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This thesis examines the soundscape of protests in Indonesia during the politically turbulent period of late New Order Indonesia. Scrutinizing student-organized protest in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, this micro-historical approach focuses on the performance aspect of *aksi*, an Indonesian term commonly used to depict political protest.

Using a theoretical framework that combines performance studies, sound studies, and popular music analysis, this thesis focuses on performances by two political actors -- comedian Butet Kartaredjasa and the music troupe, *Sarekat Pengamen Indonesia* (SPI) -- during a protest demanding political reform (*reformasi*) on April 23, 1998. In both cases, the performances emphasize both the political and aesthetic nature of *aksi*. This study also incorporates an ethnographic approach involving former protesters. Moreover, through sound and music this paper interrogates the role of the “people” within the constellation of student-organized political protest.

This thesis aims to historicize the narrative of political reform in Indonesia that has been diverted by political powers in the years subsequent to the reform movement. As this thesis was written over twenty years after *reformasi*, it is informed by collective memory of the New Order authoritarian government whose legacy lives on. Considering the swinging dynamics of politics in Indonesia, recurring political events, and their social impact, this study asks readers to reflect on contemporary relations between the regime and the people, politics and aesthetics, and sound and society.
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Preface

As I listened to an audio recording of a political reform protest in Indonesia from 1998 I reflected on my own experience as a student. At a protest demanding political reform on May 13, 1998, I fled from the police with other students after a protest that sparked a clash. We ended up being backed against a wall, surrounded by police officers. This time, we were fortunate: the officers ordered us to go home. Unfortunately, a number of students were not able to go home that night; they were either captured or forced into hiding. I do not consider myself a political activist, but like many young students at that time I engaged with the waves of protests across the nation against the authoritarian New Order government and its military power between 1996-1998.

Students are vanguards of the political reform that began in 1998 known as Reformasi (Reform). Thousands of students were engaged in what was considered “subversive thinking.” They were the ones who occupied the streets, and they were the ones who delivered orations at protest events. In Activist Archives, an ethnographic history of the student movement that helped bring down the Soeharto regime, Doreen Lee (2016) describes students as heroes and pioneers. Muridan Satrio (1999) boldly titled his book Penakluk Rezim Orde Baru: Gerakan Mahasiswa ’98 (Conqueror of the New Order Regime: The Student Movement ’98). In this heroic narrative Satrio often credits students with the downfall of president Soeharto. This act of labeling students as the heroes of the political reform obscures the importance of other social actors who were crucial to the cessation of the Soeharto regime. While laborers, farmers, the urban poor, and other traditionally subjugated groups were also vocal in protests against New Order policies, it is important to emphasize the role of these groups within the realm of student-organized protests.
The era of Reformasi began after the fall of the New Order and continues through the twenty-first century. However, the flame of the New Order still burns through the current form of government. The legacy of the New Order has shown its influence in current manifestations of Reformasi. At the end of the 2014-2019 parliamentary period, shortly after the 2019 presidential election, The House of Representatives attempted to re-amend policies restricting freedom of expression. One proposed regulation included stripping the powers of Indonesia’s most trustworthy institution for decreasing corruption in law enforcement, The Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi - KPK). (Schütte, 2015, 424). New Order-era military officials retained their positions occupying civil state institutions. Twenty-one years after Reformasi was declared, the military force once again attempted to repress dissenting views. They did this with threats and acts of violence against students during a period of the greatest political unrest since 1998.

Using audio recordings from a protest in 1998, I analyze protest as an act of performance. My own experiences engaging with political protest during The New Order provided me with insights into dominant and alternative discourses about Indonesian politics. This study is a history of experience on two levels: reflections on an event that I experienced, and reflections through the materiality of the audio recordings of protests. This study also incorporates an ethnographic approach involving former protesters. My goal is to include the voices of those whose experiences were obscured by the bigger and more established narratives of 1998. Considering the swinging dynamics of politics in Indonesia, recurring political events, and their social impact, this study asks readers to reflect on contemporary relations between the regime and the people, politics and aesthetics, and sound and society.
I would like to acknowledge collaborators who have helped me understand the soundscape of protest in 1998. Their embodiment with sound during the year of struggle provided valuable information for me to pass on to a younger generation of students and activists: Titok Hariyanto, Vije “Batang”, Wahyuningsih, Wahyulinantari, Zul Amrozi, Muhammad Aman Ridhlo, Ibob, Ahmad “Thole”, Butet Kartaredjasa. Also, I wish to thank Yohannes Sapta Nugraha for the music transcription, fellow graduate student, Teraya Paramehta, who provided me with a copy of Doreen Lee’s *Activist Archives: Youth Culture and the Political Past in Indonesia*, an important source for this project, and Fasisi Swidanto, whose sound archives are used as the basis for analysis in this thesis.
1.0 Introduction

1998 was an important year in the political history of modern Indonesia. It was the time when the New Order regime came to an end and opened up a new realm of democracy. President Soeharto’s resignation marked the end of his 32-year authoritarian regime. 1998 is also regarded as the peak of student activism and the struggles of the people for change. This is especially true of the late New Order in the 1990’s when nationwide activism intensified. This study revolves around the many protests leading to the fall of the authoritarian regime on May 21, 1998. I focus on performances of protest during the period of military surveillance, economic crisis, and the increasing abhorrence of Soeharto’s corrupt and authoritarian government.

Against the backdrop of this political juncture, I aim to show how vernacular forms of sound and music in the late New Order were produced, represented, and signified during protest. Underlining protest as one unit of activism, this study takes a micro-historical perspective, which looks at particular performances as part of a larger social field (Magnússon and Szijárto, 2013, 17). The act of protest connects the social unrest of the everyday to the macro narrative of activism (Canonica-Walangitang, 2001; Weis and Aspinal, 2001; Lane, 2008; Lee, 2016). It is important to investigate the workings of a given protest, its forms, and the significance it carries, which are less discussed in macro narrative analyses of Reformasi. In addition, this study proposes to further investigate the meaning of aksi (action) apart from its common understanding. By looking at two specific orators in a protest, I will elaborate how experiences of the New Order were embodied, represented, and performed, signifying the role of the rakyat (people) within the scope of student-organized protest.
1.1 Soeharto and the Military Chain

When Soeharto came to power in 1966, he established a developmentalist ideology and foreign capital affiliation as the main policy, with the military being the primary guardian of the state’s sources of capital. In general, the armed forces, or Angkatan Bersenjata Republik Indonesia (ABRI)¹ was the backbone of Soeharto’s political action. As a former general and army chief, Soeharto had always identified himself closely with the military (Crouch, 1988; Kingsbury, 1998; Rabasa & Haseman, 2002, Kingsbury and Avonius, 2009; Lane, 2012). Soeharto was behind the massacre of 500,000 to one million Indonesians in 1965 who were convicted without trial for their alleged affiliation with the Communist Party, a legal party and the third largest Communist party in the world at the time. Soeharto was considered responsible for the 1975 invasion of East Timor and the quelling of the 1996 riots during the takeover of the opposition party Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan or PDIP; Kingsbury, 2003, 70). He retained his presidency with the direct support of and control over the military. The popular discourse was that the military reflected the wishes of Soeharto.

During the New Order, ABRI departed from their proper role as independent guarantors of the values of Indonesian nationhood and associated themselves closely with Soeharto’s regime and policies (Elson, 2001, 270-273). ABRI developed an ideological and legal framework to support a formal role in political affairs called the “dual function” (dwifungsi). This concept held that the military had a “sociopolitical” function as well as a defense function. The sociopolitical function served as a watchdog over social activities. It also gave the military an institutionalized

¹ The military force (ABRI) consists of the Indonesian National Army, the Air Force, the Marines, as well as the Police.
role in politics (Kingsbury 2003, 10). In the present day, among the 500 seats in the parliament, 100 are reserved for military representatives (Hill, 1994, 19-24).

Having a sociopolitical function allows ABRI to participate in every effort and activity of the people in the field of ideology, politics, and economics. One of its manifestations was “ABRI Enters the Village” (*ABRI Masuk Desa*), also commonly referred to as “AMD.” AMD was a military infiltration of villages to aid development in rural spaces throughout Indonesia. The military’s vigilance doctrine (*kewaspadaan*) was employed to identify incorrect or suspect development as a source of threat to the state. The military’s intrusion into the social lives of the people helped enhance the military’s continued territorial function (Honna, 1999, 88). The New Order government distributed ABRI troops through Military Command Areas (*Komando Daerah Militer*, or *Kodam*). ABRI’s territorial units were organized on a regional divisional basis. *Kodam* branches had support elements, performing intelligence and internal security functions and maintaining liaisons with local officials to implement the government’s policies (Kingsbury, 2003, 79). Soeharto also established the Command for the Restoration of Security and Order (*Koordinasi Keamanan dan Ketertiban*, or *Kopkamtib*) in 1988, a body responsible for security and order, in direct coordination with the President.² It exercised broad and loosely defined security, intelligence, and interrogation functions (Hill, 1994, 24).

The Indonesian military was under scrutiny for human rights abuses throughout the New Order. Subsequent to the 1994 media ban of two national magazines, *Tempo* and *Detik*, in 1996, Soeharto’s government intervened in the opposition party congress of the Indonesian Democratic Party (*Partai Demokrasi Indonesia* or PDI) in an attempt to disempower their official leader.

---

² It was referred to by the portmanteau “Kopkamtib” and later renamed *Badan Koordinasi Strategi Nasional* (Military Surveillance Body, referred to by the portmanteau “Bakorstanas”).
Megawati Soekarnoputri. The PDI office in Jakarta was raided by the police and military which sparked unrest in the capital city known as the July 27 incident “Kudatuli” (Kerusuhan Dua Tujuh Juli). Many believed the takeover of PDI headquarters was executed by the capital district military command (Pebriyanto, 27 July 2018). The riot that followed was blamed on The People’s Democratic Party (Partai Rakyat Demokratik, or PRD). Radical activists founded the PRD and for a number of years before gaining formal status as a political group the government threatened activists with sanctions for political activities. Following Kudatuli a number of PRD activists were captured, tortured, and imprisoned.

In the late New Order human rights sanctions failed to reign in the regime’s human rights abuses despite Soeharto’s claims of transparent policies. In the days leading up to the political reforms of May 1998 several students were shot and four were killed while protesting at Trisakti University in Jakarta. Official investigations into the Trisakti incident indicated military police were responsible for the shootings. Further investigations suggested the military elite were involved in the abduction and torture of as many as two dozen dissidents. Although two soldiers have been sentenced to prison for their part in the killing of four student demonstrators -- which sparked rioting in mid-May 1998 -- human rights groups state that higher-ranking culprits remain unpunished (New York Times, 1998).

1.2 Student Protests and the Role of Rakyat

Activism played a significant part in the formation of Indonesia since the National Awakening Movement of “Prime Philosophy” (Boedi Oetomo) at the turn of the nineteenth century and through to the struggle for independence in 1945. Activists were responsible for the transition
of President Soekarno to President Soeharto, most notably the 1966 generation activists. The dissenting voices weakened gradually as some of the activists became members of the parliament when Soeharto came to power. After being silenced for some time during the first eight years of Soeharto’s regime, students of the 1974 generation began to criticize the high cost of developing the Indonesian Miniature Park (Taman Mini Indonesia Indah) led by the first lady Tien Soeharto. The rejection of the foreign investment policy turned into a mass demonstration and riot known as the January 15, 1974 incident, also referred to as MALARI (Malapetaka Limabelas Januari). After a relatively silent period during the late 1970’s, there was a resurgence of student activism under the 1977-1978 generation. This generation moved to the foreground after the 1977 presidential election in protest of election fraud, representative recruitment procedures, and local political issues. During 1977-1978 activism increased and campus activities were under intense surveillance. The government formed a military program to cleanse the campus of the Institute of Technology in Bandung (Institut Teknologi Bandung or ITB) of protesters by installing troops on campus. The military presence was intended to “normalize” and “regulate” campus behaviors, a procedure referred to as Normalization of Campus Life/Student Coordination Board (Normalisasi Kehidupan Kampus/ Badan Koordinasi Kemahasiswaan, or NKK/BKK), by stifling possibilities for public protest (Boudreau, 2004, 117-118)

In 1988 student activism emerged again with a slightly different mode of operation. Students in various cities on Java protested against the development of the World Bank-supported Kedung Ombo reservoir which flooded 37 villages and displaced 5,268 families in Central Java. Of approximately 22,000 people living in 37 villages, 21 were informed that they would have to sell their land for a government-determined compensation price (Cleary, 1995, 16). The Central Java provincial government processed land acquisition of over 5399 households.
Student engagement with subjugated populations, such as the victims of the building of the Kedung Ombo dam, exemplify the mode of activism that carried on until the late New Order and gave birth to characteristics of the activism of the 1998 generation. In order to develop and spread ideas, activists would have to go beyond seeing subjugated people as victims. New organizations emerged in the late 1980s in university cities that engaged with non-student sectors. In these environments social research and income-generating initiatives emphasized political education and mobilization (Lee, 2016,123-125). As a result, the number of students, laborers, farmers, and urban poor that joined the struggle increased. Campaigns against the politically and economically repressive New Order’s policies reached the general public.

