



ATIKA KURNIA PUTRI & YUDA B. TANGKILISAN

Cultural Strategy and Regional Museum Construction during the New Order Era, 1975-1990

ABSTRACT: The transition of power from Guided Democracy government (1959-1966) to the New Order government (1966-1998) in Indonesia was colored by unstable social and political conditions. One of the political circumstances was a confrontation with Malaysia in 1963-1966. The New Order government actually had a relationship with the Western countries and Malaysia as its nearest neighbour. Differences in view of each regime affected all policies, one of which was in the field of culture. This study was using the qualitative approach and historical method, including by searching the library materials and primary sources in the ANRI (Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia or National Archive of the Republic of Indonesia) in Jakarta. Contemporary newspapers were also needed for writing materials, especially regarding the transfer of power from Old Order government to New Order government (1966-1968) in Indonesia. This study showed that in the early period, the New Order government erased community memories of Guided Democracy government legacies, in particular the influence of the PKI (Partai Komunis Indonesia or Indonesian Communist Party), and built a calm community memory through the museums. The study also showed that the period of Guided Democracy government (1959-1966), culture was used to support the course of the revolution. One of the cultural policies during the New Order period (1966-1998) was the rehabilitation and construction of a regional museum that was carried out in the PELITA (Pembangunan Lima Tahun or Five Year Development Plan) II in 1975 to 1995. Finally, the purpose of the establishment of a regional museum in every Province in Indonesia was to erase memories of Communism and build memories of the struggle to reach the New Order government to support the development in Indonesia.

KEY WORD: Guided Democracy Government; Regional Museums; New Order Government; Culture and Development Policy.

INTRODUCTION

The transition of power between Guided Democracy government (1959-1966) to the New Order government (1966-1998) was one of the major events for Indonesia. The situation of Guided Democracy, or the Old Order government, was marked by

economic crisis and political instability until the incident of the G-30-S (*Gerakan 30 September* or September 30th Movement) of 1965 allegedly carried out by the PKI (*Partai Komunis Indonesia* or Indonesian Communist Party) and her supporters (Simatupang, 1987:4; Feith, 1992:12; and Roosa, 2008).

About the Authors: Atika Kurnia Putri, M.Hum. is an Alumna of the Department of History, Faculty of Humanities UI (University of Indonesia) and currently working as a Freelance Researcher and interested in social, historical, and museum field. Dr. Yuda B. Tangkilisan is a Senior Lecturer at the Department of History, Faculty of Humanities UI (University of Indonesia), UI Campus of Depok, West Java, Indonesia. For academic interests, the Authors are able to be contacted via e-mails address at: atikakurniaputi@gmail.com and yebete@yahoo.com

Suggested Citation: Putri, Atika Kurnia & Yuda B. Tangkilisan. (2020). "Cultural Strategy and Regional Museum Construction during the New Order Era, 1975-1990" in *TAWARIKH: Journal of Historical Studies*, Volume 11(2), April, pp.159-180. Bandung, Indonesia: Minda Masagi Press owned by ASPENSI, with ISSN 2085-0980 (print) and ISSN 2685-2284 (online).

Article Timeline: Accepted (December 27, 2019); Revised (January 30, 2020); and Published (April 30, 2020).

This incident caused various responses from the community, one of which was an action carried out by the students. The action that took place in early 1966, which was driven by KAMI (*Kesatuan Aksi Mahasiswa Indonesia* or Indonesian Students Action United), took place from January 10 to March 11, 1966. The first action took place on January 8, 1966, which was followed by thousands of people demanding lower prices for the goods (Anwar, 1980:3; Raillon, 1985; and Hadi, 2020). In the next action on January 10, 1966, students had gathered in the courtyard of the FK-UI (*Fakultas Kedokteran – Universitas Indonesia* or Faculty of Medicine – University of Indonesia) in Jakarta to prepare for an action. In this action, the students then formulated the TRITURA, abbreviation of *Tri Tuntutan Rakyat* or Three People's Demands (cf Wibowo, 1970; Suwirta, 2018; and Erlina, 2020),¹ as a momentum of early emerging of the New Order government as opposing the Old Order government (cf Simatupang, 1987; Feith, 1992; Vatikiotis, 1994; Said, 2014; and Erlina, 2020).²

Action continued by students until March 11, 1966, when President Soekarno issued a SUPERSEMAR (*Surat Perintah 11 Maret* or March 11th Warrant) of 1966, delegating power to Lieutenant General Soeharto of TNI-AD (*Tentara Nasional Indonesia-Angkatan Darat* or Indonesian National Military-Army) to take actions deemed necessary

¹TRITURA is an acronym for *Tri Tuntutan Rakyat* (Three People's Demands), namely: Disband the PKI (*Partai Komunis Indonesia* or Indonesian Communist Party); overhaul the DWIKORA (*Dwi Komando Rakyat* or Two People's Commands) of President Soekarno's Cabinet; and Reduce the Price of Goods, voiced by the students who were members of the KAMI (*Kesatuan Aksi Mahasiswa Indonesia* or Indonesian Students Action United). This demands were launched in an action carried out on January 10 to March 11, 1966.

²The "Old Order" was a term that emerged after the fall of the President Soekarno and his Guided Democracy regime (1959-1966). The term "Old Order" was popularized by the Indonesian Military-Army, who supported the realization of the New Order government. The Old Order government was identified with political instability, the economic crisis, and the development of the PKI (*Partai Komunis Indonesia* or Indonesian Communist Party). This term was widely used by researchers or writers, who provided support for the realization of the New Order government, including writers from the Indonesian Military-Army group. The Constitutional Democracy (1950-1959) and Guided Democracy (1959-1966) could no longer be used, when used for President Soekarno's leadership.

to ensure the security, calm, and stability of the government and revolution (Crouch, 1999:209; Wardaya, 2009; and Adam, 2018). This order letter was, then, considered to be a "powerful letter" used by Soeharto and his the AD (*Angkatan Darat* or Army) to clean up all those who had been involved in PKI activities deemed responsible for the events of the movement (Crouch, 1999; Roosa, 2008; and Tornquist, 2017:277).

When the MPRS (*Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat Sementara* or Provisional People's Consultative Assembly) session on June 20, 1966, SUPERSEMAR's position strengthened to the MPRS Decree, which could not be repealed by President Soekarno and took effect until the formation of a new Assembly through the General Elections. In 1967, through MPRS Decree No.XXXIII/MPRS/1967, General Soeharto was appointed as Acting President and President Soekarno was banned from conducting political activities. General Soeharto officially became President until a General Election was held through the fifth session of the MPRS in March 1968 (Roeder, 1969:200; Sundhaussen, 1986:415; and Abdulsalam, 2018).

Indonesia entered a new era by the appointment of Soeharto as President and by anti-Soekarnoists as well as anti-Communist; and the Indonesian Military-Army, this period, called as the "New Order".³ The focus of the policies implemented during the New Order government period was economic policy to deal with the crisis and to establish the Five-Year Development Plan I or REPELITA I (*Rencana Pembangunan Lima Tahun*) in 1969. The condition of the Indonesian economy at

³The understanding of the "New Order" government was officially announced at the Plenary Session of the AMPERA (*Amanat Penderitaan Rakyat* or the Mandate of People's Suffering)'s Cabinet on April 19, 1967, by the Acting President, General Soeharto. The "New Order" was the whole order of the life of the people of *Bangsa* (Nation) and the Republic of Indonesia, which was placed on the purity of the *Pancasila* (Five Basic Principles of the Republic of Indonesia) and the 1945 Constitution. The "New Order" was born because of the response to fraud that occurred during the "Old Order" government. In addition, the "New Order" had the determination, mentality, and good intention to serve the people and national interests based on *Pancasila* and the 1945 Constitution. See, for example, President Soeharto's Speech to the Plenary Session of the AMPERA's Cabinet, on April 19, 1967, as shown in MPR RI (1983); Abdul Hadi (2020); and T. Erlina (2020).

the beginning of the New Order government had achieved a fairly good monetary stability; and national income had increased rapidly and continuously throughout the decades of 1967 to 1977 (Booth *et al.*, 1986:1; Hadi & Kasuma, 2012; and Fareza, 2016).

In addition to the economy, the New Order government also focused on eliminating all elements related to Communism and the PKI in Indonesia through policies in the fields of culture and education. The New Order government was known as the “development order” and demands a stable condition of society. After development can take place, it also required national safety and security, so that the condition of society remained stable and long-term development can be continued. The national development of the New Order era had a central point, namely human development and cultural development. In carrying out cultural development, the New Order government needed to organize culture through policy. The influence of the PKI, and the understanding of Communism, must also not develop; this was the focus of the government during the New Order (Moertopo, 1973; Hoemardani, 1981:10; Syahrie, 2009; Fareza, 2016; and Anderson, 2017:211).

In this article, we will explain cultural politics during the New Order government era, which gave birth to the policy of building a Provincial Museums. Museum policy in all Provinces in Indonesia played a role in efforts to forgotten memories of the Old Order government and built collective memories about the New Order government. Cultural polemic events, that occurred since the 1960s, as the root of the national cultural debate related to the policy. Through collective museums and memories, the New Order government legitimized power and built a national culture for its interests and survival. The New Order government version of the past development process involved a number of figures and roles of government agencies.

RESEARCH METHODS

In analyzing the cultural strategy and the building of Provincial Museums in Indonesia, which were related to the development of collective memory during the New Order

government era (1966-1998), we used the historical methods. Evidence about the past was classified in two ways, namely: primary sources and secondary sources. Primary sources were determined based on their authenticity and credibility; and their ability to present information that was relevant to the research topic. Primary sources were usually in the form of written documents. Historical sources with the type of written document may be letters, meeting documents, employment contracts, and receipts (Gottschalk, 1986; Sjamsuddin, 2007; Pratono, 2010; Kuntowijoyo, 2013:74; and Rahman, 2017).

Archives and written documents were generally placed as primary sources, because they were created in a contemporary setting. Proximity to events had made subjectivity minimized. The collection of sources, or *heuristics*, was carried out in several places, such as the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia in Jakarta; the National Library of the Republic of Indonesia in Jakarta; and the Ranggawarsita Museum in Surakarta, Central Java, Indonesia (Lohanda, 1998; Sjamsuddin, 2007; and Rahman, 2017).

In addition, source tracking was also carried out at the *Suara Merdeka* (Voice of Freedom) Archive Depot in the National Library of the Republic of Indonesia in Jakarta. The primary source obtained at the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia, specifically the Directorate General of Culture, the Directorate of Museum and Cultural Heritage Objects was the manual for the construction of the Provincial Museum and documents for the establishment of the Provincial Museum. The National Library of the Republic of Indonesia and the *Suara Merdeka* Archives Depot provided data on contemporary newspapers, such as *Suara Merdeka*. Another newspaper, namely *Berita Yudha* (War News), was a collection of newspapers from the Press Monument in Solo, Central Java, Indonesia. Other contemporaries used was *Intisari* (Summary) magazine published in Jakarta (Kartodirjo, 1993; Lohanda, 1998; and Kuntowijoyo, 2013;).

The source criticism process was carried

out by carrying out external and internal testing of sorted and selected sources. Furthermore, the information obtained from the study of these sources was understood, interpreted, and explained in the framework of the analysis of cultural structures and the construction of the Provincial Museums of the New Order government era (Byrskog, 2001; Sjamsuddin, 2007; Pratono, 2010; Kuntowijoyo, 2013; and Rahman, 2017).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The study of museum construction and collective memory in the context of cultural strategies has been carried out by a number of experts, such as Jörgen Hellman (2003); Katherine McGregor (2003); Tod Jones (2015); and other scholars. Katherine McGregor (2003) and other scholars, for example, discussed uniform narratives and storylines at the TNI (*Tentara Nasional Indonesia* or Indonesia National Military)'s Museum at the national level in Jakarta (cf Hellman, 2003; McGregor, 2003; Sudarmadi, 2014; Jones, 2015; and Zhang *et al.*, 2018).

