

READING THE RESISTANCE OF HEGEMONY ON HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN INDONESIA

Andrian Dektisa Hagijanto

Visual Communication Design Study Program, Faculty of Humanities & Creative Industry, Petra Christian University, Jln. Siwalankerto 121, Surabaya 60237.

(031) 2983042

email: andrian@petra.ac.id

Abstract

Indonesian reenactors imitate the characteristic of the troops during the independence war. It becomes euphoric event in commemorating the battles and history learning activity. The activity itself is perceived as the source of history learning when it is creatively crafted to be a media content and uploaded in social media. It is a kind of excavation towards the history of independence war from the alternative perspective, which has never been disclosed before. The reenactors narrate the perspective of the history of Indonesia independence war as, what is interpreted in this writing, the articulation of hegemony counter. It becomes the example of the operationalization for theory of Cox and Schilthuis inspired by Antonio Gramsci. It is a kind of expression of resistance towards the State system and politics from the intellectual concept. Resistance using the history education as the subject becomes a kind of hegemony counter done by society group which are not included in marginalized society. This paper uses the method of library research, observation and visual analysis interview using the Barthesian semiology perspective.

Keywords: reenactor, war history learning, counter hegemony.

Abstrak

Reenactor Indonesia menirukan karakteristik serdadu jaman perang kemerdekaan, sebagai eforia peringatan pertempuran dan aktivitas pembelajaran sejarah. Aktivitas itu dipahami sebagai sumber belajar sejarah ketika kemudian dikreasikan sebagai konten yang diunggah ke media sosial. Menjadi upaya penggalan sejarah perang kemerdekaan dari cara pandang yang berbeda dari yang sebelumnya telah diungkapkan.

Para reenactor menarasikan sudut pandang sejarah perang kemerdekaan Indonesia sebagai ungkapan bentuk artikulasi counter hegemony. Hal itu dimaknai menjadi operasionalisasi teori Cox dan Schilthuis. Konsep yang berasal dari Antonio Gramsci. Menjadi ungkapan perlawanan terhadap politik dan sistem negara yang dilakukan secara intelektual. Perlawanan reenactor pada subjek edukasi sejarah menjadi suatu jenis perlawanan pada hegemoni oleh masyarakat. Namun oleh masyarakat yang tidak termarjinalkan secara sosial.

Paper ini menggunakan metode penelitian studi pustaka, observasi dan wawancara dengan analisis visual menggunakan sudut pandang semiologi Barthesian.

Kata kunci: reenactor, pembelajaran sejarah perang, counter hegemoni.

1. INTRODUCTION

Reenactor is a popular term for people who reenacts battles & events from historical wars. These activities are carried out by wearing uniform and dressing up to imitate the appearance of soldiers, as well as to perform a theatrical reenactment of renown battles in the history of Indonesia's war for independence. Through these

events, they celebrate prominent battles in Indonesian history, such as the Surabaya's 10th of November War, the Jogja's General Offensive on the 1st of March, the Surakarta's General Offensive war, the Battle to Recapture Magelang, Bandung's Ocean of Fire war, etc.

Theatrical dramas performed by reenactors are generally very attractive to the public. It is a place to learn history as well, as they could look at and observe the uniform and equipment wore by soldiers of that era. The audience who enjoys the characters and the "behavior" of the reenactors usually invites them to take pictures together or ask for an explanation about the costumes and equipment used. Reenactors usually perform impression of soldiers involved in the history of Indonesian struggle for independence, i.e., the Japanese, British, Dutch KNIL soldiers before 1942 and after 1945, as well as Indonesian guerrillas and armed forces, or TNI soldiers during the 1946-50s era. Reenactors considered their reenactments as impression, as they not only wear costume and adorn themselves with soldier's equipment and accessories of that time, but to mimic their gesture and behavior as well. This impression is a form of improvisation based on visual data from historical documentary photographs and moving images. Impression is also their effort to optimize the authenticity of historical events based on those visual documents. Examples of impressions can be seen in the photos below:



Figure 1. Reenactors impression of soldiers during an event at the War Memorial
(Source: Beny Rasmawan's photo collection, 2020)

The narrative from this interpretative reading of historic battles expands the world of history enthusiasts. The expression that manifests as a source of history learning is accommodated by the emergence of various social media channels, especially popular websites. Moreover, several historical sites have also sprung up to complement the euphoria of history fans, including the reenactors. Popular sites such as Historia, Seword, National Geography Indonesia become a place and expression for reenactors to channel their preferences. The historical stories that were revealed were turned into various studies to collect the pieces of the mosaics, which complemented historical documentation that are relatively less known to the public.

2. Problem Statement

Euphoria of the search for traces of the history of the battle and the activity of exposing information on new discoveries that exposes history is an interesting thing to study. Reading the activities of reenactors in their 'madness' phenomenon in war epics is interpreted by researchers as a 'counter effort' towards the stability of historical exposure. It seems to be a kind of alternative expression to the previously known history of popular warfare. In other words, it seems that the reenactor's activity is an articulation of counter, namely resistance that focuses on creating a holistic and objective understanding of the history of the war of independence. The visible resistance of material activities and objects is not the euphoria of anarchy, non-violence, which is what Gramsci calls the resistance of the educated by means of education. A counter hegemony by Cox and Schilthuis (2012) is said to be resistance by the general public who are not marginalized.

3. Research Methods

type of research is qualitative with a descriptive study approach using data collection techniques from literature study and observation. The tools used in the data search were interviews and observations using Whatsapp and Facebook applications as a form of complying with social distancing recommendations during the Covid 19 pandemic.

Data analysis was carried out with a Barthesian semiological perspective, namely placing material objects as denotative aspects, while Gramsci's concept or theory of hegemony as the connotative aspect where the researcher interprets the relationship between the two objects as an argumentative attitude and becomes an expression of the research mythology. This research method model is one of the possible alternatives in visual studies in Visual Communication Design science.

4. Gramsci's Theory of Hegemony Resistance

Hegemony itself has the meaning of domination by one group over another, with or without the threat of violence. An idea that is dictated by the dominant group to the dominated group is accepted as something natural which is moral, intellectual and cultural (Dominic, 1995). The concept of hegemony rolled out by Gramsci works through two stages, namely the Domination Stage and the Direction Stage.

The understanding of cultural hegemony in philosophy and sociology has an understanding which means rule and leadership, namely indirect domination by the ruling class that regulates structures and unions under it through intervention, but not using military force (Rakhmat, 2017). domination are tools of state power that operate through institutions such as schools, capital/capital, media and state institutions. The ideology that is infiltrated through these power tools for Gramsci is an awareness that aims to make the ideas desired by the state (in this case capitalism system) becomes the norm agreed upon by society .

Symptoms of the emergence of hegemony are preceded by what is called domination. If domination has occurred, the next stage is the dominated party is directed and submitted to the leadership or by the dominating class. The concept of

this arose from the situation and background of Antonio Gramsci, where he was an intellectual of the Italian Communist Party imprisoned by Mussolini's fascist regime.

The study of Gramsci is very interesting because it explains why there was no revolt in Italy but instead the workers were subservient to the fascist group that became the dictator. In addition, it is interesting again that Gramsci's concepts of hegemony are considered to be ahead of their time because they were written while in prison (1929-1935) but became the object of study in Europe in the 1960s. The concepts of hegemony that he wrote in the book *Prison Notebooks* became popular and even very relevant to study social phenomena today.

Fundamentally, the concept of domination explains that anyone who tries to fight against hegemony is considered a person who opposes 'truth/axiological concepts' and is seen as an attempt to commit ignorance; therefore, it will be considered as a deviant act. On this basis, the resistance carried out has the opportunity to be resisted through violent means by the dominating party.