As a result of this inclusive activism, members of the people’s movement (gerakan rakyat), specifically laborers and farmers, joined with students to form the the People’s Democratic Party (Partai Rakyat Demokratik, or PRD). This idea was based on the need of a systematic and programmatic umbrella organization for the struggle of students, laborers, and farmers. The Indonesia Student Solidarity for Democracy (Solidaritas Mahasiswa Indonesia untuk Demokrasi, or SMID), a sub-group of PRD, is an example of one organization. SMID’s national organization and involvement with other radical student organizations inspired students to become more active in politics (Mugiyanto, Poros HAM, 2019). On August 1-3, 1994, SMID held a special congress in Bogor, West Java, and agreed on several political actions. In the following months SMID mobilized various labor organizations and established the Indonesia Central Struggle for Labor (Pusat Perjuangan Buruh Indonesia, or PPBI), at a congress meeting in Ambarawa, Central Java. PPBI protests demanded the removal of the 1985 Regulation on Politics, and the abolishment of the military’s dual function (dwifungsi). SMID and PPBI helped to disseminate criticism of the military to the public and attract the world’s media attention. For example, students held a protest
involving the National Union of Farmers (Sarikat Tani Nasional, or STN), in East Java on National Heroes’ Day of November 10, 1994 and on International Workers’ Day of May 1, 1995 in Semarang. SMID’s affiliation with the Timor Leste Youth Movement also brought the Timor referendum to greater public attention.

During Reformasi, the urban slums were regarded as the place where student activists could enter ethnically and socially diverse communities and cultivate the people’s discontent into organized political will and action (Lee, 2016, 69). This mode of activism brought students closer to members of Indonesian society who are often referred to as rakyat (translated as “the people”). In its older Javanese translation rakyat translates as the “little people” or wong cilik (Anderson, 1990, 61). Although there has never been a rigid definition of rakyat, the term indicates the common people, non-elites, and the illiterate. Rakyat refers to those who occupy the lower stratum of the political and economic structure, the poverty-stricken, marginalized, and those who have been pushed aside (Weintraub, 2006, 412).

The abstraction of the marginalized society has also been the subject of representation in the political sphere. Indonesia’s first president Soekarno claimed to be the penyambung lidah rakyat, or the “extension of the people’s tongue.” The Indonesian parliament, People’s Representative Council, is called Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat. As shown in figure 1, the radical group People’s Democratic Party (PRD) and the ad-hoc group People’s Movement for Justice (GARDA) also claim to represent the marginalized in placing “the people” in the names of their institutions.
In his discussion of activism toward the end of the New Order, author Max Lane has asserted that “Aksi involving various ad hoc groupings – though with at least one more PRD member or PRD-influenced activist present – continued to be organized around a broad range of issues” (Lane, 2008: 148). Students and the PRD were central to rakyat activism. Oppressed groups such as laborers, farmers, and the urban poor were supported and possibly influenced by PRD discourses.

Although it is common for students to represent the interest of the rakyat, there were some activists who came from the social conditions of the rakyat and understood the political circumstances of activism in the late New Order. For example, poet and activist Wiji Thukul, whose father was a pedicab driver and whose mother was a stay at home mother. Under these conditions, Thukul only achieved an elementary school education. His working-class background provided a foundation to articulate the experiences of marginalized society through his poetry. Military intelligence often targeted Thukul, who was renowned for his writings and performed...
poetry depicting the social injustices of the New Order regime. Prior to joining PRD in 1995 he was associated with the People’s Arts Network, an arts organization that frequently criticized the government. He continued to act as the voice of the rakyat through PRD propaganda and through his work as chief editor of the PRD zine, Suluh Pembebasan (“The Torch of Freedom”) (Antares, Tagar 2019). Thukul disappeared in 1996 and is presumed to have been killed by New Order forces (Bourchier and Hadiz, 2003,163).

Another example of rakyat protesters is the collective of street musician called Sarekat Pengamen Indonesia or SPI, which will be discussed in chapter 4. SPI was renowned for advocating for the rakyat and their solidarity with various oppressed groups. SPI was known to have supported protests organized by labor and farmers’ groups. According to SPI member, Ahmad, buskers, street hawkers, pedicab drivers, and beggars are the most oppressed segment of Indonesian society. They are the true representation of rakyat.

Students generally acknowledge that the urban underclass – the “little people” – are the true representatives of the rakyat. Some members of the urban poor contest the involvement of students and their forms of representing the interests of the rakyat. However, Ahmad believed that the urban poor needed mediation from students and regarded the students’ knowledge of rhetorical skills as a valuable tool for advocacy. In an interview, he stated that “the urban poor only had feet, but we needed the brains” (Ahmad pers.comm, 2019). It was for these reasons that the SPI joined forces with the students.

Through their affiliation with student groups, marginalized communities became a fighting force. For the rakyat, resistance against the economically corrupt and authoritarian New Order regime meant descending to the streets. This call to action is reflected in Wiji
Thukul's famous 1986 poem “Peringatan,” which translates to “Warning” (Thukul, 1994). In this poem, Thukul states the famous line: “there is only one word, Lawan!” (Resist!).

The experiences of the repressive New Order have given birth to vernacular forms of expression that index various authoritarian subjects. Although these expressions were circulating as the undertone of everyday life throughout most of the New Order, it was during the late New Order that these vernacular expressions were often expressed in public. With the rising activism during the late New Order, these expressions were often channeled through protests. For example, one speech during a protest articulated the name Soeharto as the abbreviation of someone who was fond of power and wealth: “Su-har-ta” – Like (Suka)-Wealth (Harta)-Power (Tahta). Another popular form of vernacular expression was the parody song of the Indonesian Military March “Mars ABRI” often heard in protests of 1998:

Angkatan Bersenjata Republik Indonesia tidak berguna
Bubarkan saja. Diganti Menwa
Kalau perlu diganti Pramuka...

The Armed Forces of the Republic of Indonesia are useless
Just disband them. Substitute them with the Student Regiment
Or if necessary, substitute them with the youth scouts…

Against the backdrop of the Soeharto-ABRI authoritarian regime, activism in 1998 was marked by an unprecedented number of protests. Cities previously not engaged in activism became sites for organized protests. A wave of protests spread across the archipelago from Tasikmalaya in West Java to Abepura in Papua (Human Rights Watch, 1998). Diverse student interest groups participated in organizing protests. This diversity is best exemplified by three successive protests held at Gadjah Mada University (UGM) in Yogyakarta on April 2, 3 and 4. The first demonstration
was organized by a student group called the Committee of the Peoples Struggle for Change (Komite Perjuangan Rakyat untuk Perubahan, or KPRP), an organization of leftist students known on campus as the radical pro-democracy group. Some of the organizers of the demonstration were associated with SMID, the affiliate of the PRD described above. The demonstration on the following day was coordinated by the League of Yogyakarta Muslim Students (Liga Mahasiswa Muslim Yogyakarta, or LMMY), a coalition of centrist Muslim students which has been active in organizing protests on campus since 1996. The third demonstration, attracting over 20,000 students, was organized by yet another organization, a group called UGM Student Family (Keluarga Mahasiswa UGM), a body formed by the UGM student senate and supported by a large number of UGM professors and lecturers (Human Rights Watch, 1998,30).

1.3 Aksi 1998

Between the period of mid-1997 to May 1998 the student movement escalated from cities known for activism such as Jakarta, Yogyakarta, and Bandung to other cities. During that period demonstrations were ubiquitous. Student demands also became more radical (Hariyanto, 2002). During the year of struggle, a “demonstration culture” (demo-culture) formed among students. In her ground-breaking book Activist Archives: Youth Culture and the Political Past in Indonesia, Doreen Lee (2016) proposes the notion of demo-culture or culture of demonstration where protest is a site of expertise, strategies, and discipline, as well as a cultivated sphere of sensory experience. She described the wide-ranging activities of student activists such as the preparation, organization, speech writing and oration, and engagement with state security forces. As an overarching culture, demo-culture is a bricolage of activists’ techniques of the body that includes a repertoire of style
and sense (2016,74). To a certain extent the demo-culture manifests beyond sight and sound as some activist’s instincts and experiences allowed them to identify plain-clothed police officers during protests (Arifin, Balairung, 1999). Style and sense informs the embodiment of underlying actions which students performed in demonstrations.

Lee uses the word “demonstration” to refer to protest. In her account of post-reform protest she states: “The ongoing demonstration during my own period of fieldwork in 2003-2005 had a distracting currency about them.” Indeed, the word demonstration (*demonstrasi*) is commonly used in Indonesian media and scholarly writing to describe protests in Indonesia (Heryanto, 1999; Budianta, 2000; Lane, 2008). While the term *demonstrasi* is widely used, another popular Indonesian term to depict protest is *aksi*. *Aksi* in the Indonesian language literally means action and is commonly used to depict the act of protests. On protest flyers of 1996-1999, I noticed the following terms: mass protest (*aksi massa*), protest of concern (*aksi keprihatinan*), protest demand (*seruan aksi*), peace protest (*aksi damai*); among variants of protest. A newspaper article states:

> Aksi keprihatinan mahasiswa Yogya yang selama ini relatif tertib, Kamis (2/4) diwarnai bentrokan antara peserta aksi dengan aparat keamanan. Para mahasiswa panik dan berlarian, sebagian terjatuh, akibat dikejar-kejar aparat. Insiden ini berbuntut “perang batu” di Boulevard UGM. Akibat kejadian itu, puluhan mahasiswa luka-luka di bagian kepala serta radang selaput mata karena terkena gas air mata. (Kedaulatan Rakyat, April 3, 1998)

The protest of concern of Yogyakarta students that had been orderly in recent times (2/4) were marred by a clash with the police. Students panicked and ran from the scene, some fell down being chased by the troops. The incident led to a “stone fight” on the UGM Boulevard. As a result, tens of students suffered head injuries and eye damage caused by teargas. (Kedaulatan Rakyat, April 3, 1998)
On various student flyers (selectbaran mahasiswa), aksi has the connotation of creating action: “Aksi peduli pedagang K5” (Action in support of street vendors - April 21, 1996), “Aksi Kebangkitan Nasional” (Action for National Awakening – May 20, 1998), “Aksi Mimbar Bebas” (Action for Free Speech – March 2, 1997), “Aksi mogok makan” (Action for Hunger Strike – April 1, 1997). Student groups also incorporate the word aksi suggesting these groups are acting upon something: “Komite Aksi Mahasiswa Baru untuk Perubahan” (Student Action Committee for Change, or KAMY-BARU), “Kesatuan Aksi Rakyat Peduli Indonesia” (United Action of People who Care about Indonesia). These actions have political purposes which materialize in the form of protest.

In Unfinished Nations, Max Lane has discussed the radicalized political atmosphere in Indonesia by developing a chronology of protests under the chapter heading “aksi.” The chronology involves documentation of protests in Indonesia cities organized by students and workers group between 1992 and 1998:

“Aksi involving various ad-hoc groupings – though with at least one PRD member or PRD-influenced activist present – continued to be organized around a broad range of issues.” (2008, 148)

As aksi gripped the country, demanding that Soeharto go, the regime itself seemed determined to cling to the counter-revolution’s long-term central tactic: the masses must return to their previous passive state. (2008, 172)

As exemplified above, the term aksi is used to describe political action involving the people, and organized by certain groups commonly termed as activists. This definition obscures the more understated semantic meaning of aksi as performance. The word aksi is often used to relate to performance events such as music, dance or films: “Soundrenaline Suguhkan Ragam Aksi
“Musik Epik dan Karya Seni Unik” (Soundrenaline presents various epic music performances and works of art) (Oetomo, RRI, 7/9/2019), or “Aksi Panggung Shawn Mendes di tour Asia” (The performance of Shawn Mendes on his Asian Tour) (Kompas, 11/8/2019). In these media phrases elements of “action” are unquestionably present. Moreover, these actions also bring aesthetic discourse into play. The performer’s intent and audience valuation are simultaneously present, as shown in the following passages: “Menunggu aksi para pelantun puisi Rendra” (Waiting for the performance of Rendra’s poem recitation”) (Koran Bernas, 4/10/2019), “Simak Aksi Memukau Dian Sastro di Trailer After.11” (See Dian Sastro’s stunning performance in the trailer After.11) (Noviandri, Kincir, 11/2018). The aesthetic aspect, as well as the political understanding of aksi is clearly articulated in the media passage below:

Sebuah aksi baru terjadi di depan Gedung DPR RI sore hari ini, Jumat (18/10). Eits, aksi kali ini bukan aksi dari mahasiswa, melainkan aksi dari pedangdut kenamaan Dewi Perssik yang menghibur anggota Polri dan TNI jelang pelantikan presiden yang akan diadakan pada 20 Oktober mendatang. An aksi occurred in front of the House of Representatives building, Friday (18/10). Hey, this time it is not aksi from students, but the aksi of the famous dangdut singer Dewi Perssik [sic] entertaining police troops and the Armed Forces ahead of President’s upcoming inauguration on 20 October (Rahmawati: Kapanlagi, 18/10/2019)

Other media use the word aksi, such as aksi pangggung (stage act), aksi mempesona (fascinating acts), and aksi panas (hot or seductive actions) implying that aksi is linked to aesthetics. These examples suggest the use of the word are often limited to actions that are considered artistic, such as the actions of a film star, stage actor, or musician. The aesthetic element of aksi provides us with the opportunity to link the concept to performance. An analogy of a staged music presentation as performance can also be applied to student protests as
performance. During protests, orators take turns expressing their emotions while participants watch, listen, and if they are so moved, respond. Orators are actors that take the political time and space to deliver their expressions on a given stage. This interrogation of the tacit meaning of *aksi* within discussions of political protest considers *aksi* as spectacle which uses the body to deliver certain messages. These messages are often appreciated by an audience with verbal and bodily responses such as shouting and clapping.