However, the discussion on the construction of the Provincial Museum still shows the spaces that need to be filled. This discussion seeks to reveal and explain the policy of constructing a Provincial Museum that occurred during the New Order government. A series of cultural events in the Old Order government (1959-1966) underlied the cultural strategy of the New Order government (1966-1998). One of the cultural strategies of the New Order government era was the construction of Museums in each Province throughout Indonesia (Jones, 2012 and 2015; Sudarmadi, 2014; and Sellato, 2015).

Culture Development. Political and community stability as well as economic development during the New Order government era (1966-1998) were greatly maintained. This was driven by conditions during the Old Order governments, namely the Constitutional Democracy government (1950-1959) and Guided Democracy government (1959-1966) conditions of society that were unstable and prone to chaos, even though the climate of democracy

was maintained and there were debates about culture (McGregor, 2003; Karsono, 2013; and Jones, 2015).

During the New Order government era, culture was arranged to create a stable society and avoid conflict. The government regulated culture not only to make society harmonious, but also to incorporate cultural values in accordance with the objectives of the New Order government (Jones, 2005 and 2012; Saidi, 2007; and Setyawan, 2019).

In the first section of the analysis, we will analyze the cultural polemic that occurred during the Guided Democracy government era between LEKRA (*Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat* or Institute of People Culture) and the MANIKEBU (*Manifesto Kebudayaan* or Cultural Manifesto) group. The two groups debated the creation of culture in the 1960s (Supartono, 2000; Suwirta, 2008; and Susanti, Supriatna & Sumantri, 2019).

Since the New Order government succeeded in legitimizing its authority, the MANIKEBU group had dominated the formulation of national culture. LEKRA, as a rival of the MANIKEBU group, was forced to disperse and many of its members were jailed for being close to the PKI (*Partai Komunis Indonesia* or Indonesian Communist Party) and accused of being involved in the left ideologies' movement. This event became a milestone in the formulation of national culture during the New Order government era (Jones, 2005 and 2012; Saidi, 2007; and Setyawan, 2019).

The construction of monuments and museums during the Guided Democracy government (1959-1966) as one step to build community's memory of a regime. The MONAS (*Monumen Nasional* or National Monument) in Jakarta was an example of a monument that was built during the Guided Democracy government and shifted its construction during the New Order government era. In this context, Katherine McGregor (2003), and other scholars, saw that the building of MONAS was a reflection of the two ruling regimes (McGregor, 2003; Zurbuchen, ed., 2005; and Susilo & Suryaningsih, 2015).

During the Guided Democracy

government, MONAS represented socialism and sacrifice for the sake of national unity. This narrative, then, changed in the New Order government era to be militaristic and gave rise to military figures, such as Pangeran Diponegoro, a hero in Java war, 1825-1830; and General Soedirman, a father of Indonesian Military-Army in the time of independence revolution, 1945-1950 (cf McGregor, 2003:104-109; Saidi, 2007; Heuken, 2008; Zurbuchen, ed., 2005; and Susilo & Suryaningsih, 2015).

Cultural Polemic (1950-1965). Cultural policies during the New Order government (1966-1998) cannot be separated from cultural policies during the Guided Democracy government (1959-1966). At this time, there was a cultural polemic involving the Communists, or adherents of Social Realism, and Liberals, adherents of Cultural Manifesto. Cultural awareness emerged long before independence occurred and became a tool for the struggle to achieve independence (Jones, 2005; Saidi, 2007; and Suwirta, 2018).

Koentjaraningrat (2015), and other scholars, argued that cultural awareness as a tool of struggle began to emerge, when the founding of modern organizations in the early 20th century, namely: *Budi Utomo* (Good Character) organization in 1908; *Jong Java* (Javanese Youth) organization in 1915; *Jong Sumatranen Bond* (Association of Sumatranese Youth) organization in 1917; *Jong Celebes* (Sulawesi Youth) in 1918; *Sekar Roekoen* (Association of Flower as Symbol for Sundanese Youth) organization in 1919; and *Jong Bataks Bond* (Association of Batak Youth) organization in 1925, all were the organizations based on the ethno-nationalism in Indonesia (Adams, 2006; Ricklefs, 2008; Jones, 2015; and Koentjaraningrat, 2015).⁴

The peak of Indonesian nationalism awareness was at the Indonesian Youth Congress in October 1928 in Jakarta, as a milestone in Indonesian nationalism. At that meeting, there was a declaration that came

⁴Understanding culture was a total of thoughts, works, and masterpieces that were not rooted in their instincts and only because of that humans can be triggered after the learning process. See, for example, Kathleen M. Adams (2006); and Koentjaraningrat (2015:11).

to be known as the *Sumpah Pemuda* or Youth Pledge.⁵ In that event, there began to be a unity of understanding that was regional to national levels (Foulcher, 2000; Ricklefs, 2008; and Suwirta, 2015).

The debate about the direction and concept of culture began to heat up in 1960s. LEKRA (*Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat* or Institute of People Culture), who persisted with the concept of Socialist Realism, felt her position was quite strong, because it was supported by President Soekarno. The strong development of LEKRA, from year to year, was also the reason that the influence of Socialist Realism strongly colors the direction of culture (Foulcher, 1987; TB Tempo, 2014; and Day & Liem eds., 2018).

In this context, Keith Foulcher (1969 and 1987), and other scholars, stated that the initial disagreement in the direction of culture was motivated by the emergence of the *Surat Kepercayaan Gelanggang* (Letter of Arena Trust), initiated by Chairil Anwar on February 18, 1950. In this letter, Chairil Anwar stated that humans were the only universal reality (Foulcher, 1969 and 1987; Lindsay & Liem eds., 2012; and Teguh, 2019b). In the same year, LEKRA established as a cultural organization that carried Socialist Realism as a cultural concept. LEKRA expressed her disagreement with the *Surat Kepercayaan Gelanggang*, which carried the mission of universality; because for LEKRA, culture, art, and education must have political objectives (Foulcher, 1969 and 1987; Heinschke, 1996; and Supartono, 2000).

The debate related to culture was emerged since BMKN (*Badan Musyawarah Kebudayaan Nasional* or National Cultural Deliberation Board)'s Congress, which was held in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia, in 1960. BMKN was

⁵The *Sumpah Pemuda* (Youth Pledge) declaration was prepared by Muhammad Yamin. The contents of the declaration were: "*Kami Poetra-poetri Indonesia mengakoe bertoempah darah jang satoe, Tanah Air Indonesia; Kami Poetra-poetri Indonesia mengakoe berbangsa jang satoe, Bangsa Indonesia; Kami Poetra-poetri Indonesia mendjoendjoeng bahasa persatoean, Bahasa Indonesia*" (We are the Indonesian Male-Female Youth acknowledge the one land of birth, the Motherland of Indonesia; We are the Indonesian Male-Female Youth acknowledge the one nation, the Nation of Indonesian; We are the Indonesian Male-Female Youth uphold the language of unity, the Language of Indonesia). See, for example, Keith Foulcher (2000:4); and Andi Suwirta (2015).

dominated by artists, intellectuals, and cultural figures, who generally supported the cultural universality, or liberals thinking. This was immediately opposed by LEKRA as a member of the BMKN (Heinschke, 1996; Lindsay & Liem eds., 2012; and Jones, 2015:108).

In this Congress, LEKRA's role was to reject ideas about universal humanism and art for art. A representative from LEKRA submitted a resolution proposing that BMKN accepted Manipol/USDEK (*Manifesto Politik/Undang-Undang Dasar 1945, Sosialisme, Demokrasi Terpimpin, dan Kepribadian Nasional* or Political Manifesto on 1945 Constitution, Socialism, Guided Democracy, and National Character) as a basis for its work in the future (Foulcher, 1969 and 1987; Moeljanto & Ismail, 1995:35; and Kurniadi & Ahyat, 2014).⁶ At the end of the Congress, published a stencil sheet containing poetry to the Congress participants. This poem contained other resolutions besides Manipol/USDEK as the basis of national cultural development. This poem was signed by five poets (Foulcher, 1969 and 1987; Moeljanto & Ismail, 1995:36; and Farram, 2014).⁷

In response to the publication of the poetry resolution, LEKRA stated its disapproval of universal humanism in several lectures, one of which was at the Faculty of Literature at Gadjah Mada University in Yogyakarta by Bakri Siregar. LEKRA's attitude rejected universal humanism, because this concept was considered anti-revolutionary, but that did not mean that LEKRA rejected the humanism. LEKRA approved concrete humanism and took sides with the people; because for LEKRA, universal humanism was

an abstract and impartial concept (Moeljanto & Ismail, 1995:39; Day & Liem eds., 2018; and Teguh, 2019a).

In 1963, a group of writers affiliated with *Sastra* (Literature) magazine, led by H.B. Jassin, issued a document that came to be known as the MANIKEBU (*Manifesto Kebudayaan* or Cultural Manifesto). This document was compiled by Wiratmo Soekito and was completed on August 17, 1963 (Foulcher, 1969:439; Moeljanto & Ismail, 1995; Jones, 2015:125).⁸ Goenawan Mohamad and Bokor Hutasahtut, then, duplicated and spread it to intellectual circles to expect comments and criticisms (Moeljanto & Ismail, 1995; Supartono, 2000; and TB Tempo, 2014).

The MANIKEBU contained the statements of attitude in culture, namely "Universal Humanism". On August 23, 1963, several writers, artists, and cultural figures held a meeting in Jakarta, precisely on the banks of the Ciliwung River, to discuss the MANIKEBU. This meeting produced provisions or resolutions, among others, MANIKEBU in principle could not be changed anymore and MANIKEBU was not a priori in leading to cultural organizations (Moeljanto & Ismail, 1995:48; Jones, 2005; and Farram, 2014).

The MANIKEBU was a reaction from the political climate that influenced the culture during the Guided Democracy government period (1959-1966). The MANIKEBU, at the same time, represented a systematic formula that ran the position across from LEKRA. It was not only the signatory of the MANIKEBU, which was a supporter of this formula, but also writers and humanists who previously had the same ideas as the MANIKEBU, or who joined after the MANIKEBU was proclaimed. An immediate and violent reaction was directed to the MANIKEBU. The LEKRA members, for example, were

⁶The *Surat Kepercayaan Gelanggang* (Letter of Arena Trust) was a letter written by a group of authors, who were members of the *Gelanggang's* culture magazine. Aside from Chairil Anwar, Asrul Sani also played a role in the preparation of this letter. See, for example, "World Cultural Center" in Herbert Feith & Lance Castels eds. (1988:240); D.S. Moeljanto & Taufiq Ismail (1995); and Alexander Supartono (2000).

⁷LEKRA (*Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat* or Institute of People Culture)'s Deputy envoys at the BMKN (*Badan Musyawarah Kebudayaan Nasional* or National Cultural Deliberation Board)'s Congress were Joebaar Ajob, Basoeki Resobowo, Boejoeng Saleh, and Rivai Apin. While, Wiratmo Soekito was a Catholic intellectual, who stood out in the intellectual and cultural movements. Wiratmo Soekito also actively wrote about literature and culture from 1950 to 1960. See, for example, Keith Foulcher (1969:438); D.S. Moeljanto & Taufiq Ismail (1995:35); and Irfan Teguh (2019b).

