CHAPTER I
Introduction

As a mirror alike, monuments reflect diverse interpretations throughout the time of its presence. Monument is not only a memory bearer, but become struggle over the meaning of its foundation. Monuments are also often the points of convergence between the official and alternative views of the past. In some cases however contrary to the official names and meanings allocated to monuments, people have their own interpretations of monuments which might derive from either their appearance, location or any other disparate factors to the extent that the original meaning or purpose of the statue/monument may go unnoticed. The nineteenth century Indies for instance witnessed two cases of mistaken identities. The statue of J.P. Coen in Batavia was often mistaken for the Swedish king, Gustavus Adolphus. Similarly, the monument of General A.V. Michiels, erected in Padang in 1855, was mistaken as commemorating the successes of Admiral Michiel de Ruyter. While General A.V Michiels, for whom the monument was originally intended was responsible for the Dutch annexation of West Sumatra in Padang, Admiral Michiel de Ruyter was one of Dutch admirals who played roles during the Anglo-Dutch wars in the 17th century. Nevertheless, both monuments still showed the symbolical power of Dutch colonialism. [1]

Monuments, particularly those of political figures, convey historical and political information. The monuments of the Governor-Generals in the Netherlands Indiës have strong political and historical meaning in relation to colonial history of the Netherlands. Erecting monuments, statues, busts etc similarly displayed Dutch power over the Netherlands Indies.[2] On the façade of the *Nederlandsche Handel-maatschappij*, NHM, building (currently, the municipal archive of Amsterdam) on Vijzelstraat 32-34 Amsterdam, several meters above the main gate, stand the life-size statues of Coen, Daendels and Van Heutsz. Beneath each of these statues is a plaque with their names inscribed on them. This building was the head office of the NHM. Each of them contributed to the institution or extension of colonial rule in the Dutch East Indies. Coen made an impact during the VOC period, Daendels in the transitional period, and Van Heutsz in the colonial period.

---

[1] Freek Colombijn. "Waarom een villa moeilijker te slopen is dan het Jan-Pieterszoon Coen-monument. Sociale veranderingen in de Indonesische stad tijdens de dekolonisatie", in *Leidschrift, Historisch tijdschrift* 21 (2), 2006, p. 93.

[2] Peter J. M. Nas and Maaike Boersma. "Feeling at Home, Dealing with the Past", in Peter J. M. Nas (ed.), *The Past in the Present*, Rotterdam : NAi Publishers, 2007, pp. 147-63.

Some articles emphasize Coen's basic contribution to the prosperity of the Netherlands. His idea to institute a settlement on the island of Java as the governing centre of the company trade in the East Indies is seen as a prudent step with positive consequences for the company. He was responsible for building a fortification in Jacatra that was then called Batavia. He also succeeded eliminating the British presence on the Moluccan or spice islands therefore establishing a company monopoly over the East Indian spice trade.

Daendels on the other hand is well-known as the builder of the great post-road (*de Grote Postweg*) which runs 1.000 km along the north of Java. Although some writers suggest that he did not institute the road per se but worked on a pre-existing route, his notion of renovation itself can be considered exceptional. The idea to build the road was excellent, because this road was to enable the economic exploitation of Java by subsequent governments. Daendels also played an important role in setting up the basic colonial administration and legal framework.

Van Heutsz, a figure of 20th century colonial history, is famous for his leadership in the annexation of Aceh, therefore completing the conquest of that geographical territory that constitutes Indonesia today. He was responsible for the enthusiastic implementation of the Ethical Policy in collaboration with his colleague, the then Minister of Colonies, Idenburg. Nevertheless, Van Heutsz's name is not well-known to the average Indonesian who only learns history at elementary school and high school. Rather, Snouck Hurgronje is a better known name than Van Heutsz.

Representations of the three governors-general in statues, busts and reliefs were quite common in the Netherlands and the Netherlands Indies. In the Netherlands Indies, the statue of Coen stood at Waterlooplein, in Batavia. In the Netherlands, his statue stands in his hometown, Hoorn. Apart from this, there is yet another statue of his at the NHM building in Amsterdam. The last of his representations in the Netherlands is a portrait at the entrance of the *Koninklijk Instituut voor de Tropen* (KIT).

Speaking of Daendels, there seems to have been no justice done to his fame in terms of representation because there is no more than one statue of him in the Netherlands. This statue can be seen at the NHM building. Also, he is only commemorated with a plaque in his hometown, Hattem, which contains the words "de Tinne" on his previous house. In Indonesia, there still exists a statue of him with a Sundanese prince. The statue shows them shaking hands. Daendels extends his right hand and the prince his left. The

right hand of the prince carries a traditional dagger called the *keris*, and the left hand of Daendels holds his sword.