As a spectacle, aesthetic *aksi* within political *aksi* incorporates aspects of Bakhtin’s notion of carnivalesque. The protest space allows for humor, performance, and seeming chaos as a way to, for a moment, subvert previously established hierarchies of the oppressed (Bhaktin, 1968). For these reasons, I have chosen to use the term “aksi” to refer to student protests.

### 1.4 Theoretical Framework and Methodology

The inquiry into performances of sound and music as *aksi* incorporates three theoretical frameworks which draw from theories of (1) sound studies, (2) performance studies, and (3) popular music analysis. The three theoretical frameworks allow us to understand *aksi* as a spectacle with aesthetic dimensions. The theoretical framework of sound studies, performance studies, and popular music covers discussions of soundscape, pathways, and acoustemologies that inform the two major questions in this thesis: (1) How do sound and music inform people’s experience of the fall of the New Order? (2) How do sound and music work to empower the struggle for Reformasi? This brings to light the discursive insights of vernacular expression often associated with *rakyat*. This integrated theoretical framework supports inquiry of sound features of the acoustic environment of continuous political events of a given space and time (Schafer, 2012,95). My study
investigates what I call the “soundscape of ’98.” This soundscape is materialized in recordings present in the re-activation of a historical juncture where aksi adjoins various people in a given time and space. Schafer’s notion of soundscape was originally focused on the physicality of sound, but Sound Studies has added a phenomenological component, which interrogates how sound is perceived, and the symbolic meaning of sound. Inquiries through sound require an exploration of context and circumstances. Researchers using this method must strive to seek out points of connection between the materiality of sound and its social context that opens up an interpretive discourse (Feld, 2015; Feld and Brenneis, 2004).

My methodology departs from listening to a sound archive. To aid the insight of the sound materials I initiated a process of “playback and feedback” with former protesters, some of whom I have known since the 1990’s. I listened to the recordings with them during summer 2019. My role was not central to these protests. I did not engage in activism, nor perform any protest speeches, but I was among the students who descended to the streets in mass numbers in solidarity of the protests. The ethnographic listening process involving key orators allowed me to draw ideas from people who were present during these protests.

Through sound analysis and ethnographic listening, I focus on two protest orators incorporating sound and music to illustrate aksi in this context. Using a micro-historical approach, I contend that the two performers provide discourse which is not restricted to the space and time of the specific oration. A microscopic view of performance does not only value one single aesthetic performance in a specific time and space, but it opens up an interpretive discourse of a larger context of performance (Magnússon and Szíjárto, 2013,17). An aksi does not limit itself to the specific protest, it informs the relations of students and rakyat in a typical political protest in Indonesia.
An audio recording of these *aksi*, which is used in this thesis, serves as sound documentation that reflects the sound environment of the broader demo-culture. Murray Schafer describes a soundscape as any acoustic field of study isolating an acoustic environment or a given landscape (Schafer, 1993). He states, “the general acoustic environment of a society can be read as an indicator of social conditions which produce it and may tell us much about the trending and evolution of that society.” This implies a framing of space within a given time. In the context of a political event that documents the practices of demo-culture, the recording provides evidence of its sound environment.

Acknowledging the continuous *aksi* in the year of struggle and listening to the recording of *aksi* provides us with the opportunity to explore characteristics of the soundscape. Drawing on the notion of soundscape, places have identifying sounds, which Schafer identifies as keynote sounds, signals, and soundmarks. Keynote sounds may not be consciously listened to and are ubiquitous background sounds that are taken for granted. In contrast, signals are foreground sounds that are listened to consciously. Soundmarks are unique and act as identifiers of a particular community, such as a church bell, a train horn, or waves crashing on a beach. Rather than applying sound identifications to refer to specific geographical spaces, I propose the use of soundscape as the acoustic environment perceived, experienced, and/or understood by a person or people in a given context, which places emphasis on the perception, evaluation, and experience of the listeners (Li, 2018, 64).

It is through the analysis of this particular *aksi* performance that we acknowledge performers’ vigorous acts of transfer by performing what Richard Schechner calls “restored behavior” and “twice-behaved behavior.” Restoration of behavior allows for the subject to take, retake and edit performance. It supposes that there are no first-time behaviors. Behaviors are made
up of other behaviors that are re-arranged, re-emphasized, and re-assembled to be acted for the second time or the ‘nth’ time (Schechner, 1985,36). This is similar to performativity or reiteration of acts that represent previous acts (Austin, 1962; Butler, 1990). The elaboration of the meaning of the aesthetic aksi relates to the tracking down of performed behavior during the political aksi. The performance functions as transmission of social knowledge, memory, and sense of identity of rakyat as communicated by protesters. This performance studies approach not only positions aksi as the object of analysis, but allows aski to function as an episteme, or a way of knowing (Taylor, 2003, xvi). In sound studies, Feld describes these ways of knowing in terms of sound (acoustemologies). By listening to the archives of these acoustemologies, I am engaging with the sound environment of the protest and enmeshing myself into different ways of knowing (2015,13). To focus on a specific protest is to regard a visible iceberg as the tip of the lifeworld mountain of the rakyat.

The use of popular music analysis of aksi reveals discourses of space and representation. In *Popular Music Scenes and Memory*, Andy Bennett & Ian Rodgers theorize music scenes as cultural spaces in which the past and present remain aesthetically linked (Bennett and Rodgers, 2016, 6). Bennett argues that cultural space provides an affective sense of oneself as a part of something that is alive – both in a physical and temporal sense – and woven into the cultural landscape. This sense of belonging may manifest itself in both tangible and intangible (almost entirely affective) ways. However, it retains critical currency as a means through which the personal taste biographies of the many become clustered around those nodal points of collective musical life that denote scenes (Bennet and Rodgers, 2016,3). In *The Hidden Musicians: the Making of an English Town*, Ruth Finnegan emphasizes pathways of seeing people’s participation in urban life.
One way of looking at people’s musical activities is therefore to see them as taking place along a series of pathways which provide familiar directions for both personal choices and collective actions. Such pathways form one important – often unstated – framework for people’s participation in urban life, something overlapping with, but more permanent and structured than, the personal networks in which individuals also participate. They form broad routes set out, as it were, across and through the city. They tend to be invisible to others, but for those who follow them they constitute a clearly laid thoroughfare both for their activities and relationships and for the meaningful structuring of their actions in space and time. (Finnegan, 1989, 323)

Early studies on popular music scenes helps us to think about practices of music as pathways (Straw, 1997). In the case of aksi 1998, street-buskers relate musical activities as principal ways in which the urban poor interact across and within the city. As indicated by their name “street-buskers,” I propose the interrogation of the street as a prominent space linking musical practices with their aksi.

The theoretical framework of sound studies, performance studies, and popular music analysis guide my ethnographic listening to aksi. Departing from the sound archive, and incorporating protest flyers, propaganda posters, selected student magazines, and live performances, I view aksi as a combination of politics and aesthetics.

1.5 Data

In this study I focus on audio recordings of myriad aksi found in various student-organized protests in Yogyakarta between March to May 1998. In the analysis I will take into consideration
the position of aesthetic *aksi* in the realm of political *aksi*. The sound documentation was compiled by Fasisi Swidanto, a former anthropology student at UGM in 1998. During that time Swidanto analyzed underground activist’s propaganda flyers that were circulated freely into the hands of students, *rakyat*, and security officials alike. This sound documentation was supposedly to be used in parallel to his research on the content of student propaganda *aksi* flyers (*Selebaran Gerakan Mahasiswa*). The sound recording primarily used for this study is a compilation of oratories during an *aksi* which Swidanto documented on C-60 cassettes on a portable cassette recorder. The purpose of the recordings was to document sound events such as speech, chants, and songs, which were considered useful to validate the content of *aksi* flyers. The recording comprises 11 tracks with each track consisting of approximately one hour of recorded *aksi* sounds. The sound data were previously recorded using a cassette player, which has since been transformed into mp3 format; the latter serves as the primary source of this study.

Swidanto focused on protest orations performed by renowned activists, musicians, and academics. As Swidanto hit “play” and “pause,” the sounds of the buttons being pressed were recorded and speeches were suddenly cut off. These ruptures in the recording are part of the soundscape of ’98 as they provide excerpts of various sound events.

This thesis consists of five chapters. The first chapter is an introductory chapter consisting of information on President Soeharto and the military chain, a brief history of student protests and the role of *rakyat*, the terminology of *aksi* as applied in *Aksi* ’98, as well as information on data, theory, and methodology. Chapter two defines the soundscape of ‘98, providing the fundamental elements of sound within various *aksi* from the recording. Chapter two also provides a list of sound activities recorded on three tracks out of the eleven tracks of recorded protests. Chapters three and four focus on the notion of *aksi* as aesthetic spectacle involving elements of theater and music.
Chapter three focuses on poet Butet Kartaredjasa’s speech during an *aksi* on April 23, 1998, while chapter four discusses a musical performance by *Sarekat Pengamen Indonesia* (SPI) on the same day. Chapter five provides conclusions.
2.0 Soundscape of 1998

In the previous chapter I discussed the various aksi performed during the build-up to Reformasi during the late New Order. This can be viewed as a linear event. Since the late 1980s student activism has flourished outside of student spaces. Central issues for activists include freedom of expression, human rights, and the illegal imprisonment of activists in 1996. These issues sparked sporadic aksi throughout the nation. However, a major wave of protests came after the 1997 election and continued through the 1998 Asian monetary crisis. During this period an activist group, The People’s Movement for Justice (Gerakan Rakyat untuk Keadilan, or GARDA), distributed aksi flyers to lift the spirit of protesters. It claimed 1997 was the year of awakening and 1998 was the year of struggle. The culminating dissent which resulted in the 1998 struggle arose with demo-culture and included dwelling spaces of activists, organizational strategies and behavior during aksi, and youth qualities which made aksi trendy and accessible (Lee, 2015).