⁸The five people who signed the poem were Dodong Djiwaprada, Ajip Rosidi, Ramadhan K.H., Toto Sudarto Bachtiar, and Saini K.M. Meanwhile, the writers, artists, and cultural figures who joined in this meeting included Trisno Sumardjo, Zaini, H.B. Jassin, Wiratmo Sukito, Bokor Hutasahtut, Goenawan Mohamad, Bur Rasuanto, A. Bastari, Asnin, Ras Siregar, Djufri Tanissan, Soe Hok Djin (Arief Budiman), Sjahwil, and D.S. Moeljanto. See, for example, D.S. Moeljanto & Taufiq Ismail (1995:36 and 48); Alexander Supartono (2000); and Irfan Teguh (2019b).

the first to give a rejection reaction to the MANIKEBU and its Universal Humanism. Bakri Siregar, in November 1964, clearly stated his rejection of the MANIKEBU. He stated that the MANIKEBU did not support revolution, counter revolution, and deserved to be crushed. If seen from the reaction given, the MANIKEBU was already a political issue (Foulcher, 1969:440 and 1987; Moeljanto & Ismail, 1995; Supartono, 2000; Jones, 2005; and Susanti, Supriatna & Sumantri, 2019).

The all KKPI (*Konferensi Karyawan Pengarang Indonesia* or Indonesian Author Employees Conference) was a conference held in March 1964. This conference was initiated by members of the MANIKEBU and planned to be attended by authors and cultural organizations, and coincided with the Afro-Asian Writers Conference. LEKRA stated the boycott over the implementation of this event. The members of the MANIKEBU assumed that LEKRA had cornered the KKPI program by calling KK-PSI (*Konferensi Karyawan – Partai Sosialis Indonesia* or Indonesia Socialist Party – Employees Conference). The abbreviation was intentionally mistaken to get community support to jointly boycott the conference. The PSI itself had been banned earlier by the President Soekarno government. With the support of the Indonesian Army and A.H. (Abdul Haris) Nasution, the KKPI was well organized and the Afro-Asia Writers' Conference was never held (Foulcher, 1969:442 and 1986; Ismail, 1972; Nasution, 1990; Moeljanto & Ismail, 1995:50; and Supartono, 2000).

LKN (*Lembaga Kebudayaan Nasional* or National Cultural Institute)'s attitude, owned by PNI (*Partai Nasional Indonesia* or Indonesian National Party), in addressing this conflict was not firm and more towards pressuring the MANIKEBU and continuing to support the Manipol/USDEK. The same was done by cultural organizations under political parties, such as the LESBUMI (*Lembaga Seni dan Budaya Muslim Indonesia* or Indonesian Muslim Cultural and Art Institute). On April 15, 1964, a report to attack the MANIKEBU considered the Manifesto Cultural anti-revolutionary and hypocritical (Foulcher, 1969:444 and 1986; Moeljanto & Ismail,

1995; and Supartono, 2000).

The MANIKEBU practically did not have the support of other cultural organizations and the government. On May 8, 1964, President Soekarno issued a decree banning the MANIKEBU. Two days later, H.B. Jassin wrote a letter of apology to the President Soekarno. The polemic that occurred in the 1960s was not only limited in terms of culture and art, but had led to political battles. LEKRA and PKI came out as temporary winners in this polemic, because they managed to control the situation. The event of the movement was a turning point, the PKI was charged with being responsible for the murder of six Generals of the Indonesian Army in the G-30-S (*Gerakan 30 September* or September 30th Movement) of 1965, and all members of PKI (*Partai Komunis Indonesia* or Indonesian Communist Party) were killed and jailed without trial. The LEKRA was included, many members were imprisoned and killed. The MANIKEBU group climbed up in the New Order era (1966-1998) and the government gave full support (Ismail, 1972; Herlambang, 2016; and Latief, 2018).

Legitimated Power of the New Order Government. The congress and cultural polemic, that took place in the period of 1950 to 1965, showed that there were competing elements in power. In this situation, President Soekarno encouraged the issuance of provisions relating to political activities. This was where the state element played its role to start its legitimacy to oversee the activities and movements of the people. This showed that to see and analyze the way the New Order government legitimated power, one must look at the previous regime, Guided Democracy government (Purnaweni, 2004; Ricklefs, 2008; and Herlambang, 2016).

During the Guided Democracy government, the political situation was unstable and compounded by the economic crisis. In the early days of the New Order government, political culture developed from new leadership and was focused on the normalization of the political situation, suppressing conflict, and economic development (Vatikiotis, 1994:33; Ricklefs, 2008; and Zanden & Marks, 2012:307).

The development of the New Order government as a governance system increasingly enacted strict regulations on the people under the pretext of creating national stability. The New Order government, then, can achieved establishment by trying to normalize all elements of society. In realizing a normal society and minimal turmoil, it often used a repressive way. During the New Order government period (1966-1998), the role of the state was getting stronger in mastering the discourse of socio-political thought in the community. Mastery of this discourse was done by controlling public space, imagination, creativity of the community, and control of cultural discourse (Latif & Ibrahim eds., 1996:27-28; Ricklefs, 2008; and Herlambang, 2016).

The incident of G-30-S (*Gerakan 30 September* or September 30th Movement) of 1965 was the turning point of the fall of the Old Order or Guided Democracy government (1959-1966) and the birth of a new era, namely the New Order government (1966-1998). Based on the incident of G-30-S of 1965, the New Order government upheld its legitimacy and built a government as well as a stable society. After the cleansing action on all PKI (*Partai Komunis Indonesia* or Indonesian Communist Party) ranks and members, the New Order government immediately developed a discourse to overcome Communist dangers (McGregor, 2003; Jones, 2015; and Herlambang, 2016).

The state appeared as a protector and a threat, that came from the ideology adopted by the state, was considered an enemy. Communist, Socialist, and Islamic movements were considered to be the cause of instability in society and must be eradicated at the root. One of the New Order government actions to uphold the legitimacy of power was to carry out legal proceedings against the alleged perpetrators of the movement, which killed six Indonesian Army Generals (Ricklefs, 2008; Jenkins, 2010; and Herlambang, 2016).

Before the court process was carried out, the PKI had been declared as a political party that had to be dismissed. This ban included all PKI activities related to the spread of Marxism and Leninism. Not only PKI, this also applied to organizations that

were under the auspices of the PKI, such as GERWANI (*Gerakan Wanita Indonesia* or Indonesian Women's Movement); LEKRA (*Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat* or Institute of People Culture); SOBSI (*Sentral Organisasi Buruh Seluruh Indonesia* or the Central of All Indonesian Labours' Organizations); and all of its networks in regions, especially Java. One of them was carried out by *Anshor* Youth, a branch of NU (*Nahdlatul Ulama* or Islamic Cleric's Awakening) organization; and anti-Communist youth, such as HMI (*Himpunan Mahasiswa Islam* or Islamic Student Association) and PII (*Pelajar Islam Indonesia* or Indonesian Islamic Students for Secondary School), in which they occupied and burned the PKI Headquarters on Jalan Kramat Raya, Jakarta (Nasution, 1967:155; Roeder, 1969:39; Sulastomo, 1991; Saidi, 2007; and Latief, 2018).

The PKI's situation was increasingly cornered as evidenced by the fact that there were almost no groups that supported it. The KAP (*Komite Aksi Pengganyangan* or Crush Action Committee) for G-30-S of 1965 was an anti-Communist organization, which held a meeting in Surapati Park, Central Jakarta; and was attended by more than 42 political parties and mass organizations. In this meeting, they read out statements containing support for President Soekarno, expressing condolences, and urging the President Soekarno to dismiss the PKI. They also demanded to clean the entire DWIKORA (*Dwi Komando Rakyat* or Two People's Commands)' Cabinet, government institutions at the central and regional levels of the PKI elements. Finally, they demanded the death penalty for perpetrators involved in the incident of G-30-S of 1965 (Sulastomo, 1991; Abdullah *et al.*, 2003:305-306; Ricklefs, 2008; Karsono, 2013; and Erlina, 2020).

The Indonesian Army played a major role in the PKI clean-up operation that took place in Java. In his writings, A.H. (Abdul Haris) Nasution explained about the court process, which was carried out to the Indonesian Military involved in the G-30-S of 1965. This court was from 1966 to 1967, which also planned to judge President Soekarno, because he was considered to have been involved in

the incident of G-30-S of 1965 (Nasution, 1967:50; Crouch, 1999; and Erlina, 2020).

The MPRS (*Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat Sementara* or Provisional People's Consultative Assembly) raised objections to President Soekarno's accountability speech entitled *Nawaksara* (Nine Statements) and expressed support for the actions taken by Lieutenant General Soeharto after the issuance of the SUPERSEMAR (*Surat Perintah 11 Maret* or March 11th Warrant) of 1966. Formally, President Soekarno was the Supreme Leader in the AMPERA (*Amanat Penderitaan Rakyat* or the Mandate of People's Suffering)'s Cabinet, but his daily tasks were mostly carried out by First Deputy Prime Minister, General Soeharto. Within this Cabinet were President Soekarno's confidants, such as Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX, Adam Malik, Frans Seda, and Sutami, who then turned slowly to support the New Order government (Crouch, 1999; Ricklefs, 2008; Hadi *et al.*, 2017:652; Abdulsalam, 2018; and Erlina, 2020).

The first focus of the AMPERA Cabinet was the recovery of the economic sector, due to economic conditions that were experiencing a crisis. The AMPERA Cabinet policy was also focused on reducing the influence of Communism in Indonesia. In the early days of the New Order government, important positions were dominated by the Indonesian Military, mainly the Army. The consolidation of power was built by General Soeharto by placing the Army in strategic positions, such as the economy and defense. The New Order government in the early days of power was still trying to unite the forces (Crouch, 1999; Elson, 2001; and Prihatanti, Maskun & Syaiful, 2019).

Besides the Indonesian Military-Army, students were also the power of the New Order government at the beginning of their power. Students, who supported the establishment of the New Order, put their trust in this government. Student groups, such as the KAMI (*Kesatuan Aksi Mahasiswa Indonesia* or Indonesian Student Action United), were driven by cooperation between the Indonesian Military-Army and Students. The relationship created cooperation between the New Order government and

Students to enforce a social and political new order in Indonesia (Raillon, 1985:12; Abdulsalam, 2018; Suwirta, 2018; Erlina, 2020; and Hadi, 2020).

The cooperation that was pioneered in harmony was broken up in 1974, during the MALARi (*Malapetaka 15 Januari* or January 15th Havoc)'s incident. The incident was carried out during the visit of the Japanese Prime Minister, Kakuei Tanaka, to Indonesia. The visit was motivated by the collaboration between the New Order government and Japan in the economic sector, namely investment and energy (Fatah, 1999; Yogaswara, 2009; Lasut, 2011:86; Jazimah, 2013; and Suwirta, 2019).

One of the Indonesian Army Officers, who was the target of Students protest, was Ali Moertopo. Furthermore, Ali Moertopo played a role in determining the direction of culture during the New Order government. Ali Moertopo (1978) argued that culture as a force, that created continuously, was created through national security, carried out continuously through national development. Furthermore, Ali Moertopo (1978) said that national culture was a degree of heightening the humanity of the Indonesian people. Ali Moertopo (1978), in interpreting the cultural strategy, was very militaristic and the command model, that culture was a strategy to build society. The way to carry out cultural strategies was through education in Indonesia (*cf* Moertopo, 1978:9; Jones, 2015; and Setyawan, 2019). One of the educational media outside the school that was built during the New Order government era was the Provincial Museums.

Cultural Strategy during the New Order Government Era. Stability and development were two words that related to the New Order government era (1966-1998). The New Order government carried out stabilization in all fields, especially in the political, economic, and security fields. These three fields were prioritized by the New Order government, because of the crisis that occurred in 1965. Stabilization in the political and security fields was carried out in all regions in Indonesia, especially those that were the basis of the PKI (*Partai Komunis Indonesia*

or Indonesian Communist Party). As a large and growing Communist in Indonesia, the PKI had a lot of influence during the Guided Democracy government (1959-1966). One effect was to spread the teachings of Communism's ideology rooted in the thoughts of Karl Marx and Vlademir Lenin (Karsono, 2013; Permata, 2015; and Herlambang, 2016).