Gramsci in *Prison Notebooks* (2011) offers a concept against hegemony (known as *counter hegemony*) by focusing on the education sector. Furthermore, it is said that everyone is an intellectual but in society not everyone carries out their intellectual function, meaning that the group of intellectuals who carry out their intellectual function in society is a factor that plays an important role as the spearhead in the fight against hegemony.

Gramsci's theory of hegemony is quite relevant to be studied, understood and projected on social life to date, considering how the implementation or influence of the prevailing power (read: domination) sometimes makes people lose consciousness. An example of the practice of hegemony carried out by the state in the material object of research is the creation of historical narratives of the Indonesian war of independence. The narrative of nationalism that cannot be separated from the New Order's militarism is evident in the historical exposure to people's epics. Likewise, historical learning sources, both in daily conversations, news content and policies issued related to the theme of the Indonesian war of independence.

Gramsci's theory of hegemony was continued by Cox and Schilthuis (2012) who *of hegemony and counter hegemony* to identify resistance to the state and politics carried out by the general public who were not marginalized. This study is more appropriate to analyze social phenomena or popular cultural expressions such as those found in various forms of expression in *cultural studies*.

Expressions of community groups that are manifested in various channels and popular behavior such as in novels, films, music (including those performed by *reenactors*) are interpreted as expressions of liberation for things that hegemony themselves and society, whether consciously or not. In other words, only the conscious community performs critical reactions and expressions as a reaction to the hegemony that has occurred and has plagued them. They then carried out social and cultural resistance as Gramsci said in his diary that the first point of the critical movement was awareness itself (Gramsci, 2011, 324).

5. Results and Discussion.

5.a. The victor writes the history of the war that never ends is echoed.

There is an adage: "history has been written by the victors" which is said to have been first put forward by Winston Churchill, although many argue or believe that the sentence came from Napoleon. This cross of opinion is an early example of the perspective that although its essence is related to history, one cannot determine with certainty who initiated it for the first time. Therefore, history then becomes a subject that depends on many things, for example who wrote it, the interests behind the writing, or the events behind it, and so on.

Historical events are momentum, becoming a kind of assertion (a declaration, or a series of declarations as a whole, by the party responsible for the declaration), which cannot be separated from the possibility of different perspectives. There are at least two ways of understanding modern and postmodern about the nature of a historical event itself. The wars that have occurred and are then narrated are the result of the reduction and redundancy of historical events themselves.

Kompas 10 November 2017 edition in the headline "The Forgotten Epic of 10 November" explained that tactically, the Allied group of countries (America, Britain, France, the Netherlands, Canada and Australia) won the battle of Surabaya, but strategically the Republic of Indonesia won and was known to the world until the recognition of sovereignty was reached in December 1949. From this opinion, it can be understood that winning the battle was different from winning the war. There are two winning criteria for this historical phenomenon. There are two groups, each of which claims to be the winner with different criteria. If it is associated with the above adage, then in the history learning sources, two narratives of historical writing are standardized which seem to be standardized by different winners. Both are recognized as dialectical and compromising forms of history. History is a dialogical thing. From there, a common thread can be drawn on the discourse of the emergence of people's critical intellectual attitudes which became the initial expression of the trail towards counter hegemony.

History becomes a kind of compromising dialogical expression. History that was originally already rigid seems to have shifted into a media that is full of openness. History becomes postmodern, becomes flexible and not rigid as structural-functionalism in modernism. The perspective that creates the diverse mindset of 'anything goes' gives people the opportunity to think about alternative opinions outside of the rigid and structuralist history. People roll out different narrative discourses that challenge established forms of affirmation of validity and objectivity.

Opinions on alternative readings on history are a form of multi-perspective study. War is no longer fixated on the stigma of a friend group against an opposing group, no longer about right or wrong, or understanding as a binary opposition, but people see war events as a channel for discourses outside of conflict that provide space for introspection, transcendence and open alternative axiological studies.