In contrast to Daendels, Van Heutsz's representation with monuments, busts or reliefs is very conspicuous. Monuments of Van Heutsz were built both in the Indies (Batavia) and the Netherlands (Amsterdam). There were also busts of him in Aceh, his hometown, Coevorden and at the KNIL museum at Bronbeek.

The presence, the removal as well as the changing of names or functions of the monuments are interesting to examine, for instance, the changing of the Van Heutsz monument in Amsterdam. There must have been a long debate behind the changing of this monument's name. The prime question of this research then is to examine how the Dutch and the Indonesians are dealing with the past as reflected in those three monuments. How important are the monuments to both the Netherlands and Indonesia regarding the colonial past? How do the relevance and significance of the meanings of a monument change?

The intention of this research is to utilize these monuments to investigate the changing perspectives of the colonizer and the colonized in commemorating their colonial histories. The representation of the monuments both in the Netherlands and Indonesia reflects the appreciation of both governments of their past and how they seek to represent it to the present or perhaps the future as well. Looking into the history of the monuments is actually very interesting. Monuments, despite being custodians of the past, are often neglected, as opposed to texts or even oral history.

Archives, newspapers and interviews were the primary sources of this research. Records housed at the municipal archives of cities which are home to the monuments under study constitute the primary archives employed. Reports on the monuments in national and local newspapers were also used for this research.

Monument and memory are inseparable. The building of monuments is basically to commemorate important persons or events of the past. Building monuments then means attaching memory of persons or events of the past to the monuments. Various memories or information are attached to monuments. It could be victory, reminding victims of events, the grandeur of some figures etc. Colonialism can also be commemorated in the form of monuments, either events or persons. The monuments are usually located in public space, which has its own memory. Therefore monuments and public space are interrelated.

This chapter is about framing the main theme of this research. Theories and historiographical works related to monuments, memory, public space and colonialism will

be collected in order to have an analytical device to cover the research question. Nevertheless, this part will not discuss all of the theories and historiographical works of this research. Several works that do not come up in this chapter probably will be mentioned in the next chapters.

A. Monuments and Memory

Monuments are structures which are made to commemorate specifically important events or persons in the past. Monumen Pancasila Sakti, at the Lubang Buaya in East Jakarta, was built to commemorate the event as well as the seven generals who became the victims of the 1965 Indonesian coup. Rembrandt's bust in Leiden was built to venerate Rembrandt as a famous Dutch painter who was born in Leiden. Monuments can only mean to signify something of the past for the future. The Indonesian National Monument (Monas) for instance, commemorates no particular event or achievement, rather it is in the nature of a summary of or commentary on the Indonesian past.[3]

Monuments take shape in divergent forms. Architecture, buildings, parks, statues and so on are forms of monuments. The Sydney Opera House, the Arc de Triomphe in Paris, Travalgar Square in London are several forms of monuments. Nevertheless, the most popular monuments take shape in a statue or obelisk with or without inscriptions. There are so many statues erected during the history of humankind. In the modern era, statues are still built to commemorate persons or events.

Monuments are also memory bearers. Most monuments are consciously built to commemorate important persons or events. Names, meaning and images of persons and events are attached to the monuments. The Arc de Triomphe in Paris, which was completed in 1836, is to commemorate Napoleon's victorious armies. Therefore, by watching the monument, at least the French people will still remember the triumph of Napoleon and his armies. An obelisk in the Dam Square in Amsterdam, which was unveiled on May 4th 1956, is to venerate the victims of World War II. In order to strengthen the remembrance, a public commemoration is held on that day every year. Memory is unavoidably embedded into monuments and people intentionally use monuments as the memory bearers. Memories in the monuments supposedly live for

---

[3] Benedict R. O'G. Anderson. "Cartoons and Monuments: The Evolution of Political Communication under the New Order", in Benedict R. O'G. Anderson (ed.), *Language and Power: Exploring Political Cultures in Indonesia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990, p. 175.

generations, so that people who live in the period of long after the monument was erected will still know them.

Unveiling monuments is not always smooth. Views for and against the building of monuments are common. The building of Taman Mini Indonesia Indah (an open museum of Mini Indonesia) in the 1970s, for instance, faced many protests from the beginning. As the initiator and project leader, Mrs. Suharto, on several occasions argued how important the project was for tourism. She had a firm stand that she would never stop the project as long as she was alive. Nonetheless, the protests continued until her husband, President Suharto, said that he would take a *Supersemar*[4] to those who were against the project.[5] Learning from this case, it is clear that the story behind the monuments reflects the intention of the unveiling and responses.