The New Order government considered the PKI as an organization responsible for the G-30-S (*Gerakan 30 September* or September 30th Movement) of 1965's incident and was officially banned since 1966. The New Order government, through the Indonesian Military-Army, eradicated the PKI and related organizations to its roots. The cleansing of PKI members, sympathizers, and related organizations was carried out in all regions of Indonesia, especially those that were the basis of PKI. The New Order government also tried to clear the influence of the PKI in various fields, one of which was culture. The PKI, through its cultural organization, LEKRA (*Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat* or Institute of People Culture), heavily colored the cultural dynamics of the Guided Democracy government era (1959-1966). During the New Order government, the cleansing of PKI's elements was also strengthened by placing the PKI and Communism ideology as a danger that must be removed (Ismail, 1972; Setneg RI, 1994; Lev ed., 2008:97; Lane, 2012; and Said, 2014).

In the field of culture, the New Order government tried to clean up the PKI elements by implementing a cultural strategy. Culture, which during the Guided Democracy government supported the revolution; during the New Order government, the culture was directed to support development. In this context, Ali Moertopo (1973 and 1978) was a key figure who organized culture as a strategy to support development. The cultural strategy was, then, derived from the REPELITA II (*Rencana Pembangunan Lima Tahun Kedua* or Second Five-Year Development Plan), starting in 1975. One of the policies in REPELITA II was the rehabilitation and construction of Museums in all Provinces in Indonesia (*cf* Moertopo, 1973 and 1978; Rajab, 2004; Karsono, 2013; Masitho, 2013; and Mayrudin, 2018).

Besides that, the development in the wide cultural field during the New Order government period was TMII (*Taman Mini Indonesia Indah* or Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park). The New Order government gave more attention to the field of culture by building monuments, museums, and cultural assets. The same was done by the President Soekarno during the Guided Democracy government period (1959-1966). The difference in the construction of monuments and museums during the Guided Democracy and the New Order governments was in the values introduced to the community. Guided Democracy government, through MONAS (*Monumen Nasional* or National Monument) in Jakarta, for example, saw to arouse the spirit of revolution and the pride of the people to achieve Socialism. The New Order government (1966-1998), through the renovation of MONAS, the construction of the TMII, and the Provincial Museums, aimed at understanding the values of *Pancasila* (Five Basic Principles of the Republic of Indonesia) for the national development (Heuken, 2008; Susilo & Suryaningsih, 2015; Argenti, 2016; and Raditya, 2018).

During the New Order government period, the role of the state was getting stronger in mastering the discourse of socio-political thought in the community. The mastery of this discourse was done by controlling public space, imagination, community creativity, and control of cultural discourse (Latif & Ibrahim eds., 1996; Sudibyo, 1998; Moser, 2008; Anderson, 2017; and Oktaviani & Pramadya, 2019).

Control over the mastery of discourse during the New Order government began with the replacement of terms used during the Guided Democracy government. The terms on *revolution*, *anti-imperialism*, and *socialism* were no longer used during the New Order government era. This regime chose to replace the *Guided Democracy* with *Pancasila* Democracy. The New Order government also emphasized that all political parties, mass organizations, and community groups returned to the values of *Pancasila* or five basic principles of the Republic of Indonesia (Sudibyo, 1998; Mahfud, 2003; Purnaweni,

2004; Anderson, 2017; and Sudrajat, 2019).

The New Order government took the opposite position of Guided Democracy government in all fields, especially in terms of cultural discourse. The cultural polemic that occurred during the Guided Democracy government became a struggle that was eventually won by the MANIKEBU (*Manifesto Kebudayaan* or Cultural Manifesto). While the LEKRA (*Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat* or Institute of People Culture) and Socialist Realism thinkings have disappeared with PKI sympathizers in the cleansing action (Ismail, 1972; Heinschke, 1996; Supartono, 2000; Toer, 2000; Kurniawan, 2006; and TB Tempo, 2014).

Artists and writers who were involved in LEKRA activities and became part of the adherents of Socialist Realism were forced to take part in safekeeping and imprisonment on Buru island in Maluku. Pramoedya Ananta Toer, for example, was one of the writers who was exiled on Buru island for being a member of LEKRA. In addition, Pramoedya Ananta Toer's works, such as *Bumi Manusia* (Earth of Mankind); *Anak Semua Bangsa* (Son of All Nations); *Jejak Langkah* (Foot Steps); *Rumah Kaca* (Glass House); and his autobiography entitled *Nyanyi Sunyi seorang Bisu* (Sing Silent a Mute) were also withdrawn by the New Order government, because it was considered to contain revenge on the government and spread the teachings of Marxism (Toer, 1980, 1981, 1985, 1988 and 1997; Kurniawan, 2006; Hun, 2011; Lane, 2017; and Mrazek, 2017).⁹

The Culture, in the time of Guided Democracy government, must had a relationship with politics and was a tool of struggle to achieve revolution. For President Soekarno and Guided Democracy government, if culture had nothing to do with politics, it was considered anti-Soekarnoist. The New Order government had a different perspective, culture was not a political tool. Culture was understood as a measure of intellect that was not related to politics. Contradictory matters were also shown by the New Order government in the concept of culture, although culture was not political,

⁹See also, for comparison, "Tarik Peredaran Buku Bumi Manusia" in newspaper of *Berita Yudha*. Jakarta: 23 Maret 1981, p.6.

cultural activities were limited by a series of political regulations (Saidi, 2007; Sen & Hill, 2007:11; and Sudrajat, 2019).

The concept of culture that had been reconstructed by the New Order government was conveyed to the public through mass media and electronics. The media became an important instrument in the New Order government era to convey national culture to the people. The New Order government, then, made a series of regulations and guidelines to the media about what could be said and not said (Vatikiotis, 1994; Syahrie, 2009; and Mayrudin, 2018).

All institutions, including culture, must return to the values of *Pancasila*, which had been reconstructed. The first *Pancasila* delivered by Soekarno at the BPUPKI (*Badan Penyelidikan Usaha-usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia* or Investigation Agency for Indonesian Independence's Preparatory Efforts) session, on 1st June 1945, was used as a source of New Order government ideology. In 1978, training on *Pancasila* began, called the P-4 (*Pedoman, Penghayatan, dan Pengamalan Pancasila* or Guidelines, Enculturation, and Implementation of *Pancasila*), which was carried out by the BP-7 (*Badan Pembinaan, Pendidikan, Pelaksanaan tentang P-4* or Guiding, Educationg, and Implementing Agency for the P4). The New Order government saw that the Guided Democracy government deviated from the 1945 Constitution and *Pancasila*. The P-4 upgrading also served to overcome the danger of ideology of Liberalism, Communism, and Religious abuse. So, the P-4 upgrading was carried out in all levels of society, both in schools, the government, and the private sector (BP-7 Pusat, 1990:25-26; Sukarno, 2005; and Hartono, 2017).¹⁰

The closeness of the New Order government with the Indonesian Military, especially the Army, had an impact on the policies made during the New Order government. Policies were centralized and tended to be militaristic. In this

¹⁰See also, for example, "Kita Tolak Liberalisme dan Komunisme" in newspaper of *Berita Yudha*. Jakarta: 24 Maret 1981, pp.2 and 9.

context, Koentjaraningrat (2015) was an Anthropologist, and other scholars, who formulated the concept of culture during the New Order government. Culture, according to Koentjaraningrat (2015) and other scholars, had a narrow meaning, namely beauty. Culture had also a broad meaning, namely the thoughts, works, and works of humans that were not obtained from their instincts, and can only be triggered from the results of learning. The concept of broad culture also included all human activities that were not in the form of reflexes. Koentjaraningrat (2015), and other scholars, were known as the seven elements of universal culture and can be found in world culture (cf Kistanto, 2008; Marzali, 2014; and Koentjaraningrat, 2015:2).

In one of his works entitled *Kebudayaan, Mentalitas dan Pembangunan* (Culture, Mentality, and Development), Koentjaraningrat (2015) linked the culture and mentality of the community to support the development. This work, firstly published in 1974 and printed twenty-one times, was the most referred work in understanding the concepts and elements of culture. In addition, Koentjaraningrat (2015) also explained the importance of culture in everyday life. In one of the chapters in this work, Koentjaraningrat (2015) explained that Indonesian people were not ready to support the development. Culture was associated with the results that a person got with his efforts and work as a result of an effort aimed at satisfaction. This was different from the meaning of a work on Guided Democracy government, which must support political or revolutionary goals. The culture of the New Order government emphasized values and achievements if they wanted to go towards development (cf Lubis, 1986; Saidi, 2007; Marzali, 2014; Koentjaraningrat, 2015:39; and Setyawan, 2019).

In another chapter, Koentjaraningrat (2015) classified Indonesian people into two, namely rural people and urban people. The rural people usually worked in the agricultural sector and had a mentality called the "farmers mentality". The next group was urban people, who tend to be homogeneous by working as laborers, traders, entrepreneurs, and employees. The

employee class was the class that dominated city life; and other classes were still weak (cf Marzali, 2014; Koentjaraningrat, 2015; and Setyawan, 2019).

Koentjaraningrat (2015), then, added one more group, namely people of the Armed Forces, or Armed Forces of the Republic of Indonesia, who had the same mentality as employees. Koentjaraningrat (2015) also underlined the lives of city employees in East Java and Central Java dominated by the *Priyayi* (Noblemen)'s mentality. Rural people called farmers were thought as not understand about work and only live to work and fulfill their basic needs. Koentjaraningrat (2015) also returned farmers by only working hard to eat (cf Swasono, 2006; Marzali, 2014; Koentjaraningrat, 2015:42; Wicaksono, 2017; and Setyawan, 2019).

Farmers, in other words, did not understand art and did not engage in politics. This statement showed that farmers no longer have an important position as in the Guided Democracy government era (1959-1966). The New Order government (1966-1998) also tried to eliminate the influence of the PKI within farmers during the Guided Democracy government. Farmers were no longer a mass base that had a voice and can had a role in politics, but only workers who met the needs of urban society (Mahmuddin, 2013; Koentjaraningrat, 2015; and Bedner, 2017).

Koentjaraningrat (2015), and other scholars, then talked about the *Priyayi*'s mentality, which viewed the nature of works as charity or deeds. *Priyayi* embodied works through beauty, wisdom, and power. Koentjaraningrat (2015), and other scholars, further explained that some *Priyayi*'s mentalities were not compatible with development, for example the practice of inner side which was contrary to rationalism. The next mentality was to surrender to a destiny that was not compatible with development. According to Koentjaraningrat (2015), and other scholars, the conception of national culture was the work of every work of Indonesian children of high quality and proud of the work they made (Marzali, 2014; Koentjaraningrat, 2015; Prayitno, 2017; Wicaksono, 2017; and Setyawan, 2019).

Koentjaraningrat (2015), and other scholars, emphasized the national culture on high quality works and tended to enter into high quality culture. The cultural concept, conveyed by Koentjaraningrat (2015) and other scholars, was in the theoretical area, which took the example of Indonesian society (Marzali, 2014; Koentjaraningrat, 2015; and Wicaksono, 2017).

Rooted in the concept of national culture delivered by Koentjaraningrat, since 1974, Ali Moertopo (1978) simplified it through cultural strategies. Ali Moertopo (1978) was one of the ASPRI (*Asisten Pribadi Presiden* or Personal Assistant to the President) and one of the founders of the CSIS (Central for Strategic and International Studies) in Jakarta. Through this agency, Ali Moertopo (1978) formulated a cultural strategy that included the concepts of national culture and culture as a way to realize development (*cf* Moertopo, 1978; Jones, 2005 and 2015; Marzali, 2014; Zulkifli *at al.* eds., 2014; and Koentjaraningrat, 2015).