The Surabaya war, for example, is no longer just a necessity about the epic of heroes and fighters who fought in an effort to defend independence in 1945, or about the Netherlands - as a member of the Allies - who wanted to get back the Dutch East Indies, which was left behind by the defeat of Japan and later successfully conquered. The November 10 war can be interpreted as an epic about national unity. As an articulation of the unification of different elements of society to achieve the ideals of an independent nation. The war became a warning about the nation's children who threw away the fear and danger of death in order to defend their independence, as well as a discourse about *jihad fisabilillah* when the Allies were stigmatized as an infidel group.

Readings about the Surabaya war at this time are also understood to be a critical narrative of proving the existence and legacy of minority groups against *hoaxes* of fundamentalists who negate their participation in the history of the struggle for Indonesian independence. Namely when reenactor had the impression of imitating Laskar Kuomintang in the theatrical drama commemorating the Surabaya War in 2018 as a representation of the Chinese existence in the struggle against the Allies, as shown in Figure 5.



Figure 2. The imitating *impression of the reenactor* Laskar Kuomintang in the theatrical drama commemorating November 10, 2018. (Source: photo collection of Andrian, 2018)

Excavations of historical artifacts (including among them) the Surabaya war at this time are more of a rereading of the existence of a group that has suddenly been cornered ' for the phenomenon of identity politics and the crystallization of excess social groups from the protracted 2017 DKI Pilkada. This retrospective effort on the existence of groups who were cornered as a result of post-election identity politics became the conclusion of historical excavation studies on groups of fighters who took part in sacrificing their body and soul in the war but were simply forgotten.

The adage about the owner of history is the victor of the war, in this perspective is no longer a rigid expression. History also comes from who lost the war, who survived, who's strategy seemed to be the loser but later became the ruler. Things like that are understood to be important discourses that later become the chroniclers. All groups have the right to the writing of history. The history of the victors of the war, the history of the group that survived. The history of the victor as the party who stood tall despite suffering defeats that cost thousands of lives.

Writing history is no longer related to what is wrong or right about the loser does not mean the party is wrong. The party who loses to win also has the opportunity to create a narrative about claims and the inevitability of truth. There will be a lot of motivation to create a narrative from various perspectives about a historical event.

The war for independence is long over and each warring party has written its own version of history. They also seem to be competing to write history, claiming to be the winner according to their perspective. Therefore, there are various claims and perspectives. The historical narrative that emerges later is not about the story of the same victor, but things that have not been revealed about the victor of the war in a different perspective, as well as the loser of the war. History is also written by those who did not win physical wars, for example the exposition of Jugun Ianfu from Jogjakarta who received appreciation for the suffering caused by war (<https://www.merdeka.com/jateng/saat-mantan-jugun-ianfu-asal-jogja-tortured-japanese-to-face-bad-stigma.html>). Similarly, the story of Hiroo Onoda, the last Japanese soldier to surrender, on March 9, 1974 (<https://www.voice.com/news/2020/08/17/133222>). The two figures of different 'fate' were hailed long after the war was over. Narratives about the existence of heroism and sacrifice emerged.

The winner is no longer the sole party celebrating their own victory, but many also enjoy the euphoria of victory and claim to be part of the winner. It is also interesting to explain, therefore the narrative of the victor does not only focus on one battle and one single victory. The next winner's exposure is from a different war which is then drawn in relation to the war that has occurred. The next winner is an integral part of the previous winner.

The celebration of the present winner cannot be separated from the existence of the previous winner. This is what strengthens the motivation of excavation in order to bring up novelties in exposing history. The history of war being the object of exploitation is not enough just to be an epic. Become the object of activity in search of winners in wars and battles that are considered still relevant. Historical narrative about the never-ending and satisfying journey of searching for winners. Especially when the history of war is seen as an object of diachronic study that is relevant to the development of society and its changes. The war is long over but its echoes continue to be heard to this day.