Defining the soundscape of ‘98 through aksi informs several different aspects of presentation in which sound is performed. Figures 2, 3, and 4 represent performance events based on my analysis of three tracks recorded by Swidanto between March 1997 and May 1998. I have chosen three tracks to represent the diversity of sound events in performance. Track 1 is a recording of an event that took place on April 23, 1998. Track 2 depicts a protest organized on March 5, 1998. The third track is not dated, but it exemplifies the mobility of students before finally settling down for a series of orations. Each track is organized according to time and indicates orators, topics and remarks, sound and words articulated, and crowd response.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Orators</th>
<th>Topics / Remarks</th>
<th>Sound and Words Articulated</th>
<th>Crowd Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00-1:35</td>
<td>Butet Kartaredjasa</td>
<td>Aparat and Rakyat</td>
<td>“The three Mandates of the People” the mentioning of aparat. Voice sounding Soeharto.</td>
<td>Chattering in the background, laughs, immediate respond in the foreground, applause, cheers, whistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35-3:10</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Speech, Chattering, laughs, jeers. Imitation of a poem by Chairil Anwar</td>
<td>Laughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:20-3:37</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Aksi Coordination</td>
<td>Speech, Quranic recitation of “La ilaha illa ilah”</td>
<td>Chattering in the background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:37-4:07</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Unity, rakyat, power,</td>
<td>“People Unite is Invincible, People Unite bringing Soeharto to Justice”</td>
<td>Chattering in the background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45-8:59</td>
<td>Representation from Indonesia Islamic University (UII)</td>
<td>Soeharto</td>
<td>Abbreviation of Su-har-to, Power and Wealth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:54-22:20</td>
<td>Tattoo Artist</td>
<td>Detestation on Soeharto</td>
<td>Speech, laughs, Jokes,</td>
<td>Small laughs, jeers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:24-24:23</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Rakyat, the Marginalized</td>
<td>Speech, old male voice, responds, laughs, Wrong pronunciation of Monetary Crisis (Krisis Moneter),</td>
<td>Laughs, applause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:24 -</td>
<td>Haris Rusly Moti (PRD)</td>
<td>Strategizing Movement</td>
<td>Chattering in the background, Speech on the need to unite. Students are only 2 %. The need to gather forces from all elements. The need to descend to the streets. Organization, Organized, Awareness to make organization to resist the regime.</td>
<td>Shout “Long live PRD” Long live KPRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:21 - 2945</td>
<td>Former Malari activists 1974</td>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>Speech, responds, applause, Names of activists who are in government, Denial of conscience, Recurrence of History, Change requires unity. Empowering of resistance.</td>
<td>applause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:49 – 32:20</td>
<td>Kuss Indarto and Mochamad ‘Operasi’ Rachman</td>
<td>Various topics</td>
<td>Speech, audience, “Anarchy is New Order’s legacy”, noise of unrest among the audience, back to jokes of abbreviations.</td>
<td>Shouts responding jokes. Laughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:20-34.09</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poetry reading, silence, motorbike engine passing by, cars and traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:40 – 48.46</td>
<td>Butet Kartaredjasa</td>
<td>Monologue reading Sound of authoritarian regime</td>
<td>Noise, applause, laughs every time the word &quot;semangkin&quot; is cited, whistle. Voice, “Semangkin.”</td>
<td>Laughs and applause every time the word “Semangkin” is cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:48 – 53:33</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Ending of event</td>
<td>Slow reflective recitation, singing</td>
<td>Singing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Track 1 (recorded April 23, 1998)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Orators</th>
<th>Topic/ Remarks</th>
<th>Sound and Words Articulated</th>
<th>Crowd Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00 – 0:53</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Welcoming Aksi</td>
<td>Speech, Shouts: “Long Live Students,” Voice in the megaphone in the background., different to the main source of oration. People talking. Shouts “Where’s the rector?”</td>
<td>Applause when notified there will be lecturers joining the aksi. Chants “Long Live students.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:53</td>
<td>Anggito Abimanyu (lecturer)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Speech, Shouts of giving more megaphone, more mic. “Long live students,” “questioning students: “Do you believe in the government?” Interactive speech, feedbacks, Shouts.</td>
<td>Cheers, applause, shouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speech “Silence is not golden, silence is oppressed”</td>
<td>Applause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:35</td>
<td>Alianto Dwi Nugroho (Head of Student Council)</td>
<td>Support to the people</td>
<td>Speech, Shouts: “Long live students, taking off identity to join the people.</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:31 – 9:55</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political reform, Succession, feedback,</td>
<td>Shouts of agreement; applause, Chants “Repeal Soeharto”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:55 – 10:24</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chants “People United will never be defeated</td>
<td>Chanting, shouting, applause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:26 –</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>People’s economy</td>
<td>Speech: if you have spare money, don’t give it to the government. Donate it to the people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:56</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Information on aksi</td>
<td>Speech, The end of aksi, ‘Save energy for another aksi’ People talking and shouting. Asking to pray at the end of aksi. Sound of megaphone in the background (not the main source of speech)</td>
<td>Shouts to continue orations, crowd wants more orations. Asking if they are going to sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:34</td>
<td>All protesters</td>
<td>Closing ofaksi</td>
<td>Song: “Hymne Gadjah Mada”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:35 – 15:20</td>
<td>All protesters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Song “Darah juang”, People talking prior to singing. Distant megaphone heard. Shouts “Long Live students.”</td>
<td>Applause,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:26</td>
<td>Keluarga Mahasiswa Universitas Gadjah Mada</td>
<td>Statement from</td>
<td>Speech, Rarity of goods in the market. The people who suffer the most. Speech is read. Faults of Now Order: Monopoly, Capitalism. People Economic is marginalized. Siren from megaphone, Murmuring in the background, unrest in the background, feedback. People start chatting. Demands for job opportunity, fair for the people; s economy. good are affordable, presidents term must</td>
<td>People talking, Applause. Calm down! Sit down. Shouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:20</td>
<td>Protesters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chants: “Lower the price, Repeal Soeharto!”</td>
<td>Chants: “Lower the price, Repeal Soeharto!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:29</td>
<td>Field Coordinator</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Speech, “Commands is still in my hand”, Reading notes from Koento Wibisono, the head of alumni Universitas Gadjah Mada, asking crowd to stand up</td>
<td>Applause, Jeers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:20</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Uniting Students</td>
<td>Students Pledge</td>
<td>Crowd follows citing the pledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:24</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>End of aksi</td>
<td>Prayer and informing next aksi, conversation of protesters in the background on police intelligent personnel. Multiple megaphones in different places sounding at the same time. People talking. Megaphones to be collected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Orators</td>
<td>Topics / Remarks</td>
<td>Sound and Words Articulated</td>
<td>Crowd Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:50</td>
<td>Protesters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Song: Hymne Gadjah Mada, Welcoming students who just arrived. Chants: Lower the price, Repeal Soeharto.</td>
<td>Chanting, Singing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:16</td>
<td>Protesters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chants: “People Unite can never be defeated.” Sounds of traffic, people’s stride, whistles, distant singing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:05</td>
<td>Protesters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chants: “Lower the Price, Repeal Soeharto” Chant “One Command, one Mission” Mixed chanting from different groups Car horns Chant “People united, Repeal Soeharto.”</td>
<td>Chanting, talking, applause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3. Track 2 recorded March 5, 1998**
| Time  | Anonymous | March | Event Description | Response
|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|-----------
| 15:52 | Anonymous | March | Chants: “People united will never be defeated” gradually joined by others | Respond to chant
| 16:13 | Anonymous | March | Chants: “Lower the price, amend economy” Motorbike passing | Respond to chant
| 17:10 | Anonymous | March | Song: Activist version of Indonesia Tanah Air Beta” Chant: “Lower the price, amend the economy” Chant: “Long live students”; “Long live the people, Chant: “People united can never be defeated.” Motorbike passing. | Singing
| 18:48 | Anonymous | March | Strides, megaphone siren, | |
| 18:50 | Anonymous | March | Speech: “We refuse lifetime president, Song “We shall overcome”, motorbike passing, | Applause, singing
| 19:55 | Anonymous | March | Chant: “People united can never be defeated”, Speech “We are back on the streets to make a change”, “Poverty and hunger,” “Don’t let our aksi be smeared by racial issues”, “The developmentalist ideology fails,” “There won’t be any change unless we unite” Shouts “Long live students, long live the people” | Applause, cheers.
| 21:28 | Anonymous | March | Shouts: “Long live the people” Chants: “Lower the price, amend economy” Speech: “We must end this, the New Order has failed in actualizing their promise.” “This is statement, we will not cease until we die.” “Hundreds of people have died.” “Long live Democracy,” “Fight” | Applause, respond to orator.
| 23:21 | Anonymous | March | Speech: “On people’s economy” “Rakyat will suffer from high interest” “Silence is oppression” Murmuring on the foreground “are you doing your thesis” Shouts: “Long live the people” | Chanting
| 26:04 | Anonymous | March | Chant: “People united can never be defeated” Sounds of megaphone in distance, people talking, motorcycle passing, strides, sound of traffic Chant, “Lower the price, amend economy” | Applause, cheers.
| 29:53 | Anonymous | March | Speech “Repeal Soeharto”, people talking, laughing, “Lower the price” sounds of sirens from megaphone | Applause, cheers
| 30:30 | Anonymous | March | Speech unintelligible. Shouts: “Long live the people” Chant “Lower the price, amend economy” | Respond to oration, chanting
| 31:30 | Anonymous | March | Speech “Let’s implement this grand meeting in our beloved campus” “Is it true 82% of students of Universitas Gadjah Mada agree to repeal Soeharto?” “Long live students” “Command to join”, distant megaphone, traffic, | Applause, cheering, agreeing to oration
| 32:50 | Anonymous | March | Song “We shall overcome”, strides, traffic | Singing
| 34:07 | Anonymous | March | Chant “People united will never be defeated” Speech “We will start our grand meeting to unite our demand” “Our founding fathers made a grand meeting to defeat the Dutch,” people talking, traffic, Chant “Lower the price, amend economy” megaphone sirens, distant megaphone. | Applause
| 39:50 | Anonymous | March | Song “We shall Overcome” Shouts “Long live students” Chant “Lower the price, amend economy.” Speech “Let’s repeal Soeharto” Chant “Lower the price, repeal Soeharto” Chant “People will win, will win, will win” Speech | Singing, chanting, responds to oration, applause.
| 43:20 | Anonymous | March | Song “Hymne Gadjah Mada” | Singing
| 44:40 | Anonymous | March | Shouts “Sukesi, sukasei” (Succession) Speech “Let’s walk slowly, we are waiting for our friends who also want to be in this struggle.” Bandung, Dili, Ujung Pandang, they refuse the election of 1997, are we gonna be silent?” “Fight back!” “Repeal Soeharto” Chant “Lower the price, repeal Soeharto” | Respond to oration, applause, megaphone feedback, chanting
| 47:34 | Anonymous | March | Chant “People united will never be defeated” megaphone siren Speech “We must fight” “We still have dignity” chants “Lower the price, repeal Soeharto” “Students of Gadjah Mada, is paid by the people” “We refuse Soeharto for a reason 82% students agree to repeal Soeharto” | Chanting, applause, cheers
<p>| 50:00 | Anonymous | March | Chant “Lower the price, repeal Soeharto” Speech “we speak to repeal the leadership of Mr. Soeharto” “Friends who want to speak…unintelligible. | Chanting, applause, respond to unintelligible shout “Long live!” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker/Label</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Speech Content</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51:02</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Speech: “unintelligible”, laughs, sound of traffic, people talking, distant speech.</td>
<td>Applause,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52:52</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Speech: “Political reform” and “Economic reform”, distant shouts, megaphone siren</td>
<td>Applause,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55:15</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Commanding oration</td>
<td>Speech “Friend let’s all sit down”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55:57</td>
<td>Anonymous (a student/mother)</td>
<td>People’s Economy</td>
<td>Feedback, megaphone sirens Speech “I am a student and mother” “We are in the same despair, I find how milk influence the nutrition of our child” – END OF CASSETTE</td>
<td>applause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Track 3 (unidentified date)
From the myriad sounds that characterize aksi, I examine the three main aspects of sound-generating forms that define the soundscape of ’98: (1) speech, (2) chants, and (3) songs. These three sound events are interrelated in text, intention, interaction, valuation, and other circumstances. Speech, chants, and songs are a significant catalyst to performed actions. Therefore, it is important to also consider how these aspects relate to other sounds framing one single soundscape of ‘98.

Overall, the recordings show that these aksi were peaceful demonstrations despite an incident when a number of students chased a police informant. This informant was identified and interrogated in a closed space (Track 2-24:25). Sounds of rage are common in aksi, especially during clashes with police. In these tense moments one can hear police officers’ voices amplified by megaphones, and the clash of stones and police shields. One can also hear the sound of tear gas canisters being launched, petrol bombs exploding, water cannons blasting, police sirens, helicopters, and shotguns firing. These sound events contribute to the cacophony of the soundscape of ’98 (Aman Ridhlo, pers.comm, 2018).

The soundscape of ‘98 in the recording was occupied mostly by speeches, chants, and songs. While speeches are direct means of communication in spoken words, chants and songs are formally organized sounds. Whereas chants are rarely named, songs have titles. In some cases, protesters who have the authority to lead the protests would deliver these three aspects following each other as exemplified in figure 4.
Speeches are the most common aksi sound events. Speeches express thoughts in spoken words that are usually delivered on a temporary stage or while moving. Speeches are usually performed by competent persons selected by aksi organizing groups. On most occasions, people from the crowd were also invited to express their thoughts. Speeches provide an opportunity for protesters to spontaneously participate in aksi. The diversity of orators can vary in voice, dynamic, and style. The use of microphones and megaphones as mediators of sound result in specific types of reverberation that contribute to the soundscape. The inclusion of voice, mediated sound, and protester response is exemplified in the speech by Ajianto Dwi Nugroho (ADN), head of the Student Council, a shadow organization of the formal student union of UGM. This speech was recorded during an aksi on March 5, 1998 (Figure 4). Against the murmuring keynote of thousands of protesters, the sound signal takes the form of an empowering speech (Figure 5).

Hidup mahasiswa! (Massa: Hidup!)  Long live students! (crowd: long live!)
Hidup rakyat Indonesia! (Massa: Hidup!)  Long the people of Indonesia (crowd: long live!)

Pada hari ini Dewan Mahasiswa  On this day, the student council supports all aksi
Mendukung aksi-aksi yang dilakukan oleh organized by students (cheers and applause)
mahasiswa
Pada hari ini sudah saatnya kita melepas baju-baju  On this day, it’s time we shed our identity clothing
kelompok kita  (applause)
Kita bersatu, bersatu memimpin barisan  We unite, unite, to lead the line for a change
Menuntut perubahan

Tidak ada perubahan selain reformasi  There is no change except for economic reform
Ekonomi dan reformasi politik and political reform (applause)
Reformasi ekonomi, turunkan harga  Economic reform, lower the price political reform
Reformasi politik turunkan... (unintelligible due to protesters shouting “Repeal Soeharto!”), reverberating applause, shouts)

Kita, mahasiswa beraliansi dengan seluruh rakyat Indonesia  We, students make alliance with all elements of people
(ambience of people talking in the background)
of Indonesia (shouts in the foreground mic feedback)
Because change is not only for students
Perubahan bukan milik mahasiswa saja perubahan milik seluruh rakyat Indonesia

Krisis ekonomi bukan diciptakan oleh orang Cina

Bukan diciptakan oleh orang Katolik, tapi….. Pembangunan Orde baru… oleh… Jenderal Soeharto.