The use of the word “strategy” in cultural strategy was taken from a Military perspective, which meant to lead an Army. In a broad sense, strategies were matters relating to ways and efforts to control and use all community resources to achieve their goals. The concept of culture, according to Ali Moertopo (1978), was in line with what was conveyed by Koentjaraningrat (2015), that culture was the embodiment of the results of human thoughts, willingness, and feelings in the relationship between humans and humans, humans and the environment, and humans and God (Moertopo, 1978:4; Jones, 2005 and 2015; Zulkifli *at al.* eds., 2014; and Koentjaraningrat, 2015).

Ali Moertopo (1978) believed that strategic thinking about culture made culture as a power. While the national culture strategy was to place culture as a power to get culture as a means to be able to achieve national goals. Culture was a power that was created continuously, which was created through national security and implemented with national development. National culture, that supported development, was the most important point of the cultural concept of

the New Order government era. Culture was no longer a political tool to achieve revolution, but a valuable culture to support development (*cf* Moertopo, 1978:5; Jones, 2005 and 2015; Zulkifli *at al.* eds., 2014; and Dyer, 2016).

Culture was one of the sectors that received attention from the New Order government during REPELITA II (*Rencana Pembangunan Lima Tahun Kedua* or Second Five-Years Development Plan) in 1974-1979. Cultural policies to support development began to be issued in this period. The REPELITA II, besides focusing on sustainable economic development, agriculture, resilience, and security, also paid attention to culture as a supporter of development. One of the programs in the field of culture, that carried out during the New Order government period, was the construction of TMII (*Taman Mini Indonesia Indah* or Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park) in Jakarta. The TMII construction was carried out in 1994 and was initiated by Siti Hartinah or Tien Soeharto, the President Soeharto's wife (Syahrie, 2009; Fareza, 2016; and Raditya, 2018).

The TMII consisted of several museums under a state institution, such as the Information Museum under the Information Service and the Postal Museum under Indonesia Post as well as other museums. The traditional houses of each Province in Indonesia were presented at the TMII as the Provincial Platform. Not surprisingly, the land needed to build Indonesia miniature was very large and had large funds (Soeharto, 1989; Elson, 2001; Raditya, 2018; Ansah, 2019; and Qodir, 2019).¹¹

The construction of TMII gained a lot of protests from the students, who began to be critical of President Soeharto's leadership style and wanted the New Order government to be in line with the initial ideals. Students criticized the funds needed to build the TMII

¹¹See also, for example, “Taman Mini Indonesia Indah: Wahana Rekreasi Rasa Orde Baru” in *CNN Indonesia*, on 22nd April 2018. Available online also at: <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/gaya-hidup/20180420125016-269-292210/taman-mini-indonesia-indah-wahana-rekreasi-rasa-orde-baru> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].

was too big. The students action was known as the MALARI (*Malapetaka 15 Januari* or January 15th Havoc), which took place on January 15, 1974. This action could easily be quelled by the New Order government and changed President Soeharto's attitude towards students. After 1966, the closeness between students and President Soeharto was very visible, but after the MALARI of 1974's event, a rift in the relationship was inevitable. President Soeharto's leadership with the Indonesian Military was increasingly repressive towards activities deemed incompatible with the New Order government's vision, including students (Lasut, 2011; Jazimah, 2013; Argenti, 2016; Raditya, 2018; and Suwirta, 2018 and 2019).

The construction of the National Monument and Museum of National History in Jakarta were also completed during the New Order government with several changes in dioramas. Museum construction in Indonesia continued to be carried out in accordance with the Museum Rehabilitation and Development program in the PELITA II. The construction of Provincial Museums, throughout Indonesia, including rehabilitation of museums that had been built during the Dutch colonial period, such as National Museum (McGregor, 2003; Hitchcock, 2005; Jones, 2005; Susilo & Suryaningih, 2015; and Fareza, 2016).

Provincial Museum Construction. The museum is one of the media outside of school learning that plays a major role in the community. Not only as a learning medium, the museum is also a place for sightseeing. This was seen by the New Order government as an opportunity to instill nationalism and build memories about development. The word "development" was used as the name of the Cabinet during the New Order government (1968-1998). The Development Cabinet I, for example, was the name of the Cabinet that used the word "development" in the New Order government era (*cf* McGregor, 2003 and 2007; Hitchcock, 2005; Jones, 2005; Kregar & Roženberger, 2014; and Lukito, 2016).

In his autobiography, President Soeharto explained that the development carried

out using his own strength, although still receiving assistance from the Capitalist countries. In the Development Cabinet I, culture had not become a priority, because attention was shown to political stability and security, economy, elections, and cleansing the state apparatus (Roeder, 1969; Soeharto, 1989:238; and Elson, 2001).

Ali Moertopo (1973 and 1978), as one of the important figures in the New Order government's consolidation period, argued that development could only be carried out if national stability had been achieved. Development was identical to modernization carried out by the New Order government in various fields: economic, political, social, and culture. This modernization aimed at the welfare of the people in the future (*cf* Moertopo, 1973:52 and 1978; Aning ed., 2005; and Zulkifli *at al.* eds., 2014).

Socio-cultural modernization was supported by the rehabilitation and construction program of the Provincial Museum in the REPELITA I (*Rencana Pembangunan Lima Tahun Pertama* or First Five-Years Development Plan). The rehabilitation and construction project of the Museum was carried out in every Provincial capital city in Indonesia. Rehabilitation was carried out on three Museums that had stood since the Guided Democracy government or the Old Order government (1959-1966). The Museums included the National Museum in Jakarta, the Bali Provincial Museum, and Yogyakarta State Museum of Sonobudoyo. The three Museums got physical building improvements, such as physical expansion, adding facilities and infrastructure, and adding human resources. The Central Museum or the National Museum in Jakarta and the Bali Museum got the priority to conduct training and improvement of human resources (Sutaarga, 1973; Jones, 2005; Sudarmo, 2005; Alfida, 2014; Mardianto *et al.* eds., 2018; and Jurriens, 2019).

The construction of Provincial Museums in each provincial capital was carried out during the REPELITA II (1975-1980). The process of building a regional museum was done in stages, starting from the selection of places and procurement of collections to be ready

to open to the public. Regional museums in each Province were included in the general museum category. Besides the general museum category was a special museum. In the public museum, the collections on display were regional collections and usually carried a certain theme, such as especially building nationalism. Special museums had more thematic collections and discussed special issues. Furthermore, the Provincial Museum was called the "Provincial Public Museum" built in each provincial capital in Indonesia (Akbar, 2010; Azra, 2010; and Munandar *et al.*, 2011).

Provincial public museums were built as many as 21 museums in each provincial capital city throughout Indonesia during REPELITA II. The museum construction continued on REPELITA III by adding one museum to be built, namely the Irian Jaya Provincial Public Museum (Asiarto, 1999; Ishaq, 2000; and Munandar *et al.*, 2011). The construction of the museum continues until the REPELITA IV and REPELITA V by building and rehabilitating 26 museums throughout Indonesia. During the REPELITA VI (1995-1999), the Provincial Public Museum was built in East Timor. One of the provincial museums that was successfully built and inaugurated in 1985 was the Central Java Museum of Ranggawarsita (Asiarto, 1999; Ishaq, 2000; Putro, 2008; and Munandar *et al.*, 2011).¹²

The construction of the Provincial Public Museum aimed to preserve cultural heritage and also natural heritage. Funds that were used to build the general public museums of the province were also not small and with a long process. The first process carried out in the construction of the Provincial Public Museum was a feasibility study that produced a profile of each region. Regional profiles were used as a basis for museum planning policies, such as master plans. The plan was arranged to determine the software,

hardware, museum personnel, and building design (Ishaq, 2000; Munandar *et al.*, 2011; and Zabalueva, 2018).

During the initial construction, during the REPELITA I and the REPELITA II, the central government represented by the Directorate of Museum, Ministry of Education and Culture, discovered many problems related to the construction of the museum. Furthermore, the Directorate of Museum designed the provincial standard museum standardization guidelines, which regulate technical matters surrounding the construction of the provincial museum. The choice of place, type of collection, and museum building were explained in this guideline. This guideline also regulated the grouping of museums according to the size, collection, and level of community needs in the museum. This grouping was divided into three, including museums type A, B, and C. This guide also regulated regional collection groups and archipelago insights (Sutaarga, 1973; Asiarto, 1999; Jones, 2005; Munandar *et al.*, 2011; and Sellato, 2015).

The guidelines compiled by the Museum Directorate at a glance were a way out of the difficulties encountered in building a museum. On the other hand, this guideline can be understood as an attempt by the government of the New Order government era to uniform the Provincial Public Museums in Indonesia. One of the goals of building a Provincial Public Museum in Indonesia was to build a sense of nationalism that was based on *Pancasila* (Five Basic Principles of the Republic of Indonesia) and supports development (*cf* Asiarto, 1999; McGregor, 2003 and 2007; Jones, 2005; Munandar *et al.*, 2011; and Suadnyana, 2017).

The nationalism developed by the New Order government was closely related to the negation of the Old Order government or Guided Democracy government. During the Guided Democracy government or President Soekarno era (1959-1966), culture and art were aimed at the struggle to achieve national unity and Socialist society; while during the New Order government era (1966-1998), both seemed freer, but still binding. The direction of culture was more militaristic and was aimed at one command.

¹²See also, for example, "Museum Jawa Tengah Akan Diresmikan" in newspaper of *Suara Merdeka*. Semarang: 4 Juli 1989, p.2; and "Wisata Sejarah: Museum Ronggowarsito" in *DOTSEMARANG: Personal Blog of Semarang*, on 13th October 2017. Available online also at: <https://dotsemarang.blogspot.com/2012/02/wisata-sejarah-museum-ronggowarsito.html> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].

In the construction of the Provincial Public Museum, it was more likely to be centered on the Directorate of Museum and in accordance with the cultural direction of the New Order government. The narrative at the Provincial Public Museum in Indonesia also showed the uniformity that carries the government's program, namely development (Sutaarga, 1973; Asiaro, 1999; McGregor, 2003 and 2007; Jones, 2005; and Munandar *et al.*, 2011).

CONCLUSION ¹³

Not much different from the previous regime, the New Order government (1966-1998) needed the legitimacy of power through the formulation of a cultural strategy to maintain and carry out its power. For this reason, a political and cultural strategy was prepared, and implemented in the spirit and motto of national development, which emphasizes on sector and economic growth. Cultural development, in the context of extracting collective memory, was carried out in the establishment of museums, especially public museums at provincial level in Indonesia.

The cultural control and policies of the New Order government era were reflected in the previous period, when culture became an arena of polemic and political interest. The cultural polemic of the 1950-1960s involved ideas and the flow of freedom and counter-freedom, which was driven by the PKI (*Partai Komunis Indonesia* or Indonesian Communist Party) with their LEKRA (*Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat* or Institute of People Culture) organs. The debate about the concept of culture, which initially rejected the MANIKEBU (*Manifesto Kebudayaan* or Cultural Manifesto) was reversed during the New Order government.

¹³**Acknowledgment:** This paper – before be revised in the form currently – has been presented in the 12th PAHMI (*Persidangan Antarabangsa Hubungan Malaysia-Indonesia* or International Conference on Malaysia-Indonesia Relations), on 1-2 August 2018. We would like to thanks to Andi Suwirta, M.Hum., a Senior Lecturer at the Department of History Education FPIPS UPI (Faculty of Social Studies Education, Indonesia University of Education) in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia, for helping to edit this article, including enriching and updating the Bibliography or References. However, all the contents and interpretations in this article remain the academic responsibility of both of us as the Authors.