The importance of a monument stems from its location, the nature of the monument and its inscriptions. The placement of a monument is particularly significant. A monument can be placed in the schoolyard, in the city square, in front of a town hall or a church, in a cemetery, or at a busy junction. The placement of monuments at these sites is of differing importance and the significance of the monument itself is closely associated to the importance of the space in which it is located to peoples' everyday lives. Erecting a monument in or around a church in Dutch cities was probably important in the past when the Dutch people were more religious or pious, than today when the Dutch are less pious. The development of a city, its road systems and the continuity and change of its city centre must be considered to comprehend the significance of those places.[6] The placement of a monument in a big city and in a small town is one of the significance of the monument. The monuments located in big cities, especially in the capital cities, are very strategic and have more meaning than those located in small towns. This is because capital cities are prominent "theaters of state power", hence monuments are a means of communicating the power, authority and ideology of the regime.

The second factor is the nature of the monument: whether or not, it possesses or takes the form of a statue. Statues, in particular, are powerful images. The presence or the absence of a statue might be a result of cost or ideological considerations. For instance, it is

---

[4] Supersemar is an acronym of Surat Perintah Sebelas Maret, a letter of order which was issued on the 11th March, 1966. It is a letter that was issued by President Soekarno to Major General Suharto in 1966 to take action to create order. Suharto used this letter to usurp authority from Soekarno.

[5] Benedict R. O'G. Anderson. "Cartoons and Monuments…", pp. 175-6.

[6] Antoine Prost. "Monuments to the Dead", in Pierre Nora, *Realms of Memory*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1997, pp. 307-30

difficult to find statues in Islamic cities, since the presence of profile of individuals in statues or paintings is not allowed. The third factor is the presence of inscriptions on the monument. Some monuments have a list of names of people to commemorate while others possess a special heroic epigraph in honor of a hero. According to Prost, by combining the three significances of monuments, one will assure a typology of memorials that points to a range of local sensibilities.[7]

In sum, memory and monument are very closely related, since erection of a monument has a particular intention, so that monument keeps memory. In other words, memory is attached to monument. The importance of the monument stems from location, its nature and its inscriptions. What and how to commemorate the colonies will be elaborated in the next section.

B. Sites of Colonial Memory

Several scholars have written books about colonial memory and sites of colonial memory. De Jong demonstrates that it took almost fifty years for the Netherlands to realize that Indonesia is not their colony anymore. Although, recognizing Indonesian independence in 1949, the Netherlands still tried to control their former colony in other ways, such as through the allocation of financial credit. It is not surprising that it was not until 2006 that the Netherlands acceded to the fact that Indonesians acquired independence in 1945. To the Netherlands, decolonization has been and is a long learning process.[8]

Recollection of the Dutch possession of the Netherlands Indies materializes in many forms. Nas and Boersma show that the Dutch still feel at home when they deal with many things related to the colonial Indies or Indonesian. The Indies are still imagined by the Dutch. The former colony has left a definite imprint on the Netherlands. In several Dutch cities are found houses and buildings which are influenced by the Indies' architecture. Streets, bridges, plaques and restaurants in the Netherlands are named after Indonesian islands, flowers and nationalists. Almost coexisting with their Indonesian

---

[7] Peter Stewart. *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Respons*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003, p. 298; Antoine Prost. "Monuments to the Dead…", p. 311.
[8] J.J.P. De Jong. "Dekolonisatie als Leerproces", Internationale Spectator, Juli/Augustus, LIV, nr 7/8, pp. 365-71.

counterparts are the statues and monuments of important colonial officials in the Indies, such as the governors-general.[9]

The colonizer and the colonized have varying perceptions of the colonial past. On the one hand, the colonizers promote the history of their dignity of the past. Histories of discovering, exploring, founding institutions and struggling in new lands are heroic events for them. These kinds of histories go further to the history derived from the colonial relations. Histories of physical developments, nation-building and national character in the colonized lands are important histories for the colonizers. On the other hand, the history of the colonized regarding colonialism is usually characterized by the economic exploitation, fighting wars particularly with regard to the independence wars.[10]