Untuk itu kita harus konsisten, terus perjuangkan reformasi ekonomi dan reformasi politik. Sampai titik darah penghabisan. Sampai hati Nurani ditegakkan. Aksi-aksi dilakukan. Teras turun ke jalan

Lepaskan kelompok-kelompok. Bersatu Bersama rakyat Indonesia

Bersatu Bersama kaum miskin kota (massa: hidup kaum miskin kota).

Bersatu bersama buruh, bersatu bersama petani (Massa: hidup rakyat Indonesia).

(Track 2- 06:33)

The Monetary crisis was not caused by the Chinese (ethnic group) it was not caused by Catholics but (voiceover of recordist) the development plan of the New Order… by General Soeharto (unintelligible due to mass cheering and applause)

For that, we must be consistent, keep on fighting for economic reform and political reform. Until the last drips of blood

Until conscience is upheld.

Organize aksi. Keep on descending to the streets

Disband groups, be in unity with the people of Indonesia

In unity with the urban poor (long live the urban poor)

in unity with labors, in unity with farmers (Shouts: long live the people of Indonesia, cheers, applause)

Figure 5. Speech by Ajianto Dwi Nugroho, March 5, 1998

The high dynamic of sound projected in ADN’s speech empowered protesters to respond in similar fashion. AND’s speech was sometimes interrupted by the crowd’s impulsive response that nearly rose to the level of shouting. Their slightly distorted voices were probably due to the inadequate sound amplification of the crowd. Most probable in this kind of situation is that the gain was set up high, which sometimes resulted in feedback.

Taking account of its content, ADN’s speech can be considered as a statement in support of the protests. As a shadow organization, their presence aligns with the underground activism that opposes campus regulation policies. Suggesting the shedding of group identity, students are empowered to unite with other elements that comprise “the people” (rakyat).
The underlying theme of unity is underscored in the topic of this speech. Change can be made through unification. Sometimes themes of unity tie into the shared history of the people of Indonesia, eliciting feelings of nostalgia. This appeal to nostalgia is exemplified in a speech which demands a call-and-response mode of interaction in which students in 1998 appropriated the Youth Pledge of 1928 (*Sumpah Pemuda*) (Figure 6).

| Teman-teman, mari kita berdiri dan kepalkan tangan | Let’s all stand up and raise our fists (*noises, murmurs*) |
| Sumpah Mahasiswa Indonesia | Indonesian Students Pledge (*crowd repeats, feedback*) |
| Kami, mahasiswa-mahasiswa Indonesia Mengaku | We Students of Indonesia (*crowd repeats*) acknowledge (*crowd repeats*) |
| Bertanah air Satu | one motherland (*crowd repeats*) |
| Tanah air tanpa penindasan | motherland without repression (*crowd repeats, feedback*) |
| Kami, mahasiswa-mahasiswa Indonesia Mengaku | We, Students of Indonesia (*crowd repeats*) acknowledge (*crowd repeats*) |
| Berbangsa Satu | one nation (*crowd repeats*) |
| Bangsa yang gandrung akan keadilan | A nation that longs for justice (*crowd repeats*) |
| Kami mahasiswa-mahasiswa Indonesia Mengaku | We Students of Indonesia (*crowd repeats*) acknowledge (*crowd repeats*) |
| Berbahasa Satu | one language (*crowd repeats*) |
| Bahasa kebenaran | a language of righteousness (*crowd repeats*) |
| Turunkan Harga, tolak Soeharto | Lower prices, Repeal Soeharto! (*crowd repeats*) |

(Track 2- 21:20)

Figure 6. Appropriation of the Youth Pledge 1928 by students in 1998

The speeches in this discussion can be empowering and very serious. However, there are times when they take a more light-hearted turn. An example of this is a speech by Kuss Indarto and Muchamad “Operasi” Rachman recorded on April 9, 1998 (Track 1-4:08). The two activists/comedic artists from the Indonesian Institute of the Arts did not focus on a specific issue such as corruption, ABRI’s dual function, or the economic crisis. Their speeches were spontaneous
and impulsive; they often improvised in response to their audience. For example, Kuss Indarto did not focus his theme solely on Soeharto or the New Order, but ways in which he can engage the audience. He speaks, “Nama saya Kapri, kepanjangan dari Leonardo di Kapri-O…” (My name is Kapri, an abbreviation from Leonardo di Kapri-O), referring to Hollywood actor, Leonardo DiCaprio, whose film “Titanic” was a box office in Indonesia around that time. His oration was marked by microphone feedback and crowd response. A person in the crowd shouted “wis tau” (I’ve heard that one before) asserting the speech line that Indarto had used in previous aksi. He then responded that if an audience has heard his line before then he should keep his/her mouth shut (“Nek wis tau, mingkem”) which the crowd responded to in laughter. In the context of speech, aspects of voice, technical mediation, and public response act as sound marks of an environment where an aksi occurred.

2.2 Chants

Aksi sometimes require physical movement through space as protesters walk from one meeting place to another. When this happens, aksi incorporate sounds that could be considered outside of the soundscape of aksi. Chants and songs are intertwined with these spatial transitions, integrating themselves into the soundscape of ’98. An excerpt from track 3 depicting the moving flow of people in a march is shown in Figure 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>(strides in the foreground) <strong>(orator speaking through megaphone in the distance)</strong> “...today we are together doing a peace protest, to show concern for phenomena that occurred in this country.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:38</td>
<td>(strides, people murmuring in some distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:04</td>
<td>(sound of siren from megaphone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:07</td>
<td>Chant “Lower the price, amend the economy” <em>(followed by others in the background)</em> “Lower the price, amend economy”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(pause, strides audible)

14:20  (Anonymous singing) “We shall overcome, we shall overcome” (joined by others) “We shall overcome, we shall overcome, we shall overcome someday. Oh, deep in my heart I do believe (commanding sound from the megaphone at a distance) We shall overcome some day (megaphone still sounding, unintelligible) We walk hand in hand, we walk hand in hand, we walk hand in hand all day (lead voice mis-pitch) Ooh deep in my heart (sound of people murmuring, sound of cars passing in the background) I do believe, we walk hand in hand today.” People marching free, people marching free, people marching free someday (sounds of car passing) Oh here in my heart, I do believe, people walking free someday.

15:28  (Shout in distance without megaphone, dry voice) Long live the people of Indonesia (responds: Long live!)

15:38  (Short pause with people murmuring, shouts from the distance followed by chant) ‘Lower prices, amend economy. Lower the price, amend economy!’

15:52  (Chants) People united will never be defeated (gradually joined by others)

16:00  (Pause)

16:13  (Chants) “Lower the price, amend economy”

(Track 3, 13:45-16:13)

**Figure 7. Chants and songs performed during a march**

Chanting and singing were used as acts of control in organized protests. They were calls for the masses to gather as a single unit comprising individuals fighting for a common cause. Chants of “Lower the price, amend the economy” can be heard throughout the march. This is perhaps a modified version of the common chant “Lower the price, Repeal Soeharto!” Chants, led by a field coordinator (**kordinator lapangan** or **korlap**) or other protest organizers, are ubiquitous in the soundscape of protests. In these recordings of 1998 aksi one would often hear “**Rakyat bersatu tak bisa dikalahkan**” (The people united will never be defeated) (Track 2-9:55 and throughout tracks 2 and 3), “**Rakyat pasti menang, pasti menang, pasti menang**” (The people will win, will win, will win) (Track 3-42:00), and “**Turunkan harga, turunkan Soeharto**” (Lower prices, Repeal Soeharto) (Track 3-39:50). When protesters were confronted with anonymous provocation, protest organizers would chant. In a messy situation where protesters responded to anonymous provocation, protest organizers would chant “**Satu komando, satu tujuan**” (One command, one
mission) to focus attention on the protest mission (Track 2-35:50). For example, on March 11, 1998, the day that Soeharto was ousted from power, protesters chanted “Satu komando, satu tujuan” (One command, one mission) as students burnt a statue of President Soeharto (Track 9 - 09:35).

2.3 Songs

Protest songs were central to student political activism in Indonesia during 1998. The song “Darah Juang” (“Blood struggle”) was sung frequently in 1998 and can be heard several times on the recording (Track 2-13:55 and track 3-11:15). “Darah Juang” was written by John Tobing in the early 1990s and was popular in Yogyakarta before it was transmitted among activists nationwide (Satrio, 1999). “Darah Juang” was often sung during a march, and shows the function of coordination during tense moments to remind activists of the struggle.

Protestors often used “We shall overcome” as an expression of aksi due to its association with anti-Vietnam War activism popularized by Joan Baez and the Woodstock concert of 1969 (Track 3-14:20). In the 1990’s this song was introduced to new activists in underground meetings (Hariyanto, pers.comm 2018). Radical student groups were considered as politically leftist for their reference to socialist movements across the world. The concept of socialism is based on a distinctive combination of equality, freedom, and community (Lamb, 2019, 10). The song itself has become an anthem of resistance for protesters on a global scale.

As these protests were organized by students primarily from Universitas Gadjah Mada, its institutional anthem “Hymne Gadjah Mada” (Gadjah Mada Hymn) was often performed, even though there were protesters from other institutions (Tracks 2, 3, 7, and 9).
This discussion of the Soundscape of ’98 provides descriptions of sound events relating to *aksi*. Sound events in these recordings serve as a foundation to better understand the relationship between orators, the crowd, and the political issues at hand. The speeches, chants, and songs generally refer to themes of unification and amplification of the people’s voices. The entanglement of emotions and sound are signals for unification. Speeches, chants, and songs unified students from diverse backgrounds with people from outside the university. These events unite the 1998 generation with its political past, as exemplified by the appropriation of the Youth Pledge (Track 2- 21:20). This nostalgia is once again demonstrated in the high-spirited march song of patriotic resistance “*Maju tak Gentar*” (Stride without Fear). The intertwining of performance and shared history among protestors is a source of power on which the soundscape of *aksi* stands. It is a ground for unification, because without unification there cannot be reform. Haris Rusly Moty, a PRD activist, embodies this ideology in a speech presented at an *aksi* on April 9, 1998

> Change will only occur if we all, students, high schoolers, buskers, bus drivers, gather together hand in hand to fight for change. Friends, change cannot be the burden of students only. Students consist of only 2% of Indonesia’s population. Change will only happen if all forces of the people unite to overthrow Soeharto. (Track 1-24:24).

Although one may argue that students do not occupy the same social-political space as “the people,” the soundscape of ’98 united them. This is why “*rakyat*” was ubiquitous in speeches, chants, and songs of protest. While speeches, chants, and songs constitute *aksi* in themselves, they generated reaction (“re-aksi”) from *rakyat*, and individuals who are part of the society that have been oppressed the most -- such as the old farmer whose accent and unfamiliarity with sophisticated terms entertained the crowd (Track 1-22:24), the urban poor who articulated their stories through music (Track 1-9:34), or the young mother who cursed the economic crisis for
being unable to buy milk for her toddler (Track 3:56:22). The soundscape of ‘98 immersed students and the rakyat in the notion of “from the people, by the people, and for the people” (“dari, oleh, dan untuk rakyat”). Speech, chants, and songs served as ways in which the uniting forces of aksi amplified the voices of the people.
3.0 Aksi Humor Butet Kartaredjasa

As performance, aksi provides performers with tools to adopt an innovative and adaptable style of communication. In previous chapters I addressed AND’s speech, which was effective in facilitating an atmosphere of unity. His voice was penetrating, energizing, and adopted traditional aspects of oration. ADN’s speech possesses the style of an orator. The intentionality of an orator’s style affects crowd perception. Understanding style as aksi through orator’s intention and through how it is perceived by the crowd stimulates us to think about aksi as spectacle. Amidst the various performances the notion of aksi as both politics and aesthetics can be exemplified through the speech of a renowned stage actor, Butet Kartaredjasa. In his speech he devised and tailored his voice to present the authoritarian sound which had the crowd laughing, emphasizing the performance as a humor-filled performance (aksi humor).

3.1 Spectacle of “The People”

Kartaredjasa was born in a middle-class Javanese family. His father, Bagong Kussudiardjo, was a Javanese traditional dancer within the sultanate’s surroundings of “Kredo Bekso Wiromo,” a reputable Javanese dance association based in Yogyakarta. Albeit from an elite background, he pursued a career as an actor with Teater Gandrik, a theater troupe characterized by its folksy, simple style and focus on the “little people” (wong cilik) (Hatley, 2008; Timmerman, 2017).

Teater Gandrik developed a distinctive style in delivering criticism called guyon parikena that aimed to criticize people in a subtle way by mocking themselves. Guyon Parikena is a Javanese
phrase derived from “guyon” or laugh, which references “jokes of the everyday.” Teater Gandrik successfully established *sampakan* (humorous) theatre in modern Indonesian theater terminology. Teater Gandrik’s performances usually melded influences from the local popular genre of *ketoprak* and Western mime using a simple percussion orchestra with musicians interpolating comments into the action, as is done in traditional theater (Hatley, 2008, 37-38). The melding of Western realist plays and Javanese folk forms was characterized by their turning to indigenous theater for inspiration to develop their own *cengkok* – a Javanese word that refers to a style based in the surrounding culture or tradition (Brandon, 1993, 132).