Supporters of the MANIKEBU supported the cultural development in the early days of the New Order government centered on humanity and freedom of expression. Opportunities to develop culture in a direction considered better were open to supporters of the MANIKEBU. This cultural development continued to develop until the MALARI (*Malapetaka 15 January* or January 15th Havoc) of 1974's incident occurred. The event was considered a sign of the changing attitude of the New Order government, from supporting the development of a free culture to culture as one of the paths to development.

Cultural strategies were prepared and implemented in the form of the construction of a Provincial Museum. In this study, the role and involvement of the Museum Directorate became a part of its success. The theme of the Provincial Museum showed uniformity, especially directed to uphold and support national development policies.¹⁴

References

- Abdullah, Taufik *et al.* (2003). *Malam Bencana 1965 dalam Belitan Krisis Nasional, Bagian III: Berakhir dan Bermula*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Abdulsalam, Husein. (2018). "Bagaimana Soeharto Mengambil Alih Kekuasaan dari Sukarno?" in *Tirto.Id*, on February 22. Available online also at: [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 2, 2019].
- Adam, Asvi Warman. (2018). "Satu Hari Setelah Super Semar Terbit Jadi Pembeneran untuk Tindakan Terkelam di Sejarah Bangsa". Available online at: <http://lipi.go.id/lipimedia/satu-hari-setelah-super-semar-terbit-jadi-pembeneran-untuk-tindakan-terkelam-di-sejarah-bangsa/20062> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 2, 2019].
- Adams, Kathleen M. (2006). *Art as Politics: Re-Crafting Identities, Tourism, and Power in Tana Toraja, Indonesia*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Akbar, Ali. (2010). *Museum di Indonesia: Kendala dan Harapan*. Jakarta: Papas Sinar Sinanti.
- Alfida. (2014). "The Role of Indonesian National Library in Preserving and Disseminating Manuscripts" in *HERITAGE OF NUSANTARA: International Journal of Religious Literature and Heritage*, Vol.3, No.1

¹⁴**Statement:** We, herewith, declare that this paper is not a product of plagiarism and has never been reviewed and published by any scholarly journals. This paper will also not be withdrawn by the Authors, if it has been published in the *TAWARIKH* journal in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia.

- [June], pp.47-62. Available online also at: <http://jurnallektur.kemenag.go.id/index.php/heritage/article/viewFile/19/108> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].
- Anderson, Benedict R.O'G. (2017). *Kuasa Kata: Jelajah Budaya-budaya Politik di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Mata Bangsa, Translation.
- Aning, Floriberta S. [ed]. (2005). "Ali Moertopo: Pemikir Orde Baru, Pelopor Modernisasi Intelijen" in *100 Tokoh yang Mengubah Indonesia: Biografi Singkat Seratus Tokoh yang Paling Berpengaruh dalam Sejarah Indonesia di Abad 20*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Narasi, cetakan pertama.
- Ansah, Suandri. (2019). "TMII: Taman 1001 Budaya Impian Soeharto dan Ibu Tien" in *SP: Suara Palu*, on March 20. Available online also at: <https://suarapalu.com/tmii-taman-1001-budaya-impian-soeharto-dan-ibu-tien/> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: January 5, 2020].
- Anwar, Yozar. (1980). *Angkatan 66: Sebuah Catatan Harian Mahasiswa*. Jakarta: Penerbit Sinar Harapan.
- Argenti, Gili. (2016). "Gerakan Sosial di Indonesia: Studi Kasus Gerakan Mahasiswa Tahun 1974" in *Jurnal Politikom Indonesiana*, Vol.1, No.1 [Juli], pp.1-19.
- Asiarto, Luthfi. (1999). *Perkembangan Permuseuman di Indonesia dari Pelita I-VI*. Jakarta: Direktorat Permuseuman, Direktorat Jenderal Kebudayaan, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Azra, Azyumardi. (2010). "Museum: Revitalisasi Wawasan Nusantara" in *Museografia*, Volume IV(5), pp.5-10. Published by Direktorat Permuseuman in Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Bedner, A. (2017). "The Need for Realism: Ideals and Practice in Indonesia's Constitutional History" in M. Adams, A. Meuwese & E. Ballin [eds]. *Constitutionalism and the Rule of Law: Bridging Idealism and Realism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.159-194. doi:10.1017/9781316585221.006.
- Booth, Anne et al. (1986). *Ekonomi Orde Baru*. Jakarta: Penerbit LP3ES, Translation.
- BP-7 [Badan Pembinaan, Pendidikan, Pelaksanaan, tentang Pedoman, Penghayatan, dan Pengamalan Pancasila] Pusat. (1990). *Bahan Penataran P-4: Pancasila/P-4*. Jakarta: Penerbit BP-7 Pusat.
- Byrskog, Samuel. (2001). *Story as History, History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History*. Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Crouch, Harould. (1999). *Militer dan Politik di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Sinar Harapan, Translation.
- Day, Tony & Maya H.T. Liem [eds]. (2018). *Cultures at War: The Cold War and Cultural Expression in Southeast Asia*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Dyer, Mike. (2016). "Strategic Culture, National Strategy, and Policymaking in the Asia-Pacific: Interview with Ashley J. Tellis" in *NBR: The National Bureau of Asian Research*, on October 27. Available online also at: <https://www.nbr.org/publication/strategic-culture-national-strategy-and-policymaking-in-the-asia-pacific/> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].
- Elson, Robert E. (2001). *Suharto: A Political Biography*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Erlina, T. (2020). "Peranan Kesatuan Aksi Mahasiswa Indonesia dan Kesatuan Aksi Pelajar Indonesia dalam Proses Peralihan Kepemimpinan Nasional, Tahun 1965-1968" in *Jurnal Wahana Pendidikan*, Volume 7(1), pp.95-102.
- Fareza, Mufid. (2016). "Dampak Kebijakan Perekonomian Era Orde Baru terhadap Pembangunan di Indonesia". *Unpublished Academic Paper*. Yogyakarta: Program Studi Pendidikan Sejarah, Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas PGRI [Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia] Yogyakarta. Available online also at: <http://repository.upy.ac.id/1203/1/Artikel.pdf> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 1, 2019].
- Farram, Steven. (2014). "Ganyang! Indonesian Popular Songs from the Confrontation Era, 1963-1966" in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, Volume 170, pp.1-24.
- Fatah, Eep Saefullah. (1999). *Negara Orde Baru dan Pengendalian Konflik Politik, 1967-1988: Studi tentang Peristiwa Malari, Petisi 50, dan Tanjung Priok*. Jakarta: Rosdakarya Bandung.
- Feith, Herbert. (1992). *Sukarno-Militer dan Demokrasi Terpimpin*. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan, Translation.
- Feith, Herbert & Lance Castels [eds]. (1988). *Pemikiran Politik Indonesia, 1945-1965*. Jakarta: Penerbit LP3ES, Translation.
- Foulcher, Keith. (1969). "A Survey of Events Surrounding Manikebu: The Struggle for Cultural and Intellectual Freedom" in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde*, Deel 125, 4de Afl.
- Foulcher, Keith. (1986). *Social Commitment in Literature and the Arts: The Indonesia 'Institute of People Culture', 1950-1965*. Australia: Monash University Press.
- Foulcher, Keith. (1987). "Politics and Literature in Independent Indonesia: The View from the Left" in *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, Vol.15, No.1, pp. 83-103.
- Foulcher, Keith. (2000). *Sumpah Pemuda: Makna dan Proses Penciptaan atas sebuah Simbol Kebangsaan Indonesia*. Depok: Penerbit Komunitas Bambu, Translation.
- Gottschalk, Louis. (1986). *Mengerti Sejarah*. Jakarta: UI [Universitas Indonesia] Press, translated by Nograho Notosusanto.
- Hadi, Abdul. (2020). "Sejarah Tritura & Gerakan Mahasiswa Tumbangkan Orde Lama" in *Tirto.Id*, on January 10. Available online also at: <https://tirto.id/sejarah-tritura-gerakan-mahasiswa-tumbangkan-orde-lama-erMo> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 2, 2020].
- Hadi, Dwi Wahyono & Gayung Kasuma. (2012). "Propaganda Orde Baru, 1966-1980" in *Verleden*, Vol.1, No.1 [Desember], pp.40-50. Available online also at: http://www.jurnal.unair.ac.id/filerPDF/4_jurnal%20propaganda_dwiwahyonohadi.pdf [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 1, 2019].
- Hadi, Kuncoro et al. (2017). *Kronik '65: Catatan Hari*