Colonization, particularly for the colonizers, was not easy to forget. Even for French, Aldrich regards that decolonization was a painful process. It was believed that the loss of the colony(ies) would reduce the role France played in world affairs. The loss of colony(ies) further left their imprints on their colonizers. The memory of the French empire is reflected in the street naming, the building of museums and monuments and so forth. The capital city of France, Paris, is a site of colonial memories. Streets are named after explorers (i.e. La Pérouse), missionaries (i.e. Cardinal Lavigerie), colonial military figures and administrators (i.e. General Faidherbe). At least, those buildings and namings are warnings against historical 'amnesia'. Interestingly, in Paris, although less prominently marked, are also sites of anti-colonial memory. Aldrich gives an example of a plaque along the Seine and another one in a Métro station that commemorate those who were killed during demonstrations against the war in Algeria. This would hence show that both the colonial past and those associated with it, along with others who featured in the anti-colonial movement are commemorated. However, France is still reluctant to, for instance name streets, after episodes or individuals who evoke mixed or negative feelings.[11].

Monuments are material traces of the past. The greatness and valor of the past events or persons are commemorated in monuments, even those events and persons

---

[9] Peter J. M. Nas and Maaike Boersma. "Feeling at Home, Dealing with the Past", in Peter J. M. Nas (ed.), The Past in the Present, Rotterdam : NAi Publishers, 2007, pp. 147-63.

[10] Gert Oostindie. "Historical Memory and National Canon", in Gert Oostindie, Dutch Colonialism, Migration and Cultural Heritage, Leiden: KITLV Press, 2008, pp. 63-93.

[11] Robert Aldrich. Decolonization, the French Empire and Sites of Memory, www.port.ac.uk/special/ france1815to2003/ chapter10/interviews/filetodownload,26394,en.pdf, accessed on 13 February 2009; Robert Aldrich. "Putting the Colonies on the Map: Colonial Names in Paris Streets", in Tony Chafer and Amanda Sackur, *Promoting the Colonial Idea: Propaganda and Visions of Empire in France*, New York: Palgrave, 2002, pp. 211-23.

associated with colonialism. Recollection of events of the past as well as the greatness of persons of the past is kept in the monuments. Events or persons commemorated in monuments are important for a large number of people and connected to national or local interest. Nevertheless, an act or individual considered worthy of commemoration by one group may be considered an object of denunciation by another. Therefore, there are monuments that were erected to commemorate both troops' victory in wars and the victims on either side of the battle lines. Monuments are also known to acquire meaning vastly different from the original intention they were known to possess. In Germany for instance, a monument which previously commemorated the Germans' occupation of Namibia currently is commemorated as an anti-colonial monument.[12] Since the physical appearance of monuments is static, it seems that monuments have a greater task to keep memory rather than the people.

To recapitulate, it takes quite a long process to really realize that the colonizers lost their colonies. For the Dutch, recollection of the colony appears in many forms, including statues and monuments that show their power over the colony. Because the colonial past is disgraceful, the Germans changed the name of a colonial monument to an anti-colonial monument, while the French commemorate several anti-colonial movements, although reluctantly. The subsequent section will discuss about the public space completing monument in meaning making.

C. Public Space and Meaning Making

Monuments are usually located in public space. Memories do not only adhere to the monuments themselves, but also to the public space as well. Locating monuments in public space makes sense to attract people passing by, so that, the people will hopefully recollect the past by looking at the monuments. In this sense, public spaces also become sites of memory. New nation-states after decolonisation usually built new memories by erecting monuments in public space. This is evident from Nas' study of Jakarta's monuments. As he evidently shows, the first president of Indonesia, Soekarno, sought to remove all traces of Dutch colonial memory from Jakarta. As an architect he was concerned about architectural symbols of the nation. He built several monuments in Jakarta to give a new identity of Indonesia as a nation that had been liberated from colonialism. The Istiqlal

---

[12] Robert Aldrich. "Putting the Colonies on the Map…".

Mosque, the National Monument, the Hanuman Monument, the Liberation of Irian Barat and several other monuments were built during the Soekarno era.[13]

In a similar study, Blockmans shows that the authorities of Istanbul, Moscow and Berlin created architectural sites to create symbols of the country or nation. Monuments were symbolic expressions of nationality. Furthermore, monuments also became power expressions of regimes. Constantinople, the previous name for Istanbul, became a metropolis city after the conquest of Egypt and Syria. The metropolis city became an arena of creation and influence by the king's family. Berlin also experienced similar contestation. Five German regimes, since the end of the World War I, constructed five different buildings and architectural creations. Similar developments also occurred in Moscow. The city became modern since the 1960s when skyscrapers were planted on the seven hills and the establishment of many television antennas. The changing regimes of the three cities created different monuments as symbolic expressions of their powers. Thus, monuments were the realm of contestations among the regimes.[14]