In addressing problems of “the little people,” Teater Gandrik usually depicted interactions among village folk rather than kings and nobles. This setting enabled Gandrik to localize the play narrative from the national level to the district level. Teater Gandrik engaged the concept of “little people” into an everyday sensibility. They were often positioned within an old Javanese conception of social strata at the bottom of the society with *priyayi* (noble) being at the top (1990, 61). This Javanese sensibility acted as a guiding principle in Kartaredjasa’s protest speech as a speech “of the people and for the people.”

### 3.2 “Three Mandates of the People” Speech

According to Kartaredjasa 1998 was a critical time in Indonesia’s history. Although he had been critical of the New Order regime mainly through performances in theater spaces, in 1998 he felt that he had to take part in street protest (Kartaredjasa, pers comm, April 2019). The nation’s economy, social and legal rights, and people’s lives had become increasingly vulnerable under the Soeharto regime. During his performance Kartaredjasa delivered the “Three Mandates of the
People” (*Tiga Amanat Rakyat*) speech. This monologue was not fully recorded; the only recording available is of the last section (figure 8). Kartaredjasa’s performance can be heard on the first recorded material on track 1 (Track 1-00-1:35). The beginning of the recording suggests an ambience of an open field full of people, the different depth and reverberation of the sound on the stage was amplified. Then a voice from a microphone is heard, a familiar sound which the audience responded to in laughter. Figure 8 shows a transcription of the speech.

---

...and thirdly, I want to suggest to the troops (*laughs*)

Both troops who are visible, and those who are deliberately hiding themselves. (*applause*)

I, in this opportunity, only want to remind the troops that troops are also “people”

Their mothers, the parents of those troops are also “people”.

So, if the troops are beating us, they are actually beating themselves (*laughs, applause*)

So, do believe that the troops will not beat us up

Because in the end, those troops will be thankful to the struggle of students (*loud cheers*)

Herewith, the three mandate I present to you

Thank you. *Wassalam*

---

Figure 8. The “Three Mandates of the People” speech

Kartaredjasa’s speech “Three Mandates of the People” operates on with what has commonly been categorized as an unsophisticated and an allegedly “bad and incorrect” form of
the Indonesian language. This vernacular form was commonly associated with Indonesian official
speech. Within the structure of the New Order government there was a language center led by
linguistic scholars (Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa). This center developed a
program to enhance Indonesian language (bahasa Indonesia) aligned with the development
program (Pembangunan) affiliated with the New Order regime. According to Heryanto (1995),
the main goal of the program was to establish technocratic language that facilitated the training of
professionals and bureaucrats, as well as the management of Pembangunan projects sanctioned by
the state. However, state officials often overlooked the development of a vernacular national
language, preferring their own official linguistic style. New Order state official linguistics was said
to have included an “excessive” use of the suffix -nya, and the preposition daripada, as well as
their habit of pronouncing the suffix -kan as -ken (Heryanto 1995,43). Kartaradjasa used the styles
of guyon parikena to mock the New Order style of speaking in his “Three Mandates of the People”
speech shown in Figure 9. The figure shows the classification of incorrect and correct
pronunciations which characterized Soeharto use of the Indonesian language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soeharto’s Bad and Incorrect use of Bahasa Indonesia</th>
<th>Good and Correct use of Bahasa Indonesia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daripada</td>
<td>Dari (of, from)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengingatken</td>
<td>Mengingatkan (to remind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menyembunyiken</td>
<td>Menyembunyikan (to hide)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya sampaiken</td>
<td>Saya sampaikan (I present)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. The state-official Bahasa Indonesia used in the “Three Mandate of the People” speech

The first line of Kartaredjasa’s speech “Saya menghimbau daripada aparat” mirrors
Soeharto’s style of speech. The first line translates as “I suggest/warn the military.” Like Soeharto,
Kartaredjasa practiced the incorrect use of the word “of” in “I suggest of the troops” instead of the official and correct “I warn the military.” Soeharto’s wasteful preposition “daripada” is a well-known characteristic of his speech. We can see this in a recorded documentation of Soeharto during a meet-and-greet with members of the society (Figure 10). Written in bold, his speech about his predecessor Soekarno (“Mr. Karna”) and Communism exemplifies the excessive use of “daripada” as well the suffix “ken”

“...kita laksanakan. Tapi saudara-saudara mengetahui bahwasanya, walaupun, toh, sudah kembali kepada Undang-Undang Dasar 45... pelaksanaannya sampai pada tahun 65 tidak sesuai dengan apa yang tercantum dalam Undang-undang Dasar 45. Khususnya dalam rangka melaksanakan...merupakan konsep perjuangan daripada Bung Karna...bagaimana dalam membawa daripada kelangsungan perjuangan bangsa Indonesia untuk mencapai daripada cita-cita.”

“...we will implement. But friends know that, although (we) go back to 1945 regulations... the implementation in 1965 did not fit to that of the 1945 regulations. Especially in implementing it... is a concept of Mr. Karna (Soekarno)... how in bringing of the sustainability of the Indonesian struggle to reach of the dreams.

Figure 10. Examples of Soeharto’s use of incorrect language

Soeharto was known for using a non-standard pronunciation of active verbs. Kartaredjasa mimicked this during his speech, explicating the authoritarian leader’s reminder to the military to be soft on student protesters. “Saya, di dalam kesempatan ini cuma mengingatken...” (I, in this opportunity only want to remind...). The pronunciation of di dalam (in or within) is pronounced

---

3 “Pak Harto bicara ttg komunis dan PKI”. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=flj0onZ5ZU4 accessed March 11, 2019 at 8pm.
as daːle:m instead of daːlɑ:m. The word “to remind” is performed as *mengingat-ken* instead of *mengingat-kan*.

The “Three Mandates of the People” operated by adopting this renowned linguistic style indexing New Order authority. Heryanto explains that this linguistic style is known to the public as the state official language which was used by New Order officials such as Soeharto and his loyal ministers. Their linguistic performance has occasionally been “the target of criticism and mockery” (1995,38-44).

The New Order developed a list of common words in speeches that were associated with depictions of authoritarian power. Kartaredjasa incorporated these words into his speech (figure 11). For example, he used the words “*menghimbau*” (to suggest), “*aparat*” (military or police troops) and “*amanat*” (mandate) in his speech (as described in Figure 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarian associations</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Menghimbau</em> (I suggest, I warn)</td>
<td>“In December 19, 1978 the coordinator of Security and Order, General Sudomo, suggest that (timber) businessmen are mentally prepared for the government’s policy and lower the price of goods unassociated with the policy.” (Soeharto.co)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 1995 Suharto issued regulation No. 90/1995 suggesting businessman to donate 2% of their profit to Yayasan Dana Mandiri, an organization he established (Netralnews, August 3, 2003).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aparat</em> (the military force or the police)</td>
<td>Military as tool to control the regime (apparatus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amanat</em> (mandate)</td>
<td>Mandate institutions such as People’s Representative Council and People’s Consultative Assembly. Both were controlled by Soeharto.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 11. Words with authoritarian associations*

---

4 During the New Order, Soeharto’s state officials were never particularly interested in the technocratic language prescribed by the language center (Heryanto, 1995, 43).
The word “menghimbau” (to suggest) possesses authoritarian associations. The speaker is giving a suggestion or warning. Moreover, the use of menghimbau is often heard from top-ranking government officials. In figure 8, the first examples of the word come from General Sudomo, a military general who was the coordinator of Security and Order under Soeharto. The second example comes from President Soeharto himself encouraging businessmen to donate profits to support his regime. Although “menghimbau” is a suggestion, it carries the idea of obligation, especially when delivered by top-ranking government officials. In semiotics, the word “menghimbau” is a signifier which indexes a certain signified (Atkin, 2005:161-188). The signifier in this case does not only indicate the meaning of the formal semantic meaning of a word but through social conventions and experiences of witnessing government official it indexes authoritarian power. It is a suggestion with consequences should it not be implemented.

The term aparat (apparatus) was popular during late New Order and central to Soeharto’s authoritarian power. Although the word means “facilities or supplies relating to the government” the most common usage was to depict the role of ABRI as an apparatus of the government. I discussed ABRI’s dual function in the introduction, its close affiliation with Soeharto, and its repressive approach to maintaining order. Numerous political incidents throughout the New Order involving ABRI caused many to hate the term “aparat.” Most of theaksi during 1997-1998 called for the abolishment of ABRI’s dual function and militaristic repression.

ABRI’s repressive approach silenced the majority of Indonesians. However underground vernacular expressions developed in the form of military parody. These vernacular expressions allowed people to develop ways to overcome their fears of the government. For example, many activists developed an uncanny ability for sensing the presence of plain-clothed troops. ABRI intensified surveillance in 1998 and in response activists developed skills to identify aparat nestled
among protesters (Arifin, 1999). Kartaredjasa’s incorporation of this issue reflects the common experience of fear that aksi participants experienced. The meta-language of laughs and applause subsequent to his warning to aparat indicates factuality. He states: “I want to remind aparat, those who are apparent and those who are in disguise.” (Track 1 – 00:35)

Kartaredjasa presented the “Three Mandates of the People” in such a way that echoed the authoritarian mandates of the New Order regime. During the New Order the president was the executor of mandates prescribed by the People’s Consultative Assembly (Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat, or MPR). However, members of the New Order parliament were appointed by the president. Haris Rusly Moti, a PRD activist, stated: “We need to disband the parliament (MPR/DPR). They were not chosen via democracy. They were not chosen (by the people) but appointed by Soeharto.” (Track 1-24:24). The meaning of “mandate” therefore was far from having the sincere sensibility defined in its conventional semantic meaning.

While we understand its semantic meaning, the “Three Mandates” would not be engaging or subversive without the performative sound of the New Order. I argue that it was Kartaradja’s voice-work that created its significance. Aksi participants were able to relate Kartaredjasa’s voice-work to the rhetoric and linguistic performances of state officials. Kartaredjasa’s performance was a looking-glass version of Soeharto’s speeches. He took on the character of Soeharto, through embodiment and vocality. Aside from common diction and pronunciation, Kartaredjasa’s speech was based on bodily internalized reiteration of sounds that people heard over and over during the New Order. During his thirty-two years in power, Soeharto was known by his distinctive bass-nasal voice. His authoritarian sonic vocal timbre was recognized by people across Indonesia via the state-run radio station Radio-Repulik Indonesia (RRI), and Televisi Republik Indonesia (TVRI). During the New Order the army monitored radio and television media for pengamanan
*dan ketertiban umum* (security and public order). This was true for public and private stations as well (Sen and Hill, 2000,87). In 1981 The New Order banned advertisements on national television network TVRI as a way to focus on the facilitation of national development and eliminate messages that did not promote the regime’s agenda (Kitley, 2000:68). Soeharto was often shown on the government world news program “*Dunia Dalam Berita*” presenting residential speeches or presidential visits. TVRI’s program “*Dari Desa ke Desa*” (“From Village to Village”) was another popular example. “*Dari Desa ke Desa*” focused on the potential success story of local farmers, animal rearers, and fisherman. In this program Soeharto would talk to members of the society in a semi-formal tone about their livelihood and answer questions that appear to have been prepared in advance (or possibly vetted). This program depicted Soeharto’s monitoring of the short-term developmental goals which he designed within the Five-Year Development Plan (*Rencana Pembangunan Lima Tahun*, or *Repelita*), in attaining economic “take off” (*tinggal landas*) toward the status of an industrialized state. This television program documented Soeharto’s visits to various rural places in Indonesia in a special program which often interrupted the network’s programming schedule. In short, Soeharto’s image and voice were broadcast into the lives of the people and his voice and image became iconic.

---

5 Detik News, Soeharto, Dari Desa ke Desa Hingga Klompencapir

6 A YouTube documentation of Soeharto’s televised visit to Irian Jaya (now West Papua) can be used as comparative media for his sound embodiment. Temu Wicara Presiden Soeharto Pada Panen Raya di Merauke Irian Jaya 1- Swasembada Pangan https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bze2Ebd8OGQ
The manifestation of sound identification is not a singular act or event but a ritualized production which Butler calls ‘performative’ (Butler, 1993). The reiteration of sound channeled through electronic media materialized into the ability to sense a certain voice characteristic. In a ritualized action of listening, the identification of sound focuses on the trait of the sound itself independent of its cause and its meaning (Chion, 1994, 3). The identification of Soeharto’s voice through listening was the embodiment of a performative sound.

Kartaredjasa’s performance embodied the sound of Soeharto and presented the familiarity of sound into performance, a process which Diana Taylor refers to as a repertoire of embodied knowledge (Taylor, 2003, 25). Repertoire as embodied knowledge is an important system for transmitting knowledge. In this case, Kartaredjasa extends this idea to the audience’s familiarity of sound materiality. His voice, intonation, and commonly used words articulate a shared understanding between performer and audience.