- Per Hari Peristiwa G-30-S, Sebelum dan Setelahnya*. Yogyakarta: Media Pressindo.
- Hartono, Yudi. (2017). "Model Pembelajaran Nilai-nilai Karakter Bangsa di Indonesia dari Masa ke Masa" in *Jurnal Agastya*, Vol.7, No.1 [Januari], pp.34-48.
- Heinschke, Martina. (1996). "Between Gelanggang and Lekra: Pramoedya's Developing Literary Concepts" in *Indonesia*, Volume 61 [April], pp.145-169.
- Hellman, Jürgen. (2003). *Performing the Nation: Cultural Politics in New Order Indonesia*. Great Britain: NIAS Press.
- Herlambang, W. (2016). *Kekerasan Budaya Pasca 1965: Bagaimana Orde Baru Melegitimasi Anti-Komunisme melalui Sastra dan Film*. Tangerang: Marjin Kiri.
- Heuken, A. (2008). *Medan Merdeka: Jantung Ibu Kota RI*. Jakarta: Yayasan Cipta Loka Caraka.
- Hitchcock, Michael. (2005). "We will Know Our Nation better: Taman Mini and Nation Building in Indonesia" in *CIVILISATIONS: Revue Internationale d'Anthropologie et de Sciences Humaines*, Volume 52(2), pp.45-56. Available online also at: <https://journals.openedition.org/civilisations/754> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].
- Hoemardani, Soedjono. (1981). *Renungan tentang Pembangunan*. Jakarta: Penerbit CSIS [Centre for Strategic and International Studies].
- Hun, Koh Young. (2011). *Pramoedya Menggugat: Melacak Jejak Indonesia*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Translation.
- Ishaq, H.M. Daud. (2000). *Kecil tapi Indah: Pedoman Pendirian Museum*. Jakarta: Proyek Pembinaan Permuseuman Jakarta.
- Ismail, Yahya. (1972). *Pertumbuhan, Perkembangan, dan Kejatuhan LEKRA di Indonesia: Satu Tinjauan dari Aspek Sosio-Budaya*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- Jazimah, Ipong. (2013). "MALARI: Studi Gerakan Mahasiswa Masa Orde Baru" dalam *Jurnal AGASTYA*, Vol.03, No.01 [Januari]. Available online also at: <file:///C:/Users/acer/Downloads/902-1668-1-SM.pdf> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 11, 2019].
- Jenkins, David. (2010). *Soeharto & Barisan Jenderal ORBA: Rezim Militer Indonesia, 1975-1983*. Depok: Penerbit Komunitas Bambu, Translation.
- Jones, Tod. (2005). "Indonesian Cultural Policy, 1950-2003: Culture, Institutions, Government". *Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis*. Australia: Curtin University of Technology. Available online also at: https://espace.curtin.edu.au/bitstream/handle/20.500.11937/403/16663_Tod%20Jones%20ELEC.pdf [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 8, 2019].
- Jones, Tod. (2012). "Indonesian Cultural Policy in the Reform Era" in *Indonesia*, No.93 [April], 147-176.
- Jones, Tod. (2015). *Kebudayaan dan Kekuasaan di Indonesia: Kebijakan Budaya Selama Abad ke-20 hingga Era Reformasi*. Jakarta: Penerbit YOI [Yayasan Obor Indonesia], Translation.
- Jurriens, Edwin. (2019). "Art, Image, and Environment: Revisualizing Bali in the Plastilicium" in *CONTINUUM: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, Volume 33, Issue 1, pp.119-136. Available online also at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10304312.2018.1547363> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: January 25, 2020].
- Karsono, Sony. (2013). "Indonesia's New Order, 1966-1998: Its Social and Intellectual Origins". *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*. Ohio, USA [United States of America]: The College of Arts and Sciences, Ohio University.
- Kartodirjo, Sartono. (1993). *Pendekatan Ilmu Sosial dalam Metodologi Sejarah*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- "Kita Tolak Liberalisme dan Komunisme" in newspaper of *Berita Yudha*. Jakarta: 24 Maret 1981, pp.2 and 9.
- Koentjaraningrat. (2015). *Kebudayaan, Mentalitas, dan Pembangunan*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia, edisi revisi, edisi pertama tahun 1974.
- Kistanto, Nurdien H. (2008). "Sistem Sosial-Budaya di Indonesia" in *SABDA: Jurnal Kajian Kebudayaan*, Vol.3, No.1 [April], pp.99-105.
- Kregar, Tone & Tanja Roženbergar. (2014). "Museum Collections between Ideology and Reflection" in Rooksana Omar et al. [eds]. *Museums and Idea of Historical Progress*. Cape Town: Iziko Museums Publications in association with ICOM-SA, pp.139-150. Available online also at: http://comcol.mini.icom.museum/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2019/01/Museums_and_the_Idea_of_Historical_Progress_ICMAH_COMCOL.pdf [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].
- Kuntowijoyo. (2013). *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan Bentang Budaya, edisi revisi.
- Kurniadi, Agil & Ita Syamtasyah Ahyat. (2014). "Indoktrinasi Manipol-USDEK sebagai Hegemoni Politik, 1959-1967". Available online at: <http://lib.ui.ac.id/naskahringkas/2017-03/S57846-Agil%20Kurniadi> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 11, 2019].
- Kurniawan, Eka. (2006). *Pramoedya Ananta Toer dan Sastra Realisme Sosial*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Lane, Max. (2012). *Malapetaka di Indonesia: Sebuah Esei Renungan tentang Pengalaman Sejarah Gerakan Kiri*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Djaman Baroe, Translation.
- Lane, Max. (2017). *Indonesia Tidak Hadir di Bumi Manusia: Pramoedya, Sejarah, dan Politik*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Djaman Baroe, Translation.
- Lasut, Yopie. (2011). *Kesaksian seorang Jurnalis Anti Orba: Malari Melawan Soeharto dan Barisan Jenderal Orba*. Depok: Yayasan Penghayat Keadilan.
- Latief, Azhari Muhammad. (2018). "Politik Sastra: Konflik Aliran Sastra antara Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat (LEKRA) dan Manifes Kebudayaan (MANIKEBU), 1950-1965". *Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis*. Medan: Departemen Ilmu Politik, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Universitas Sumatera Utara. Available online also at: <http://repositori.usu.ac.id/bitstream/handle/123456789/3680/140906072.pdf> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 11, 2019].
- Latif, Yudi & Idy Subandy Ibrahim [eds]. (1996). *Bahasa dan Kekuasaan: Politik Wacana di Panggung Orde*

- Baru. Bandung: Penerbit Mizan.
- Lev, Daniel S. [ed]. (2008). *Menjadikan Indonesia: Dari Membangun Bangsa Menjadi Membangun Kekuasaan*. Jakarta: Penerbit Hasta Mitra, Translation.
- Lindsay, Jennifer & Maya H.T. Liem [eds]. (2012). *Heirs to World Culture: Being Indonesian, 1950-1965*. Netherlands: Brill.
- Lohanda, Mona. (1998). *Sumber Sejarah dan Penelitian Sejarah*. Jakarta: Lembaga Penelitian UI [Universitas Indonesia].
- Lubis, Mochtar. (1986). *Manusia Indonesia: Sebuah Pertanggungjawaban*. Jakarta: Penerbit Idayu Press, cetakan ke-7.
- Lukito, Y. (2016). "Taman Mini Indonesia Indah: The Rebirth of Indonesian Vernacular Architecture After Independence" in *Exhibiting Modernity and Indonesian Vernacular Architecture*. USA [United States of America]: Springer VS, Wiesbaden.
- Mahfud, Moh M.D. (2003). *Demokrasi dan Konstitusi di Indonesia: Studi tentang Interaksi Politik dan Kehidupan Ketatanegaraan*. Bandung: Rineka Cipta.
- Mahmuddin. (2013). "Paradigma Pembangunan Pertanian: Pertanian Berkelanjutan Berbasis Petani dalam Perspektif Sosiologis" in *Jurnal Sosiologi Universitas Syiah Kuala*, Vol.3, No.3 [Juni], pp.59-75.
- Mardianto, Herry et al. [eds]. (2018). *Sonobudoyo: Sejarah dan Identitas Keistimewaan*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Museum Sonobudoyo. Available online also at: <http://sonobudoyo.com/public/file/publication/3945e-Katalog-Temporer-2018.pdf> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].
- Marzali, Amri. (2014). "Memajukan Kebudayaan Nasional Indonesia" in *HUMANIORA*, Volume 26(3), pp.251-265.
- Masitho, Beby. (2013). "Dinamika Politik Pembangunan pada Masa Orde Baru: Studi tentang Industrialisasi Ketergantungan dan Peran Modal Jepang" in *PERSPEKTIF*, Vol.6, No.2 [Oktober], pp.118-123.
- Mayrudin, Yeby Ma'asan. (2018). "Menelusik Program Pembangunan Nasional di Era Pemerintahan Soeharto" in *JOG (Journal of Government): Kajian Manajemen Pemerintahan & Otonomi Daerah*, Vol.4, No.1 [Juli-Desember], pp.71-90.
- McGregor, Katherine. (2003). "Representing Indonesian Past: The National Monument History Museum from Guided Democracy to the New Order" in *Indonesia*, No.75, published by Cornell University Press in Ithaca, New York, USA [United States of America].
- McGregor, Katherine. (2007). *History in Uniform: Military Ideology and the Construction of Indonesia's Past*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.
- MPR RI [Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat Republik Indonesia]. (1983). *Presiden Soeharto, Bapak Pembangunan Indonesia: Evaluasi Pembangunan Pemerintah Orde Baru*. Jakarta: Penerbit MPR RI.
- Moeljanto, D.S. & Taufiq Ismail. (1995). *Prahara Budaya: Kilas Balik Ofensif Lekra/PKI dkk*. Bandung: Penerbit Mizan.
- Moertopo, Ali. (1973). *Dasar-dasar Pemikiran tentang Akselerasi Modernisasi Pembangunan 25 Tahun*. Jakarta: Yayasan Proklamasi dan CSIS [Central for Strategic and International Study].
- Moertopo, Ali. (1978). *Strategi Kebudayaan*. Jakarta: Penerbit CSIS [Central for Strategic and International Study].
- Moser, Sarah. (2008). "Performing National Identity in Postcolonial Indonesia". *Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis*. Singapore: Department of Geography, National University of Singapore. Available online also at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/48630813.pdf> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 17, 2019].
- Mrazek, Rudolf. (2017). *Pramoedya Ananta Toer dan Kenangan Buru*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Mata Bangsa, Translation.
- Munandar, Agus Aris et al. (2011). *Sejarah Permuseuman di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Direktorat Permuseuman, Direktorat Jenderal Sejarah dan Purbakala, Kementerian Pariwisata dan Ekonomi Kreatif. Available online also at: <http://repositori.kemdikbud.go.id/7742/1/SEJARAH%20PERMUSEUMAN%20DI%20INDONESIA.pdf> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].
- "Museum Jawa Tengah Akan Diresmikan" in newspaper of *Suara Merdeka*. Semarang: 4 Juli 1989, p.2.
- Nasution, A.H. (1967). *Menegakkan Keadilan dan Kebenaran: Pandji Tertinggi Orde Baru*. Djakarta: Penerbit Seruling Masa.
- Nasution, A.H. (1990). *Memenuhi Panggilan Tugas*, Jilid 5. Jakarta: Penerbit Gunung Agung.
- Oktaviani, Jusmalia & Teguh Puja Pramadya. (2019). "Model Negara Kekuasaan: Orde Baru dalam Tinjauan Pemikiran Hobbes dan Niccolo Machiavelli" in *Indonesian Perspective*, Vol.4, No.2 [Juli-Desember], pp.175-190.
- Permata, Harsa. (2015). "Gerakan 30 September 1965 dalam Perspektif Filsafat Sejarah Marxisme" in *Jurnal Filsafat*, Vol. 25, No. 2, Agustus 2015, pp.220-251.
- Pratono, Suhartono W. (2010). *Teori dan Metodologi Sejarah*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Graha Ilmu.
- Prayitno, Ujianto Singgih. (2017). "Revolusi Mental dalam Perspektif Budaya Jawa: Analisis melalui Pemikiran Pierre Bourdieu" in *ASPIRASI*, Vol.8, No.2 [Desember], pp.223-234.
- Prihatanti, Maskun & M. Syaiful. (2019). "Tinjauan Historis tentang Keterlibatan Militer dalam Pemerintahan Soeharto pada Masa Awal Orde Baru". *Unpublished Academic Paper*. Bandar Lampung: FKIP UNILA [Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Lampung].
- Purnaweni, Hartuti. (2004). "Demokrasi Indonesia: Dari Masa ke Masa" in *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, Vol.3, No.2, pp.118-131.
- Putro, Widhi Setyo. (2008). "Museum Ronggowarsito yang Memprihatinkan" in *Kompas.Com*, on April 15. Available online also at: https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2008/04/15/15141487/museum_ronggowarsito.yang.memprihatinkan [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 30, 2019].
- Qodir, Zuly. (2019). "Kebhinekaan, Kewargaan, dan Multikulturalisme". *Unpublished Academic Paper*. Available and owned by the Authors.
- Raditya, Iswara N. (2018). "Sejarah TMII: Proyek Orde