Similarly, supplied by ideas from his wife and other family members, Suharto, who was president after Soekarno, also built several monuments in Jakarta. One of them was initiated by his wife. Taman Mini Indonesia Indahis the small open museum where people can see how the ethnic architectural building and custom in Indonesia are. To legitimate his power, Suharto also built Monumen Pancasila Sakti, well known as the Lubang Buaya (the Crocodile Pit). In this monument's stand are statues of several generals who were killed in the 1965 Indonesian Revolution. A pit wherein the generals' bodies were found were the important spots of the monument. Nevertheless, all the monuments built during Soeharto era are located in the second ring, while Soekarno's are in the first ring of Jakarta.[15]

Nevertheless, public space, and surely monuments are not media of keeping memories, but also losing them. Showing the case of Soekarno's monuments as well as Soeharto's, Kusno asserts that public space is an important point to remove memories. The Japanese military government in Indonesia removed the Dutch colonial memory by, for instance, removing the statue of Coen in Waterlooplein. In this case, Colombijn poses question on why Coen's monument had to be removed while other legacies of colonialism

---

[13] Peter J. M. Nas. *Urban Symbolism*, Leiden: Brill: 1993.

[14] Wim P. Blockmans. "Reshaping Cities: The Staging of Politcal Transformation", in Journal of Urban History, vol. 3 no. 1, November 2003, pp. 7-20.

[15] Abidin Kusno. *Ruang Publik, Identitas dan Memori Kolektif, Jakarta Pasca-Soeharto*, Yogyakarta: Ombak, 2009; Peter J. M. Nas. Urban Symbolism, Leiden: Brill, 1993.

such as villas still existed. Statues of colonial military and civil officers, whatever their meaning to people had strong colonial associations. Although villas did suggest coloniality to an extent, they could still be tolerated because they benefited the people. Moreover they were still symbols of authority and could be used by the new systems of power.[16]

Kusno subsequently argues that Soekarno tried to remove all colonial memories by building many monuments in Jakarta. Soeharto tried to remove or at least to shift people's point of interests from Soekarno's to his. Perhaps, Soekarno wanted to have an image of a *Bapak Pembangunan* (building father) by ordering to build a new building called the Gedung Pameran Pola Pembangunan Nasional Semesta on the historical site of his previous house where he proclaimed the Independence of Indonesia. The house and the Proclamation obelisk had been destroyed before. Nonetheless, it was Soeharto who finally succeeded to have the title of *Bapak Pembangunan*. This title was built by firstly the *petrus* campaign (*penembak misterius*, mysterious shooting). It was a campaign to shoot gangsters and leave their corpses on the street in the early 1980s. Soeharto wanted to remove the memory of people on the street during the Soekarno period, when crowds of people listened to Soekarno's speeches. Soeharto showed that streets were dirty, it was not as glorious as in Soekarno's time. After the *petrus* campaign, Soeharto then built many buildings and malls to create new memory of the streets. Since he came to power, Soeharto subtly suggested that he was better than Soekarno by giving the title "new" (New Order) to his period, and "old" (Old Order) to Soekarno's. The old one was bad and had to be replaced by the new one.[17]

The way a new regime removes a memory of the previous regime was called *damnatio memoriae*. This is a set of more or less formal and traditional strategies for attacking the memory of a dead public enemy. The methods of doing this principle were the eradication of visual representations of the persons, a ban on their names, and the prohibition of the observance of the funeral and mourning. The *damnatio memoriae* negates the image represented. The negation or opposition of initial representation does not mean to negate the evidence of the past, rather to produce new signs of it.[18] In such an

---

[16] Freek Colombijn. "Waarom een villa moeilijker te slopen is dan het Jan-Pieterszoon Coen-monument. Sociale veranderingen in de Indonesische stad tijdens de dekolonisatie", in *Leidschrift, Historisch tijdschrift* 21 (2), 2006, pp. 91-107.

[17] Abidin Kusno. *Ruang Publik, Identitas dan Memori Kolektif…..*

[18] Charles W. Hedrick Jr. *History and Silence: Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000, p. xii; Peter Stewart. *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

instance, therefore, the meaning although transformed in form remains even though the monument may be removed.