I propose that these sound identifications are just a part of a larger perceptual field in action. Listening with the ear is inseparable from listening with the mind. Bearing in mind that Kartaredjasa never stated that he was acting as Soeharto during his speech, his voice-work communicates a common understanding of who the sound belongs to. It is more than just indexing but also presenting the iconic voice of Soeharto. Through connotations of authority (in linguistic terms including the words aparat and mandate) Kartaredjasa engages with human aspects that are often overlooked in political rallies. The idea of Soeharto greeting undercover police and military forces possesses a twist of irony. The third Mandate suggests Soeharto’s alignment with the people by delivering a mandate to the military to eliminate violence. Kartaredjasa’s embodiment of Soeharto offers the understanding of knowledge signified by forms of meta-language such as applause, laughter, and the release of tension among aksi participants. The embodiment of the
performative sound was performed within the framework of an evocative dramaturgy that produced intimate resonance with the audience (Barba, 2010, 10). Intimate resonance presented sound familiarity between Kartaredjasa, Soeharto, and the people. In the “Three Mandates of the People,” the materiality of the voice and its semantic meaning were strongly acknowledged by other aksi participants. Hence the meta-language sounds of laughter and applause reverberated loudly among the participants.

3.3 Language and Oratory in Javanese Society and Indonesian Politics

Drawing from a study on New Order language in context, Virginia Matheson Hooker differentiated Soeharto’s speech style from first-president Soekarno. Hooker describes the Old Order style of speech as a dialogue whereas the New Order style was regarded as a monologue. The dialogue and monologue analogy illustrate the relationship between president and rakyat during the two regimes. Hooker argues that President Soekarno’s speech was personal, emotional, chaotic, and used a mixture of informal language. On the contrary, Soeharto’s speech was impersonal, sober, formal, planned, ordered, repetitive, and dignified (Hooker, 1993, 285). Soekarno was often referred as the spokesman of the people or the extension of the people’s tongue (penyambung lidah rakyat), whereas Soeharto was regarded as the extension of (the military force as) an apparatus (penyambung lidah aparat). Hooker acknowledged the different styles of their speech acts, which in this thesis can be considered as performance (aksi) or style (gaya). This sensibility shows the segregation between leader and rakyat as opposed to Soekarno’s engaging and dynamic style.
The speech style of the New Order president maintained an image of stability through consistent policy, vocabulary, and repetition. According to anthropologist James Siegel, Soeharto made his voice into a reflection of established texts as though he spoke only in quotations: “He was the embodiment of texts, the one whose acknowledgments made the event into a ceremony, something formal and repeatable” (Siegel, 1986, 279). Furthermore, Siegel stated that Soeharto’s speech possessed Javanese court etiquette (1986, 280). Although Soeharto’s speech is in Indonesian, it is closely related to the high-Javanese language level known as kromo.

The Javanese language system is defined by social strata: kromo for the higher class and ngoko for the lower class. Kromo, the aristocratic language that refers to polite speech forms, makes up a much smaller percentage of the Javanese vocabulary (Smith-Hefner, 1989; Anderson, 1990). However, the use of kromo and the concept of aristocracy have shifted throughout phases of Dutch colonization, Japanese occupation, and nationalism. The uses of kromo and ngoko are relative depending on who is speaking. In contemporary Java a speaker uses a higher speech level, one containing a larger percentage of kromo forms, in addressing or referring to unfamiliar people or people of higher social standing, corresponding to the respectable strata in Javanese society which Clifford Geertz refers to as priyayi (Geertz, 1960). However, palace language also has the attribute of an artificial type of use, and so was clearly susceptible to manipulation and modification in much more far-reaching ways (Errington, 1982, 90).

According to Michael Bodden, priyayi are defined as Javanese bureaucratic servants, initially of the Javanese kingdoms, and later of the Dutch colonial administration (Bodden, 2010, 285). During the Dutch colonial period new elite roles such as indigenous Javanese positions in Dutch governmental system including regent (bupati) and district-chief (vedana) were considered
to be priyayi and subject to the use of kromo language. Although these positions were not hereditary, there was a strong continuity of use among family members in many cases.

Soeharto’s kromo attributes can also be seen through how he is perceived: calm and polite. His behavior was heavily influenced by Javanese principles of inner calm reflected in external impassiveness. Soeharto often indulged in practices aimed at placating supernatural forces. His ambition to rule over a de-politicized realm was perfectly compatible with the outlook of Javanese kings, whose “primary duties in the political sphere were to guard against disturbances and to restore order if any such disturbance should occur” (Ward, 2010, 28) This attitude contributed to the construction of his speech style, which was similar to a Javanese king. In his speeches, he would translate into Javanese, which would have been incomprehensible to people from other parts of the country (Kristoff, New York Times, May 17, 1998).

The issue of Javanese language sensibility was also brought into Kartaredjasa’s speech. His embodiment of the performative sound based on timbre, rhythm, pitch, and dynamics represents Soeharto. His intonation was flat and monotonous. The pauses were held patiently, maintaining his inner calm. Kartaredjasa’s sound embodiment is both formalism and realism at work. In theater studies these approaches refer to representation and presentation. Representation in acting is basically imitating and illustrating the characters’ behavior. Representation actors believe that the characters they create on stage will be acknowledged by the audience, but lacking in empathy and emotional involvement from the audience.

Kartaredjasa was known to impersonate Soeharto through his vocal works in the realm of theater performances. Among theater practices, actors embraced the techniques of the body including sound and voice to mimic others. Kartaredjasa first impersonation of Soeharto’s was in the 1986 performance of Dhemit (Spirits). He then performed several political character roles in
the following years, including *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* by Ahmad Tohari and *Semangkin* by Seno Gumira Ajidarma. While Kartaredjasa’s voice work is regarded as impersonation (Winet, 2001,4), it is more appropriate to say that his *aksi* are re-enactments or performative sounds (Schechner, 1985,36; Bain,2001,184).

Drawing from Stanislavski’s discussion on character in *An Actor Prepares*, “an actor chooses carefully from his memories and culls out of his living experiences the ones that are most enticing” (Stanislavski, 1936, 13,166). Actors and characters are autonomous entities for it is impossible for an actor to divest himself of his own soul or to penetrate fully into another. Through Kartaredjasa’s accustomed aesthetics of *wongcilik*, Soeharto’s speech is placed within the realm of the vernacular. By performing Soeharto’s Javanese court voice sensibility and incorporating speech sentences infused by perspectives of protesters, the speech was a subversion of the authoritarian power. In Kartaredjasa’s speech, the sound performance no longer represents the Javanese king. The speech sound resembles Soeharto and his *kromo* attributes, but it was performed by embracing the aesthetics of *wongcilik* or *rakyat*. Using the evocative dramaturgy associated with *ketoprak* and Gandrik’s *sampakan*, he delivered Soeharto to the *rakyat* and *wongcilik* through the aesthetics of *aksi* (political protest). Using Bourdieu’s explanation of *habitus* (Bourdieu,1977,19) Kertaradjasa’s style derives from the thoughts, perceptions, and beliefs of the New Order. Moreover, the sound performance of Soeharto is a manifestation of *rakyat* performance styles: theatrical action (*aksi teatrikal*), monologue play (*aksi monolog*), and humorous approach (*aksi humor*). Kartaredjasa’s artistic style embraces the *rakyat’s* aesthetics of *sampakan* and potentially unifies protesters in a number of ways. Further, Kartaredjasa validates the common feelings of social intrusion and oppression by the military force (*aparat*). The reiterative sounds stimulate a unified opposition to the public enemy. Rather than donning a
military uniform that emphasizes the role of the military as a tool of oppression, the semantic
dramaturgy strips the New Order authorities of their uniform and embraces the humanistic qualities
of military troops. If the New Order is symbolized through sound, the “Three Mandates of the
People” speech desacralizes Soeharto’s symbolic powers and highlights humanistic values.
Subverting Soeharto’s *kromo* sensibility as vernacular expression is therefore a process of
democratization. While embodying the sound of the New Order, he subverts the voice of the
authoritarian president into the representation for the people.

Kartaredjasa’s speech is an example of an *aksi* at work. The is mediated through an
aesthetic belonging to the *rakyat*. However, signification of “the people” requires *aksi* to be more
than discourse. In “Dangdut Soul: Who are ‘the People’ in Indonesian Popular Music?” Andrew
Weintraub stated that

> “the people” are imagined as embodying certain living spaces, interests, and behaviors. Moreover, they have also been produced symbolically through institutions that privilege certain kinds of representations and marginalize others. These institutions have their own hierarchies and internal ideological conflicts, but they all speak on behalf of audiences. In this case, the condition of “speaking on behalf” is what characterizes asymmetrical relations of power among different groups. (Weintraub, 2006, 427).

Kartaredjasa’s privilege as a former student and established artist limited his *aksi* as an aesthetic
*aksi*. In a society marked by divisions of gender, class, caste, region, religion and other narratives,
it is almost impossible for the marginalized to speak or voice their own interests (Spivak, 2000).
However, Kartaredjasa’s articulation “for the people” was precious to fueling activism spirit
among protesters. The *wong cilik* aesthetic was able to transport students to the realm of *rakyat*
and to unite them through a humanistic and egalitarian approach.
4.0 *Aksi Jalanan: Sarekat Pengamen Indonesia (SPI)*

In this chapter I will discuss the music of *aksi*. The performance I will analyze informs us of the aesthetics of the streets during the 1998 protests. From April 23th until April 25th, 1998, a number of musicians performed during an event called Democracy Podium (*Mimbar Demokrasi*). Among those musicians was an ensemble of street-buskers, the Indonesian Union of Buskers (Sarekat Pengamen Indonesia, or SPI). As singing beggars (*pengamen*) who play for spare cash, SPI members lived in the back alleys and slums of the city. They made their living by performing in a variety of public spaces including neighborhood residential areas and public transportation. Before moving to a discussion of SPI’s participation in aksi ’98, I will discuss what I will call “street aesthetics” (*aksi jalananan*) with specific reference to SPI. As street buskers, SPI members nurtured ways in which vernacular music-making can be systematically presented. I refer to this as the *aksi jalananan* or “street aesthetic.” Using techniques of storytelling, their musical lyrics depict the people and their lives under the authoritarian Soeharto government.

4.1 Street Aesthetics

The Indonesian term for busker, *pengamen*, translates as “singing beggar”; indeed, like beggars (*pengemis*), most *pengamen* in Yogyakarta earn little money (Richter, 2012: 54). *Pengamen* refers to humble street musicians slinging battered colorfully decorated guitars as they
roam through the city in search of spare change. In *Modern Noise, Fluid Genres: Popular Music in Indonesia, 1997-2001*, anthropologist Jeremy Wallach states that *pengamen* are traveling performers/mendicants in Indonesian cities, often criticized as little more than beggars who are unwilling to work. They play at street intersections approaching pedestrians and motorists in a quest for *rupiah* (the local currency). They are regarded as representing the failure of the Indonesian government to provide for all its citizens (Wallach, 2008, 177-179).

Wallach states: “If *pengamen* are living icons of “the folk” (*rakyat*), as so many of them claim, then the music played by *pengamen* is ipso facto folk music, representing ordinary Indonesians and constituting a musical heritage shared by all citizens, from the humblest to the most affluent” (Wallach, 2008, 181). On the one hand, they are entertainers with command of Indonesian popular music; they are accustomed to breaking into spontaneous song, in some cases about the futility of the meaning of life (Richter, 2013, 67). On the other hand, *pengamen* are agents of embodied experience that reflect their social life on the streets. For some *pengamen* the street experience has given them the critical ability to scrutinize their position within the political life of the state. Daniel Ziv’s film *Jalanan* (Streets), depicts these narratives of the urban marginalized poor through a focus on three *pengamen*. The film shows a *pengamen* named Bambang “Ho” Mulyono being arrested in Jakarta by security officials and locked up ahead of an international summit in the Indonesian capital. The documentary depicts Ho, who had been a *pengamen* since 1997, singing about corruption to passengers in a bus. As he states in the documentary film, “I love Indonesia, but I don’t know if Indonesia loves me.” Boni Putera, another *pengamen*, is pictured living with his wife and two children under a bridge in suburban Jakarta; he states: “This is like a house but not exactly a house, this is a temporary shelter, like cardboard.”

---

7 Daniel Ziv’s film *Jalanan* (Street side). DesaKota Production, 2013
Titi Juwariyah, a female *pengamen*, is pictured living in a rented house but still plays music on the streets to finance her children’s education. She does not want her children to become *pengamen* (Ziv, 2013).

**SPI**

SPI was initiated by a number of *pengamen* who were angry about their marginalized status. Street musicians rarely choose to earn their living on the streets; for many busking is the only option for income (Wallach, 2008; Richter, 2013; Ziv, 2013). SPI believed that social issues such as poverty and unemployment are systematic problems of and the result of government policy. SPI was against the systems that positioned them and their fellow *rakyat* to be marginalized. In order to resist the policies that created these inequities SPI activists needed to mobilize the *rakyat* to think critically and systematically.

In order to mobilize, they needed the help of students. SPI was not fond of the elite status of students, but they reached out to students for assistance. Students were regarded as contributing to the problematic discourses about and representations of poverty and marginalized populations. Students did not share experiences with the *rakyat*, and yet they had the knowledge, skills, and resources to fight systems of oppression. If the students could teach the *rakyat* the knowledge and skills needed and provide resources and support, the *rakyat* would have a better chance for success in their struggle (Ahmad, pers.com, 2019).