5.b. A small narrative on heroism as a *counter hegemony*.

The Oemoem attack of March 1, 1949 (hereinafter abbreviated as SO) is a major war event that is remembered, preserved and commemorated to this day. There are always various findings in the form of testimonies and documentation that complement the narrative about the gallantry event in the history of the struggle for independence. SO is a battle story that has been preserved for generations, especially in the Special Region of Yogyakarta.

The reenactors who were members of the Djogjakarta '45 community apart from being actively involved in the reenactor's actions during the war also collected various war events that occurred before and after the SO incident. At least there are various battle events that seem no less heroic by the *reenactor* of the Djogjakarta

'45 Community was an effort to compile the history of the war that took place in the DIY region. Completing the description of the war. It was revealed that there were many skirmishes that preceded the occurrence of SO that were not exposed or unknown to the layman. The battle is then written in full including how it was triggered, what it happened and the model of the war, where it took place, who was involved, who died, how many were injured and how much each side lost, and so on. The presentation was so comprehensive that it was complemented by documentation of supporting artifacts in the form of pictures, charts, photos of places, photos of people who fought and photos of memorials built by the government at a later date at the battle site.

These historical stories were then summarized in many articles with the theme of Resistance to the Dutch in 1948-1949, on their blogspot. See more at <http://djokja1945.blogspot.com/2014/11/perlawanan-terhadap-belanda-di-tahun.html>. As in the photo below.



Figure 3. Community page of Djogjakarta 1945
(Source FB page owned by Djokja1945.blogspot, downloaded 2021)

The exposures of these small battles became a kind of 'small narrative' of SO's 'big narrative'. Different and contrasting small narratives, one of which describes the figure of an innocent farmer who was oppressed and left his fields to take up arms, the people who became victims of the Dutch for feeding and hiding fighters, village clerics, or Catholics who braved and died against the Dutch.

These stories are an exposure to the entrepreneurship of the common people, nationalist religious figures, farmers and non-military figures and become historical narratives that 'confront' with the narrative of the SO war. The historical disclosure in the story of these small-scale battles is interpreted as a counter hegemony on the dominance of the war history narrative which is very militaristic and tendentious to glorify certain figures in the New Order perspective. The skirmish became an articulation that SO did not stand alone, but there were previous small-scale battles that supported the occurrence of SO, the skirmish was no longer military domination, because it described the common people. Become a wider and more open form of articulation because everyone is free to interpret and narrate from various perspectives. An awareness that SO is not a war belonging to the army, but also the oppressed people.

5.c. *Counter hegemony collaborative strategy Reenactor's.*

SO commemoration in the last 5 years is a big agenda that involves many government agencies. Become a popular activity on a national scale. In addition to learning history and preserving nationalism, SO is a tourism object, and a collaborative event between government agencies. Many parties were involved besides the Army, Air Force, Police, Student Regiments of various campuses, the Tourism Office, the Vredeburg Museum. In addition, it also involves scientists and researchers in the field of sociology-ethnography-history from surrounding campuses. History activists, student councils and schools, and of course *reenactors* throughout Indonesia.

Collaborative events with various forms of activity, for example apart from conventional history learning with classic activities such as exhibitions of historical artifacts, dioramas and photos about SO, also create unique and anti-mainstream history learning, namely by theatrical action imitating the battle of SO. This theatrical drama is unique because every year *the scene* is different. Another unique activity is the exchange of costumes and impression support items such as buying and selling replica uniforms, replica weapons, replica emblems, replica hats, replica bags, gun holsters and various other replicas.

If the artifact exhibition is carried out by the museum and tourism office, then the exchange of various replicas of the *reenactors* is an activity seeking fortune, uniquely, it has become a favorite euphoria in the series of historical commemorations, this can be interpreted as a counter hegemony reenactor for the methods and media of history learning carried out by government agencies. A fight against conditions where they are not marginalized as Cox's point of view.