Damnatio Memoriae is actually an official prohibition to memorialise enemies of the regime during Roman Empire. Persons who committed rebellion or *coup* were not supposed to be remembered. The victims of the *damnatio memoriae* were thus those who were obviously unworthy of social existence. Their existence in busts, inscriptions on monuments and especially statues had to be removed. Even to mention their names was even strictly prohibited. Anyone who mentioned the name of an enemy of the regime would immediately be killed. Their existence had to be removed in many ways.[19]

The removal of memories via monuments or statues could be done harshly or gently. Toppling, bombing or dynamiting are the obvious ways to remove memories in monuments. The intention of removal, either harshly or gently, is the same, namely to remove the previous memory and replace it with a new 'proper' memory. The gentle removal is very interesting since it is not only replacing one memory with another, but at the same time it creates sympathy that might cause faster creation of a new memory. The removal of several Dutch colonial statues in Indonesia during the Japanese occupation was done gently. The way of removals seemed to make Indonesians sympathetic to the Japanese, thinking that they were good and gentle, as previously the Dutch troops had caused great destruction.[20] Street names in Indonesia, Surabaya for instance, were changed from those after the Dutch colonial era to more Indonesian ones, particularly the opponents of the Dutch. For example, streets or areas named after Teuku Umar, the commander in chief of the Acehnese in the Aceh war, replaced Van Heutsz, the commander in chief of the Dutch side.[21]

Chris Healy shows that the historical monuments bequeathed by 20th century Australia are not nearly so solid or taken for granted as those of the 19th century. He argues that it happened because they are within reach of lived experience. The 20th century monuments in Australia are more fractured, subject to challenge, reinterpretation and even the refusal of popular memory. It was not until 1988, that Australians realized that their

---

[19] Peter Stewart. *Statues in Roman Society…*, pp. 268-70.
[20] Abidin Kusno. *Ruang Publik, Identitas dan Memori Kolektif…..*
[21] Sarkawi B. Husain. "Sepanjang Jalan Kenangan: Makna dan Perebutan Simbol Nama Jalan di Kota Surabaya", in Freek Colombijn et.al., *Kota Lama Kota Baru: Sejarah Kota Kota di Indonesia Sebelum dan Sesudah Kemerdekaan*, Yogyakarta: Ombak, 2005.

social memory is a product of colonialism.[22] Australian history has been challenged since 1988, two hundred years after the Europeans first anchored in Australia.

From the explanation of the relation between monument, memory and public space, it is clear that space is a social product or a result of complex social construction. The social production of urban space is fundamental to the reproduction of society. Lefebvre argues that the social production of urban space is not only a means of production, but also a means of control and a means of domination.[23] The meanings of space are formed through the social processes which are going on and on as well as the changes that have taken place over time. Public and private spaces, as well as the composition of buildings in a city do not only reflect different social status of the people, but also denote and form the inter-location social relations. Lefebvre argues that urban space process has its own dynamics, which is separated from the formation of social groups and social relations.

Ben Anderson proceeded to study monuments and their politico-cultural meanings in Indonesia from the period of Soekarno to that of Soeharto. To comprehend the intention and the context of a monument, he analyses the form and the content of the monument, although it is not entirely understood of what the role of monuments are in forming and transforming collective identity. He considers monuments as the symbolic speech of authority, rather than direct speech. He says that direct speech often eludes the academic eye because of its fluid and ephemeral nature. Symbolic speech escapes attention for rather different reasons. Anderson also considers monuments as an important symbolic speech for Indonesian political cultures. Though many monuments were built during Soekarno's ascendancy in Indonesia, people usually think that Soekarno was more inclined to building monuments when actually Soeharto had been even more 'monument minded'.[24] During his reign, Soeharto built many monuments both within and outside Jakarta. Anderson considers monuments as an important symbolic speech for Indonesian political cultures. To comprehend the intention and the context of a monument, he analyses the form and the content of the monument, although the role of the monuments in forming and transforming collective identity is not entirely understood.

---

[22] Chris Healy. *From the Ruin of Colonialism: History as Social Memory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 5-6.
[23] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henri_Lefebvre, accessed on 28 February, 2009.
[24] Benedict R. O'G. Anderson. "Cartoons and Monuments: The Evolution of Political Communication under the New Order", in Benedict R. O'G. Anderson, *Language and Power: Exploring Political Cultures in Indonesia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990, pp. 152-93

Monuments and statues have different appreciation. In a thorough study of monuments in Jakarta, Nas demonstrates that the monuments in Jakarta have many different meanings. Although official meanings are attached to monuments, people have a different appreciation and attach a different meaning to them. For instance, the Dirgantara statue, popularly known as Tugu Pancoran based on Hanuman, the monkey god in the Ramayana, is differently appreciated by people. From its appearance, some people think that it is a "trooper", others a parachutist, a third lot a "Seven-up Man".[25] However, the statue was erected to show that as a country of thousands of islands, Indonesia is guarded by a powerful Air Force and is connected by a good aviation system. This is the reason why the statue takes the shape of Hanuman who flies across the seas to aid Rama in the story of *Ramayana*.

