p>A. Framework on history writing, specifically in Indonesia from 1945 till today, and use the controversy of the Serangan Umum 1 Maret as an example of these changes in history since the fall of Suharto</p> <p>Draws on research proposal Concepts: collective memory, politics of memory, sites of memory (<i>Les lieux de mémoire</i>) <u>Literature:</u> Zurbuchen (2005), Nora (1989), Alderman & Dwyer (2009), Bijl (2012), Watersoon & Woon (2012), Connerton (1989), Halbwachs (1992)</p>	800
		<p>B. Framework on re-enactment as a way to (re) interpret the past</p> <p>Draws on research proposal and new literature Concepts: Re-enactment, role-play, reflexivity <u>Literature:</u> William Dray on Collingwood (1995), Ten Brink (2012), Tyler (2009), Connerton (1989), Samuels (1994)</p>	600

2	Empirical	<p>A. Short description on the Komunitas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who are the members (describe also hierarchy) • Activities (focus on the re-enactment, finances of the re-enactment = links to military and museums) <p><u>Literature:</u> Hefner (2001) on hierarchy and stratification in Javanese culture</p>	700
		<p>B. On 'play'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-enactment is a way to realize a mythical world / imagined past • Constructed through material objects which they themselves create (uniforms, props, guns). Describe how the Komunitas' members emphasized how a certain 'knowledge' or 'skill' is also needed to make and therefore also wear these creations <u>Literature:</u> Ingold (2000) • In this process of creation, they strive towards authenticity. This claim of authenticity is also how they differentiate themselves from other historical groups. It is a mechanism for in- and ex-clusion <u>Evidence:</u> some people were rejected to participate in the re-enactment as their outfits were not considered; 'authentic' enough • Yet, 'authenticity' also 'created', leading to a simulacrum <u>Evidence:</u> guns are painted as if they have rust on them, 'modern' items are removed from the 'stage' of the re-enactment <u>Literature:</u> Radtchenko (2006) • Often, 'spectacle' is preferred over 'authenticity', making the re-enactment is therefore also a very aesthetic practice <u>Evidence:</u> the tank was not actually authentic as it was indeed from 1945 but did not operate in the Serangan umum 1 Maret <p>Concepts: masculinity, authenticity, simulacrum <u>Literature:</u> Miller (1998), Hefner (2001), Radtchenko (2006)</p>	1500

		<p>C. On 'prestige'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repeating importance of 'spectacle' and 'authenticity' and argue that the performance is not directed towards the audience but rather towards other participants, namely those of other historical societies. Description of the network of historical societies in Indonesia <u>Evidence:</u> little effort has been done to invite spectators while they claim to re-enact to educate people • Describe how within the network, most value seemed to be ascribed not to the performance or even experience but rather to representations of the event (videos and photos) <u>Evidence:</u> much more time and effort seemed to be invested in this aspect, and the Dutch role was more popular (even though it's the enemy) merely because the uniform is so <i>keren</i> (cool). Interviews Chandra Gusta, Ega, Mas Agung • These representations also highly edited to be 'authentic' <u>Evidence:</u> Chandra Gusta bringin a Dutch uniform merely to go on the picture with the (Dutch) tank • Description on the profile pictures on Facebook of the members of the Komunitas, all in military uniform. Describe how the Komunitas in my opinion wanted to be affiliated with the military <u>Evidence:</u> participating in ceremonies, referring to soldiers as 'hero's, some wanted to go in the military themselves such as Ega and Satriyo Literature: Anderson (2001) on the military as most powerful institution in Indonesia • Pose the question of re-enactment is a way (role-play) to temporarily feel as part of the military / being a soldier <p>Concepts: militarism, role-play <u>Literature:</u> Anderson (2001), Gapps (2009)</p>	1000
--	--	---	------

3	How do my findings relate to theory / previous studies? (Analysis)	<p><i>Argumentation:</i></p> <p>A. Return to research question on re-enactment as ‘alternative narrations of history’, problematize ‘alternative’ and reference to interviews with historians on what ‘alternative history’ means in Indonesia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Return to the Komunitas. First a description on how they promote themselves as educators of history and discussion. • Then a description on how they denied to take any political stance and how Ega was not even aware of the controversy surrounding the Serangan Umum 1 Maret <u>Evidence:</u> interviews with Ega, Mas Agung, Chandra Gusta, Mas Afuun • My analysis however suggests that ‘not choosing’ is also a choice: financial links to military and museums may influence their promotion of the common narrative And, next year potentially the family of Suharto will finance the event Additionally, the hierarchic structure of Komunitas leads to limited possibilities of critical re-examination of the past <u>Evidence:</u> Observations, Mas Penyo who determines distribution of the role, narration, etc • Back to literature on re-enactment that promotes critical re-examination of the past. Argument: in the Komunitas there seems to be limited room for this, at least collectively. 	500
		<p>B. Question that remains: but what does re-enactment then mean to them?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Back to the section on play and prestige and repeat the argument that re-enactment ‘realizes’ a mythical world, constructed through ‘authentic’ objects and spectacle for immersion • Success for the performance is determined in a network of historical societies • The creation of the ‘authentic’ world through material objects leads to a ‘hyper-reality’, a simulacrum. Photos and video’s (representations) of the re-enactment become more important and ‘real’ than the experience itself. • Back to literature: Radtchenko (2006) claims that in the alternative reality of re-enactment, a space is created in which a person can create the world he or she desires. Therefore, role-play seems to become a simulacrum: my protagonists were temporarily soldiers themselves, something they highly respected and looked up upon in daily life. (I do not know if role-play and simulacrum are theoretically compatible, should re-read the definitions) • Re-enactment in this case is therefore a way to profile yourself in the present, as a patriot and nationalist, by embodying your historical awareness <u>Literature:</u> theory on the performativity of identity by Butler and on ritual and construction of identity by Goffman, Schechner & Appel (1990) • Therefore it is also nostalgic, because this nationalism is what they frequently told me they are missing today. it is a kind of nostalgia that is not directed towards the past but 	900

		<p>rather the future</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> interviews with Ega, Ibu Bekt, Mas Agung</p> <p><u>Literature:</u> Svetlana Boym, Gotfredsen (2013), Melchior (2015), Sastramidjaja (2014), Fritzsche (2002), Anderson (2001)</p>	
	Conclusion	<p>A. Summarize findings</p> <p>Pose the question if this article completely rejects current literature on re-enactment?</p> <p>Answer: no it doesn't. De Groot (2009): re-enactment [does] reject the idea of a 'whole' and 'positivist' identity.</p>	250
		<p>B. Implications of the research</p> <p>Especially research is needed on this network of historical society and the role of social media within this</p>	200