Because apart from selling, there are often discussions between traders and buyers that give rise to critical expressions of merchandise, especially in relation to the historical authenticity associated with the merchandise.



Figure 4. Stock replica of British *jungle boots* as the model used by the Speciale Troepen Corps (KST) troops, one of the Dutch special forces involved in the SO battle. (Source: Andrian photo collection, 2020)

The uniqueness of *the counter hegemony groups reenactor*. The authorities provide facilities to reenactors, for example with financial support and facilities for organizing a memorial, providing transportation and accommodation to stay at

Vredeburgh Fort for *reenactors* and their communities from out of town during their visit and celebrating the SO commemoration.

Reenactor understands that history is a channel of representation. The history of the war of independence tends to be told from a military perspective which has the potential to carry *hidden messages* related to ideology, politics, social and culture. Including the history of the war of independence is not free of interests, one of which is related to social stability and security and related to politics. Therefore, it is commonplace, historical review and disclosure to the public by the authorities is common after several decades. The history of the war of independence is also brought into the political realm with restrictions or censorship for certain interests. For example, no one discussed Suharto's existence in the KNIL even though the number one figure of the New Order was a former KNIL. Just as the political world does not know friend or foe but has eternal interests, so is history that is twisted.

The wars and battles that ensued were no longer a matter of fighting arms but were wars of interest and hidden agendas, wars no longer manifested in their form and enemies (proxy wars), quota wars, access wars, and broadcasting rights. It's a capital issue. The winners of the war are no longer those who control the other party with bullets or bombs but use capital in the name of profit or secret compromises of the ruling group.

Reenactor in the excavations found that the photo documentation of historical events was not all events that actually happened, but there were some photographs that were made after the event had passed. Some of them were reenactment on Soekarno's orders, with the aim of creating documentation of historical events and making them artifacts (materialistic aspects) that have content that evokes nationalism and the nation's patriotic spirit (dialectical and logical aspects) on the condition of the nation at that time which dominantly believed in certain things. which is metaphysical-transcendental beyond reason.

5.d. Media content creation as a practice of new social movements and resistance.

Various posts about the history of the war of independence on social media not only show the identities of reenactors as activists in their networks, but also produce various historical visual content that develops dynamically in popular and more attractive packaging and make it a medium, and an alternative outlets without the anarchy and confrontational screaming.



Figure 5. Hunting photos for broadcast content or just expression on social media.
(Source: Andrian photo collection, 2019)

Changes and developments in information communication technology that take place very quickly have caused transitional upheavals in social life. *Reenactors* are basically individuals who place themselves outside the social structure of historical institutions. However, the social structure of institutions operating in the historical field (generally included in the military institution) which has an influence on the economic, political, and cultural structures (tourism) seems to have contributed to the dominance and determination of the historical activities carried out by the *reenactor*.

Determination of historical learning resources that characterize certain figures as heroes, creates representations of exemplary and patriotic attitudes, creates resistance. Resistance with the creation of imitation characters of the figures of Bambang Soegeng, Suharto, Sri Sultan HB IX, and military officials involved in formulating the SO strategy. On one of the reenactor event in 2019 gave rise to many imitations of popular figures such as the Suharto figure or General Sudirman, whose imitations that day were carried out by more than one reenactor. The figures were then taken pictures and uploaded to social media pages. It becomes a kind of 'parodic impression' of historical figures. If in history books, the characters are 'sacred', but in the impression they are funny and fun and become entertainment.

Apart from that, the use of haphazard visuals which I think ignores historical authenticity creates a tendency to use certain figures. Popular figures through commercial films also color the impression. Imitation of popular fictional figures is also carried out in theatrical acts. One example, in the film *Janur Kuning* (Alam Surawidjaja, 1979) appears the figure of Lieutenant Komarudin which makes the character, Amak Baldjun, more popular than the real Komarudin figure. SO's theatrical action gave rise to other popular figures, such as Sergeant Tobing who was a fictional character from the film "*Kereta Api Terakhir*" (Mochtar Soemodimedjo, 1981).