Monuments can be subtle but dynamic. Regarding *gardu* (guardhouse) as a monument, Kusno studies the changing functions and meaning of *gardu*. The *gardu* was initially taken from the *pendopo* in Javanese royal palaces. The adoption of *pendopo* in more popular ways started after the development of the *Grote Postweg* in 1808. It was during Daendels' administration which governed under the French rule. Possibly the word *gardu* was adopted from a French word *gard*. The *gardu* was located in every stopping place for taking a rest and changing horses. This adoption was motivated by association of the idea of traditional power and protection, and also by, presumably, the picturesque and exotic form of the roof. Kusno argues that by detaching the form from the Javanese royal residence, Daendels displaced the *pendhopo* and resurrected it as the first commercially administered guardhouse.[26]

Soekarno successfully utilized *gardu* as a *podium* for his speeches. It was then used as a *posko hansip*, a post command for civilian defender, by one of the big political parties in Indonesia, Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan (PDI-P) led by Soekarno's daughter (Megawati). It utilized *gardu* as a multi-purpose post. She ordered a *gardu* built to create order and security after May Riots of 1998. Nevertheless, the very idea of this proliferation of building *gardu* is to popularize the leader of the party and her father (Megawati Soekarnoputri and Soekarno) because their pictures always exist on the walls of most *gardu*.[27] In this case, *gardu* is a dynamic monument that has existed in previous

---

[25] Peter J. M. Nas. "Jakarta, City Full of Symbol", in Peter J. M. Nas (ed.), *Urban Symbolism*, Leiden: E. J. Brill: 1993, pp. 21-2.
[26] Abidin Kusno. "Guardian of Memories: *Gardu* in Urban Java", in *Indonesia* vol. 81, April 2006, p. 100.
[27] Abidin Kusno. "Guardian of Memories …", pp. 95-150.

Indonesian traditions, with appropriation of names and functions. The case of *gardu* shows that the significance of monuments does not only lie in the material or physical existence, but also in the story behind the making and the next developments. All the time *gardu* always symbolise power. The location, function and accessories or equipments in the *gardu* are an entity of power.

The memory bearer is actually not only the monument, but also the public space where the monument stands. The creation and removal of memory is to the public space as well. Since the public space is more accessible than the monument is, the public space becomes significant in creating and removing memory. In brief, monument and public space are complementary to guard memory. Memories of colonial pasts are usually located in public space. The significance of the monument is dependent on which public space the monument is located in, besides its size, nature and inscriptions.

To conclude, to create new memory, people firstly destroyed the old one. A new memory can be created from the time old memory was removed. In the case of the Japanese when removing Coen's monument carefully, as Kusno argues, the Japanese wanted to demonstrate that they were better than the Dutch. After being defeated by the Japanese, the Dutch destroyed many things as an expression of their defeat. However, the Japanese wanted to show that they were not destroyers That was why they did not destroy Coen's statue. At least they did not destroy in public, or in official ceremony as the removal. Secondly, a new memory can also created by shifting the focus from the previous one. The way Soekarno planned to build his monuments was by shifting attention of people from old Jakarta to a new centre of attention, Monas. Several other monuments built during Soekarno's period were also built around the new centre. Thirdly, a new memory can surely be attached when there is replacement of the previous. This is actually an old way from the Roman empire to remove an old memory and replace it with the new one.

…

Conclusion

It is not a good idea to remember colonialism as it was. Both the Netherlands and Indonesia have their own memories of colonialism. The Netherlands deeply regret and are

ashamed of what their ancestors did in the Dutch East Indies while Indonesians always remember the struggle and misery of their ancestors under Dutch colonialism. Their treatments of the monuments to the three governor-generals reflect how both nations comprehend past coloniality.

Indonesian nationalism was born as response to Dutch colonialism. For Indonesians, the presence of a monument as a symbol of colonialism started to emerge when the Dutch colonial government unveiled the Van Heutsz monument in Gondangdia, Batavia. Student protests were directed at the plan during the unveiling of the monument in 1935. The protests took place in the context of the 1930s struggle for self-sovereignty in the Netherlands Indies. The struggle for self-sovereignty in the 1930s was limited because of the colonial government's repressive measures towards nationalist activists. They could be exiled or sent to jail without trial.