- Baru dari Ambisi Tien Soeharto” in *Tirto.Id*, on November 12. Available online also at: <https://tirto.id/sejarah-tmii-proyek-orde-baru-dari-ambisi-tien-soeharto-cjwh> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 17, 2019].
- Rajab, Budi. (2004). “Negara Orde Baru: Berdiri di Atas Sistem Ekonomi dan Politik yang Rapuh” in *Jurnal Sosiohumaniora*, Vol.6, No.3 [November], pp.182-202.
- Rahman, Fatchor. (2017). “Menimbang Sejarah sebagai Landasan Kajian Ilmiah: Sebuah Wacana Pemikiran dalam Metode Ilmiah” in *EL-BANAT: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Pendidikan Islam*, Vol.7, No.1 [Januari-Juni], pp.128-150.
- Raillon, Francois. (1985). *Politik dan Ideologi Mahasiswa Indonesia: Pembentukan dan Konsolidasi Orde Baru*. Jakarta: Penerbit LP3ES, Translation.
- Ricklefs, M.C. (2008). *Sejarah Indonesia Modern*. Jakarta: Penerbit Serambi, Translation.
- Roeder, O.G. (1969). *Soeharto: Dari Pradjudik sampai Presiden*. Djakarta: PT Gunung Agung.
- Roosa, John. (2008). *Dalih Pembunuhan Massal: Gerakan 30 September dan Kudeta Suharto*. Jakarta: Institut Sejarah Sosial Indonesia dan Hasta Mitra, cetakan ke-1, Translation.
- Said, Salim. (2014). *Gari Gestapu ke Reformasi: Serangkaian Kesaksian*. Bandung: PT Mizan Pustaka, cetakan kedua.
- Saidi, Acep Iwan. (2007). “Indonesia dalam Dua Orde: Sebuah Citra yang Retak” in *Jurnal Sositologi*, Voume 10(6), April, pp.161-172. Available online also at: <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/41548-indonesia-dalam-dua-orde-sebuah-citra-ya-9f7e2e64.pdf> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 8, 2019].
- Sellato, Bernard. (2015). “Sultans’ Palaces and Museums in Indonesian Borneo: National Policies, Political Decentralization, Cultural Depatrimonization, Identity Relocalization, 1950-2010” in *Archipel*, Volume 89, pp.125-160. Available online also at : <https://journals.openedition.org/archipel/494> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 8, 2019].
- Sen, Krishna & David T. Hill. (2007). *Media, Culture, and Politics in Indonesia*. Singapore: Equinox Publishing.
- Setneg RI [Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia]. (1994). *Gerakan 30 September, Pemberontakan Partai Komunis Indonesia: Latar Belakang, Aksi, dan Penumpasannya*. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia.
- Setyawan, Ignatius Roni. (2019). “Refleksi Kritis Pembangunan Budaya pada Era Orde Baru dan Reformasi” in *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Sosial, Humaniora, dan Seni*, Vol.3, No.1 [April], pp.1-10.
- Simatupang, T.B. (1987). *Dari Revolusi ke Pembangunan*. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
- Sjamsuddin, Helius. (2007). *Metodologi Sejarah*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Ombak.
- Soeharto. (1989). *Pikiran, Ucapan, dan Tindakan Saya: Sebagaimana Dituturkan kepada Ramadhan K.H. dan G. Dwipayana*. Jakarta: PT Cipta Lamtorogung.
- Suadnyana, Wayan. (2017). “Bali Museum Denpasar: History, Entrance Fee & Location Map”. Available online at: <https://www.raftingbali.net/bali-museum-denpasar/> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 30, 2019].
- Sudarmadi, Tular. (2014). “Between Colonial Legacies and Grassroots Movements: Exploring Cultural Heritage Practice in the Ngadha and Manggarai Region of Flores”. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Available online also at: <https://research.vu.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/42127428/complete+dissertation.pdf> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 8, 2019].
- Sudarmo, Suparwoko N. (2005). “A Community-Based Approach to Tourism in Indonesia”. *Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis*. UK [United Kingdom]: School of Social Sciences, Faculty of Arts, Victoria University of Technology. Available online also at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/10834612.pdf> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].
- Sudibyo, Agus. (1998). “De-Soekarnoisasi dalam Wacana Resmi Orde Baru: Kilas-Balik Praktek-praktek Rekayasa Kebenaran dan Wacana Sejarah oleh Rejim Orde Baru” in *JSP: Jurnal Sosial Pembangunan*, Vol.2, No.1 [Juli], pp.1-25.
- Sudrajat, Ajat. (2019). “Demokrasi Pancasila dalam Perspektif Sejarah”. *Unpublished Academic Paper*. Available and owned by the Authors.
- Sukarno, B. (2005). *Pancasila dalam Tinjauan Historis, Yuridis, dan Filosofis*. Surakarta: Sebelas Maret University Press.
- Sulastomo. (1991). *Hari-hari yang Panjang, 1963-1966*. Jakarta: CV Haji Masagung.
- Sundhaussen, Ulf. (1986). *Politik Militer Indonesia, 1945-1967: Menuju Dwi Fungsi ABRI*. Jakarta: Penerbit LP3ES, Translation.
- Suparsono, Alexander. (2000). “Lekra vs Manikebu: Perdebatan Kebudayaan Indonesia, 1950-1965”. *Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis*. Jakarta: STF [Sekolah Tinggi Filsafat] Driyarkara.
- Susanti, Nurmalia, Nana Supriatna & Yeni Kurniawati Sumantri. (2019). “LEKRA VS MANIKEBU: Perlawanan Majalah Sastra terhadap Politik Kebudayaan Pemerintah Masa Demokrasi Terpimpin, 1961-1964” in *FACTUM*, Vol.8, N0.1 [Oktober-April], pp.97-112.
- Susilo & Angelia Rantya Apriliawati Suryaningsih. (2015). “Monas sebagai Simbol Perjuangan Bangsa Indonesia” in *Jurnal Kepariwisata*, Vol.9, No.3 [September], pp.55-78.
- Sutaarga, Moh Amir. (1973). *Museum dan Permuseuman di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Direktorat Museum, Direktorat Jenderal Kebudayaan, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Suwirta, Andi. (2008). “Dinamika Kehidupan Pers di Indonesia pada Tahun 1950-1965: Antara Kebebasan dan Tanggung Jawab Nasional” in *SOSIOHUMANIKA: Jurnal Pendidikan Sains Sosial dan Kemanusiaan*, Volume 1(2), pp.85-98.
- Suwirta, Andi. (2015). “Memaknai Peristiwa Sumpah Pemuda dan Revolusi Kemerdekaan Indonesia dalam Perspektif Pendidikan” in *SIPATAHOENAN: South-East Asian Journal for Youth, Sports & Health*

- Education*, Vol.1(1) April, pp.57-68. Bandung, Indonesia: Minda Masagi Press, APAKSI Bandung, and KEMENPORA RI Jakarta, ISSN 2407-7348.
- Suwirta, Andi. (2018). "Pers dan Kritik Sosial pada Masa Orde Baru: Studi Kasus Pers Mingguan Mahasiswa Indonesia di Bandung, 1966-1974" in *MIMBAR PENDIDIKAN: Jurnal Indonesia untuk Kajian Pendidikan*, Volume 3(2), September, pp.113-136. Bandung, Indonesia: UPI [Indonesia University of Education] Press, ISSN 2527-3868 (print) and 2503-457X (online).
- Suwirta, Andi. (2019). "Pers dan Kritik Sosial pada Masa Orde Baru: Peristiwa MALARI Tahun 1974 dalam Pandangan Surat Kabar *Merdeka* dan *Indonesia Raya* di Jakarta" in *SUSURGALUR: Jurnal Kajian Sejarah & Pendidikan Sejarah*, Volume 6(1), March, pp.73-98. Bandung, Indonesia: Minda Masagi Press and UBD Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam, ISSN 2302-5808.
- Swasono, Meutia F. (2006). "Antropologi dan Integrasi Nasional" in *Antropologi Indonesia*, Vol.30, No.1, pp.101-122.
- Syahrie, Sugeng P. (2009). "Politik Pembangunan Orde Baru: Industrialisasi, Swastanisasi, dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi" in *LONTAR: Jurnal Sejarah*, Vol.6, No.1 [Januari – Juni], pp.1-11.
- "Taman Mini Indonesia Indah: Wahana Rekreasi Rasa Orde Baru" in *CNN Indonesia*, on 22nd April 2018. Available online also at: <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/gaya-hidup/20180420125016-269-292210/taman-mini-indonesia-indah-wahana-rekreasi-rasa-orde-baru> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].
- "Tarik Peredaran Buku Bumi Manusia" in newspaper of *Berita Yudha*. Jakarta: 23 Maret 1981, p.6.
- TB [Tim Buku] Tempo. (2014). *LEKRA dan Geger 1965*. Jakarta: Penerbit KPG [Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia].
- Teguh, Irfan. (2019a). "Bakri Siregar dan Sastra dalam Gelombang Politik Lekra" in *Tirto.Id*, on June 19. [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: January 11, 2020].
- Teguh, Irfan. (2019b). "Surat Kepercayaan Gelanggang: Suara dan Elan Seniman Kosmopolitan" in *Tirto.Id*, on October 22. Available online also at: <https://tirto.id/surat-kepercayaan-gelanggang-suara-dan-elan-seniman-kosmopolitan-ekaa> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: January 8, 2020].
- Toer, Pramoedya Ananta. (1980). *Bumi Manusia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Hasta Mitra.
- Toer, Pramoedya Ananta. (1981). *Anak Semua Bangsa*. Jakarta: Penerbit Hasta Mitra.
- Toer, Pramoedya Ananta. (1985). *Jejak Langkah*. Jakarta: Penerbit Hasta Mitra.
- Toer, Pramoedya Ananta. (1988). *Rumah Kaca*. Jakarta: Penerbit Hasta Mitra.
- Toer, Pramoedya Ananta. (1997). *Nyani Sunyi Seorang Bisu*, Jilid 1 & 2. Jakarta: Penerbit Hasta Mitra.
- Toer, Pramoedya Ananta. (2000). *Realisme-Sosialis dan Sastra Indonesia*. Jakarta: Lentera Dipantera.
- Tornquist, Olle. (2017). *Penghancuran PKI*. Depok: Penerbit Komunitas Bambu, Translation.
- Vatikiotis, Michael R.J. (1994). *Indonesian Politics Under Suharto: The Rise and Fall the New Order*. London: Routledge.
- Wardaya, Baskara T. (2009). *Membongkar Supersemar! Dari CIA hingga Kudeta Merangkak Melawan Bung Karno*. Yogyakarta: Percetakan Galang Press.
- Wibowo, Christianto. (1970). *Aksi Tritura: Kisah sebuah Partnership*. Djakarta: Pusat Sedjarah Angkatan Bersendjata.
- Wicaksono, Andri. (2017). "Mencari Karakter Pendidik yang Ideal bagi Indonesia: Dalam Cerita dan Realita dari Masa ke Masa" in *LENTERA: Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, Volume 1, pp.109-118.
- "Wisata Sejarah: Museum Ronggowarsito" in *DOTSEMARANG: Personal Blog of Semarang*, on 13th October 2017. Available online also at: <https://dotsemarang.blogspot.com/2012/02/wisata-sejarah-museum-ronggowarsito.html> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].
- Yogaswara, A. (2009). *Dalang Peristiwa 15 Januari 1974 (MALARI)*. Yogyakarta: Media Pressindo.
- Zabalueva, Olga. (2018). "Museology and Museum-Making: Cultural Policies and Cultural Demands" in *ICOPOM Study Series: The Politics and Poetics Museology*, Volume 46, pp.231-247. Available online also at: <https://journals.openedition.org/iss/1183> [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 24, 2019].
- Zanden, Jan Luiten van & Daan Marks. (2012). *Ekonomi Indonesia, 1800-2010: Antara Drama dan Keajaiban Pertumbuhan*. Jakarta: Penerbit Kompas, Translation.
- Zhang, Carol X. et al. (2018). "Politics of Memories: Identity Construction in Museums" in *Annals of Tourism Research*, Volume 73, pp.116-130. Available online also at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327988328_Politics_of_memories_Identity_construction_in_museums [accessed in Jakarta, Indonesia: March 8, 2019].
- Zulkifli, Arif at al. [eds]. (2014). *Rahasia-rahasia Ali Moertopo: Seri Buku Tempo, Tokoh Militer*. Jakarta: Penerbit KPG [Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia] dan Majalah Tempo.
- Zurbuchen, Mary S. [ed]. (2005). *Beginning to Remember: The Past in the Indonesian Present*. Singapore: NUS [National University of Singapore] Press.



MONAS and TMII as Cultural Heritages in Indonesia
(Source: <http://www.beritajakarta.id/> and 2/3/2020)

The development in the wide cultural field during the New Order government period (1966-1998) was the TMII (*Taman Mini Indonesia Indah* or Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park). The New Order government gave more attention to the field of culture by building monuments, museums, and cultural assets. The same was done by the President Soekarno during the Guided Democracy government period (1959-1966). The difference in the construction of monuments and museums during the Guided Democracy and the New Order governments was in the values introduced to the community. Guided Democracy government, through MONAS (*Monumen Nasional* or National Monument) in Jakarta, for example, saw to arouse the spirit of revolution and the pride of the people to achieve the Socialism.