The popularity of Sergeant Tobing's figure in the film, played by Gito Rollies, when he was young and became an idol at that time. Authentic figures and imaginative figures both met at the event reenactor *Serangan Oemoem* March 1, 1949. Sergeant Tobing's reimagined figure in the theatrical action commemorating the historical events of the battle became a replica that was imitated again.



Figure 6. Various impressions, characters of Dutch KNIL soldiers and fighters.

The figure of the piped man is an active police officer on duty in the Magelang Regency area.

(Source: photo collection of Andrian, and Agung Setiawan, 2021)

Several themes of the television program entitled 'Indonesia in Events' from one of the national TV channels are about the Indonesian War of Independence. In a program that describes history, it always involves analysis or opinion from event figures or Indonesian historians. It always displays battle visualizations resulting from a mixture of historical documentary *scenes* from imaginative war films. Even though it only uses film clips in scenes of war and gunfights, it is not told or displays the full figures of the film's players.

In the perspective of historical authenticity, it is considered as a form of chaos that has the potential to obscure historical facts. It's as if the visual aspect becomes less important, just a supporting image, or becomes just a generation of impressions about the history of the war of independence. In stark contrast to the impression built through the analysis of competent historians, eyewitnesses and prioritizing methodological aspects.

But on the other hand, it can also be understood that visuality in historical content is actually a very important part that is used as an attraction to study history. With the support of images from a blend of historical films with non-historical films, the content becomes a subject about history that attracts attention and is studied. Although efforts to increase the attractiveness of history by using non-historical images can be interpreted as a form of ambiguity in history learning. Because TV channels are a category of media which in this paper are interpreted as dominant media and tools of power, but what is being done is also interpreted as an effort by the media to counter hegemony, especially on the sacredness and historical rigidity of the ruling party (read: government). Therefore, the position of the establishment of the media with 'two legs' is an articulation that the media is a tool of government power as well as a tool to resist the power of those who are dealing with the government.

Due to the lack of research in war films, local production films tend to ignore and underestimate their authenticity. Directors and producers are more concerned with the story factor and the charm of the film stars who play, even a few who mix historical original stories with imaginative things. War films become more

interesting with the use of artists who are being loved or insert tantalizing love scenes, and so on.

The reenactors who were dissatisfied with such conditions together with their group then made *scenes* in the form of short videos that were more concerned with the authenticity and accuracy of the outfits and gears used.



Figure 7.

Impressions of various characters, the *reenactors* imitate the historical figures of the Oemoem Attack on March 1, 1949 General Sudirman, Lieutenant Colonel Suharto to the imaginative figure of Sergeant Tobing.

(Source: Andrian's photo collection, 2019)

The making of the video is a continuation of the theatrical drama. The video became the subject of historical content as well as an expression of counter hegemony, because from the reenactor, popular and interesting commercial films with the theme of war are still considered problematic in terms of the authenticity of gears and outfits. Therefore, reenactor creates 'match' history learning resource content by striving for the authenticity outfits used. It is still not optimal due to the weakness of acting, directing and inadequate shooting equipment compared to popular films.

Reenactor is quite satisfied with providing education about authentic impressions as well as the determination to struggle that authenticity is a significant thing in the content of history learning resources. This can be seen from the short film entitled "Malang Bumi Hangus" and "KNIL Menyergap" by reenactors from the Malang Community. The short film emphasizes the authenticity of costumes and gears. The film was uploaded by Agus Idr on his Facebook account, as shown in Figure 8 below:



Figure 8. Captured from a short film by Agus Idr. The Battle of Malang, the Earth Scorched and the KNIL in ambush (Source: Agus Idr's FaceBook account photo collection, 2021)

In reading as a form of counter hegemony, what reenactors by creating imitations of historical figures or creating scenes that emphasize the authenticity of the impressions of outfits and gears become what interpreted as the form and form of alternative channels, both as a way of delivering and competing content that works through media that allow it to be accessed. If commercial film producers create content and distribute it through television media and the XXI film network and Netflix, for example, reenactors use Youtube, Instagram and Facebook channels. Both are content and media that actually complement each other but also face each other.