The spirit of nationalism became stronger during the Japanese occupation period. Unlike the Dutch colonial period, during the Japanese occupation nationalist leaders were involved in many important Japanese institutions. Those nationalists who were co-operative with the Japanese used their involvement in Japanese institutions to build nationalism into a wider Indonesian nation. They urged people to help the Japanese win the Pacific war, but more importantly the nationalist leaders asserted that by helping the Japanese they were helping their own country. They helped the Japanese because they were eager to defend Indonesia.

One of the ways to build nationalism was by removing all colonial symbols. Many monuments and statues related to Dutch colonialism were removed especially to celebrate the Japanese arrival in Indonesia. The statue of Coen at the Lapangan Banteng was also a target for removal. Statues like Coen's were a symbol of Dutch prosperity, but also a symbol of slavery for Indonesians. The presence of colonial statues according to the Japanese would only decrease the spirit to revive the people from the misery of the colonial period. Therefore those statues with regard to colonialism had to be removed.

During independence, vestiges of colonialism are still useful to commemorate. The Kompas cycling expedition along the great post road, from Anyer to Panarukan, is a prominent example. The celebration and commemoration were directed to the indigenous people who worked hard to build the road, instead of commemorating Daendels who gave the order to build the road.

For the Dutch, their past colonialism is a dark page of their national history. Most of the monuments with regard to colonialism were targets of criticism. The communists and the social democrats even criticized the monuments when colonialism was still taking place. Anger and shame of their colonial past were demonstrated by destroying Van Heutsz's monument in Amsterdam. The protest attacks were also aimed at Coen's statue in Hoorn. Although strictly speaking Coen is not a figure of the colonial period, he was also considered as a bad figure of the past. The Dutch want to know what Coen had done in the Indies, not only what he gave to the Netherlands. While Daendels, who is little appreciated in the Netherlands because of his allegiance to the French, still has his monument intact.

Vestiges of coloniality are treated quite differently in Indonesia and the Netherlands. While for instance, Van Heutsz's bust and monument were targets of protests in the Netherlands, a medallion or plaque was 'imported' to Aceh in 1993. Van Heutsz's figure as a successful military officer who defeated the Acehnese during the Atjeh war, presumably inspired Indonesian military officers who were on duty in Aceh at that time. A statue of Daendels, with a Sundanese prince, stands safely in Sumedang. The gravestone of Coen is still in the courtyard of the Museum Wayang Jakarta. A *wayang golèk* of him is also part of the collection in the museum. In the Netherlands, the Van Heutsz monument was neutralized by changing its name. In 2004, the monument's name was changed to the Monument Indië-Nederland, 1596-1949.

Besides protests, another way to purge national history of its dark past is by creating a new pride. Hoorn is the most fortunate city among the three governor-generals' hometowns. A novel which takes the setting of life of three boys from Hoorn enables the town to create a new source of pride, at least locally. They have chosen the cabin boys of Bontekoe, rather than Willem I. Bontekoe, as the new pride of Hoorn 'removes' the memory of Coen. It is an elegant *damnatio memoriae*, because they do not destroy or remove the statue of Coen to have a new memory. The boys are fictional figures who are not as controversial as Coen is. They are also a good reference to children to be kind to their parents. The presence of the boys in statues, the website of the local archive, the first display of the ANWB tourist information as well as the recognition of the people of Hoorn to them provide at least a hyper-image of Hoorn. At least, the people of Hoorn are now in the process of creating a hyper-Hoorn as *de Scheepsjongens van Bontekoe*.

In sum, there are different appreciations of the presence of the three governor-generals' monuments. To the Dutch, there have been pro and contra to the presence of the

monuments, particularly to Van Heutsz's and Coen's. The solution was to detach meaning to the monuments or to create other figures as monuments. In Indonesia, the 'strikes' desecration to the monuments happened only during the Japanese occupation period and early independence. In the current Indonesia, the monuments get a different appreciation. Coens' is still 'alive' at the Museum Wayang in Jakarta. He becomes one of exhibit of interest in the Museum Wayang. Daendels' monumental work on Java was negated by a commemoration and celebration of Indonesian independence. Instead of appreciating Daendels' work, the expedition was to commemorate and appreciate the indigenous people who worked for Daendels. And Van Heutsz's was an inspiring figure, especially to Indonesian military officers who were sent to Aceh, therefore the Aceh governor requested to have a copy of the Van Heutsz's bust in Bronbeek in the form of a plaque to keep in Aceh.