Figure 9. Shooting of a short film with the theme of the Oemoem Attack on March 1, 1949 by the Community of Djogjakarta 1945. (Source: Frozi Mad 2021 photo collection)

Media is me, an expression of the reenactor of the choice of media freedom that carries a critical spirit towards various forms of media establishment and power. People may have opinions, but later on, an assertive agreement will be formed that is flexible and quickly melts back. For example, the narrative of the involvement of *santri* in the November 10 battle as called the resolution of jihad has been passed down from generation to generation in Islamic boarding schools until now. Including various supernatural powers by the students in the battle in Surabaya, although in the New Order version of the historical narrative, the role of the Islamic boarding school students, including the Chinese group in the process of writing national history, is not explained (Kompas, 10 November 2017). But the students remember it well and preserve the story from generation to generation through various opportunities and accessible media. Therefore Instagram, Youtube, Twitter, Facebook become their channels. There is always an opportunity to fight against power, without being anarchist and confrontational.

6. Conclusion.

The celebration of the commemoration of the battle for Indonesian independence was carried out with various activities, all of which became narratives related to history learning. In addition to taking a different form from conventional learning, learning from reenactors is unique and interesting, as a characteristic of hobbyist activities and becoming a forum for various interests and needs of reenactors, as an expression of various articulations of reenactors. Become an expression of practical history learning. Through the creation of sources for historical references, it could endorse and develop practices of counter hegemony. Reenactor activities not only show the identities of history learning activists and media relations networks and the methods used in history learning, but also create a variety of

history learning creativity that develops dynamically and takes various forms of media that were previously unimaginable.

Channels of expression of struggle and forms of resistance against dominations are carried out in silence. There is no need for shouting, anarchy, and not being a confrontational social movement, but based on a culture of mutual cooperation and consensus. History learning by the *reenactor* is interpreted as a kind of anti-establishment social movement and against mainstream history learning ideas. History learning is no longer rigid and conventional, but flexible, unique and interesting at the same time. Done with a variety of viewpoints and activities that unite. Sue the mainstream without realizing it. As a representation of the celebration of the war which is no longer seen as a conflict of warring parties but has been redesigned. Become an articulation and channel for a wider range of interests and is accommodating for various interests and is of course profit oriented.

The celebration of war by the *reenactor* becomes an expression of dialectical articulation. As an effort to achieve compromising conditions for the interests of the rulers and the people who are 'controlled' over the historical learning mode. This effort is an elegant, educative and embodiment of critical choices as a logical consequence of the reenactor as a community group that prioritizes intellectual attitudes. Therefore, counter hegemony is the only choice of quality and civilized resistance.

REFERENCES

- Cox, RH & Schilthuis, A (2012) *Hegemony and Counterhegemony*, The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization.
- Gramsci, Antonio, (2011), *Prison Notebooks, Notes From Prison*, (trans.), Publisher, Pustaka Pelajar, Jakarta.
- Hagijanto, Andrian Dektisa, (2017), *Knit Soldiers Andjing Nica*, Dissertation on the Study of Fine Arts, Postgraduate ISI Yogyakarta
- Kristiyono, J (2020), *Digital Counter Hegemony of the Indonesian Digital Art Community*, Dissertation for Doctoral Program in Social Sciences, FISIP UNAIR, Surabaya.
- Rakhmat, J, (1997), *Cultural Hegemony*, Cultural Landscape Foundation.
- Strinati, Dominic (1995), *An Introduction to Theories of Popular Culture*, Routledge, London.