One song frequently sung by SPI is “Mengadu Pada Indonesia” (Complaining to Indonesia) (Figure 12). It depicts the actions of *aparat* and their authoritarian tendencies. SPI members have been involved with *aparat* on numerous occasions, especially when restricting their busking activities. The consequence of the military dual-function (*dwifungsi*) was a big part of their lives. They would often find military officers as security officials in places during busking such as in
bus stations, in the market, or in red-light districts. For example, on an east-Java bound inter-city bus route, a military officer administered the curfew of buskers. If found playing beyond certain hours, their instruments would be confiscated; on one occasion an instrument was destroyed. Vernacular expression reflecting their own experience on the streets is considered street aesthetics (aksi jalanan).

(1) STORY INTRODUCTION

Hari ini sengaja aku kepadamu
Indonesiaku
Tentang ulah aparatmu yang lupa waktu
Oh, tentu kamu tahu

Today I deliberately complain to you
my Indonesia
About your troops who have forgotten
about time
Oh, you know that one

(2) STORY II – bridge

Bayangkan ulahm mereka
Mereka sok berkuasa
Mereka suka menyiksa
Bahkan membunuh sudah biasa.

Imagine, their behavior
They are playing authoritarian
They like to torture
Even killing people is normal

(3) CONCLUSION

Aku melihat tindakan aparat
Tembak sana tembak sini sampai ke akhirat
Sialan (sialan) aparat tuh setan
Kuasanya melebihi kuasanya Tuhan

I see troops action
They shoot here and there until (we) go heaven
Damn (damn) troops are devil
Their authority is bigger than God

Figure 12. “Mengadu pada Indonesia”

Street aesthetics defined SPI. Their storytelling skills embedded in their music came from their experiences and materialized in the introductory greetings to the audience, the guitar strumming, the organization of words and music, and their overall performance. This discussion
of style refers less to genre but more to the concept of scene, in this case, the street as a physical location and space. During aksi it is these elements of aesthetics that the audience perceives and reacts to. SPI’s aksi represents the twice-behaved or the nth time behavior of the marginalized (Schechner, 2002).

The storytelling form is apparent in the musical form. While music of pengamen usually takes the form of simple melodies, “Mengadu Pada Indonesia” shows pitch dynamics that resemble the telling of a story. In figure 13, the song form of “Mengadu Pada Indonesia” consists of two sections of story and one section of conclusion. Bearing in mind that songs are made for busking, the melody is intended to grab people’s attention. The bridge provides another story that is more contemplative. Its drawn-out quarter notes provide space to ponder the military force. The singer asks listeners to “imagine” (“bayangkan”) the tendencies of the police, before giving away the conclusion in a more varied set of tones.

**Story Introduction**

![Musical notation](image)
In the following section, I will discuss two songs that were part of aksi ’98. In this aksi SPI played four songs, two of which describe the world of the urban poor: “OTB Jare Soeharto” and “Indonesia Oye.” These two songs exemplify the street buskers’ traditions of replicating melodies of previously-recorded commercial songs and changing the words.
4.2 “OTB Jare Soeharto”

The song “OTB Jare Soeharto” can be translated as “OTB Says Soeharto” and emphasizes OTB (Organisasi Tanpa Bentuk): an abbreviation of a “formless” and illegal underground organization. Through this song SPI articulated the repression that activist groups experienced under the prohibition of freedom of expression. They derived the song performed by popular childhood singer Enno Lerian in 1994 “Si Nyamuk Nakal” (The naughty mosquito). “Si Nyamuk Nakal” was written by prominent children’s song writer Papa T. Bob. SPI’s “OTB Jare Soeharto” uses the melody from Enno Lerian’s version of the song for the first two verses. Buskers traditionally replicate and modify songs as a form of musical expression (Wallach, 2008, 188). Figure 12 shows a transcription of “OTB Jare Suharto.” (Track4-9.48).
Figure 14. “OTB Jare Soeharto” as performed by SPI
SPI’s “OTB Jare Soeharto” is sung by a male vocalist identified as Ibob who accompanies himself with an acoustic guitar. After a few strums of the guitar, the vocal part enters loudly. His vocals are dry and shaky of a treble range. The verse uses a I – V – I chord progression replicating the original song. The musicians play the chord progression twice before beginning the chorus with SPI’s original lyrics. The verse consists of 4-bar riffs identical to Enno Lerian’s song but ends after 6 measures. The verse starts again after a short pause underlining the two phrases that are the same melody as the original song. The chorus follows, with a IV – I – V – I progression. Both Verse (A) and Chorus (B) are played twice in succession incorporating different lyrics to each, before the song reaches a coda (C) which SPI also added (See figure 14).

On the recording, the audience responded to the song by singing along and clapping their hands along with the rhythm. As the vocal part enters, a female voice in the crowd occasionally joins Ibob’s singing. It is likely she was near the recording microphone. Some of the audience responded as if they were familiar with the song, perhaps because the melody was popular a few years before the aksi.

The simplicity of the strumming guitar suggests the aesthetics of the everyday where buskers play on the streets. Guitar strumming, the simplest form of guitar playing, is a customary style among pengamen. Their performances are often lively and energetic. This style emphasizes the song lyrics, with guitar strums functioning as rhythm and background chords. SPI’s “OTB Jare Soeharto” lyrics contain a discursive narrative that situates the group within the political events through the use of the story world of the song. The song lyrics depict the New Order as an oppressive regime (See figure 15).
VERSE 1

Banyak sawah yang digusur,  
Karena pejabat pada kolusi  
Banyak buruh yang menuntut  
Karena gaji tak mencukupi

(There is) so many rice fields confiscated  
because the bureaucrats are in collusion  
So many laborers are protesting  
Because their salary is inadequate

CHORUS 1

Banyak buruh yang menuntut  
Banyak petani demonstra  
Apa rakyat cuma dianggap sampah?

(There are) so many labors who litigate  
(there are) so many farmers who protest  
Do they consider people as trash?  
(applause in the foreground)

CHORUS 2

Dimanakah kebenaran?  
Where is virtue?  
Apa rakyat perlu turun ke jalan?

Where is justice?  
Or do we need to descend to the streets?  
(shouts and applause)

VERSE 2

Banyak paguyuban baru  
Menjelang pemilu Sembilan tujuh  
Kita butuh berorganisasi  
tapi kenapa diintimidasi

(There are) so many organizations  
Leading to the ninety- seven elections  
We need to be in an organization  
But why do we get intimidation?  
(singalong, applause)

CHORUS 3

Dimanakah hak-asasi  
Where is human rights?  
Dimanakah demokrasi  
Where is democracy?

Apa kami perlu ber-revolusi?

Or do we need to have a revolution?  
(big cheering and applause)

CODA

Tong Kosong Tut-Tut-Tut- Tut-Tut  
Trouble Moko Harmoko  
Masalah Moko Harmoko  
Per mobil BJ Habibie  
OTB Jare Soeharto

Empty can Tut-Tut-Tut-Tutut (people talking)  
Trouble Moko Harmoko  
Per mobil BJ Habibie  
OTB says Soeharto (shouts Soeharto)

Figure 15. Lyrics of “OTB Jare Soeharto” as performed by SPI
The lyrics describe the circumstances that have generated discontent among laborers and farmers, who are often represented in speeches, chants, and songs of ‘98 activists. Due to the macroeconomic development program the confiscation of land was often implemented to make way for a capitalist economy (Hill, 1994, 85). Confiscation of land to develop capitalistic business centers and factories were stressed in line 1: “(There’s) so many rice fields confiscated.” Likewise, labor manpower was overlooked for companies to gain profit, as articulated in line 3: “So many laborers are protesting because their salary is inadequate.”

Labor was an important political issue in the late New Order. In 1993 labor issues were amplified after the political conspiracy that led to the death of labor activist Marsinah, a woman who worked in the watch factory PT Catur Putra Surya (PT.CPS) in Sidoarjo, East Java. Marsinah’s death inspired labor demonstrations of PT.CPS Porong between May 3rd and 4th, 1993. Her death was highly controversial because reports indicated that the military and law enforcement conspired to prevent Marsinah’s killer from being punished (Kurniasari and Krisnadi, 2014, 18-25). A year later, the Centre for Indonesia Working Class Struggle (Persatuan Pekerja Buruh Indonesia, or PPBI) was formed in Semarang. PPBI, the only labor organization at the time, actively demanded a living wage for workers and called for Soeharto to step down. PPBI General Secretary Dita Indah Sari along with a few other colleagues were captured by the police in Tandes, Surabaya in July 1996 and after an unjust trial and she was sentenced to eight years in prison in Malang and Tangerang (Pakpahan, Kompas February 23, 1999). PPBI was later classified as a prohibited organization.

The coda mentions prominent political figures of the New Order government: Harmoko, BJ Habibie, and Tutut (Soeharto’s daughter). Harmoko was the longtime information minister, and Soeharto’s loyal servant, before being appointed as chairman of the People's Consultative
Assembly and People's Representative Council in 1997. BJ. Habibie was the Research and Technology Minister, who succeeded Soeharto as president in 1998. Tutut, the nickname of Soeharto’s daughter, Siti Hardianti Rukmana, was also appointed as minister in the 1997 cabinet. The bold statements of the lyrics, and the citing of well-known Soeharto cronies and family, culminates by citing Soeharto at the very end. The final call to the New Order perpetrators led the audience to shout “Soeharto” emphasizing the main perpetrator among his main political helpers.

SPI’s performance is full of enthymemes which carry unstated messages that are understood by the audience. The changing of lyrics from “Si Nyamuk Nakal” to “OTB Jare Soeharto” created connections between musical sound and social factors which underline the theme of the song. Yells about the most marginalized communities were apparent during the aksi. The song’s meaning is defined by the overarching topics in “OTB Jare Soeharto.” While OTB is defined clearly as the title, on the verse and in the coda, it is the concept of “rakyat” that underlines the meaning of the song. The exposition of the oppressed members of the society helps to understand why suspected members of underground organizations were intimidated. OTB is understood as the action to take control of people’s lives, to unseat undemocratic regimes, to resist global forces, to protect their livelihood, communities or even their lives, to defend the environment, or to assert their right to self-determination (Clark, 2006, 1). In such movements, OTB seeks support from networks of active citizens. The song urges the audience to resist the power of the perpetrators named at the end of the coda.
4.3 “Indonesia Oye”

Unlike “OTB Jare Soeharto” which uses parts of the song “Si Nyamuk Nakal,” the verse and chorus of “Indonesia Oye” uses the whole melody of the song “Semua ada disini” (Everything is Here) in both verses and chorus. The chord progression of both the original song and “Indonesia Oye” are the same: I – V – I – V, as well as the chorus, IV – I – IV – I – IV – I. The song lyrics also use the same mode of narrative by presenting circumstances in the verses and an anecdote in the chorus. A transcription of the song is shown in Figure 14.
Enno Lerian’s song “Semua ada Disini” was a big hit in 1994. The lyrics of the song and the music video exemplified the notion of Indonesia’s diversity. Singing about various culinary dishes and foods from various parts of Indonesia, the video that accompanies the song affirms the
richness of Indonesia and incorporates dancers with customary (adat) costumes depicting various ethnic groups within the nation-state of Indonesia. The waving of the Indonesian flag Sang Merah Putih (Red and White) is shown against the sound of West Sumatran Minang keyboard riffs, and the video depicts a West Javanese tea farm and acres of Central Javanese rice fields. Culinary associations such as Ambonese bananas, Jogjanesè gudeg, Padang rice dishes are presented in the video. When watching the video one might ask oneself: “Why go anywhere else? Everything is available here. The land is fertile, and the people are prosperous.” As Lerian states in the original song: “I love you Indonesia!” “Semua ada Disini” romanticizes the concept of the imagined community, an abstraction of a collective political idea which is fitted into a geographical territory (Anderson, 1983).

Lerian’s song emphasizes the theme of unification by referencing the variety of cultures without exploring the deeper aspects of the individual cultures represented. This song could be used as a metaphor for the New Order’s legacy of essentializing cultural traditions to attract tourism. Cultural expressions have been transformed into a singular form to accommodate plural and deeply inter-related cultural events into performances for tourists. Cultural identity of each province is often exposed as the sole cultural expression for the nation.

Despite the theme of unification, the song has gone through a significant shift of semantic meaning. In SPI’s version the song title was changed to incorporate a linguistic vernacular “Indonesia Oye” (Indonesia Okay). The lyrics of “Indonesia Oye” emphasized corruption (Figure 17). It was not uncommon for government officials to cut funding for social benefits as a way to line their own pockets, as stated in verse 1 and 2. The theme of corruption was identified early on

---

8 Instead of replicating the English “OK” (okay), Indonesians often say “Oye,” an expression used in informal language where a phrase from the English language is adopted into the everyday vernacular.
in the song when the audience cheered and applauded at the end of verse 1, partly by bringing into line the first-person perspective for corruption: “Corruption, we can just enjoy it.” The call and response is an act of unity based on the re-imagining of what it means to unite (Anderson, 1983).

VERSE 1

| Ingin makan uang rakyat banyak | in wanting to take all the people’s money |
| Bukan berarti harus memaksa | There’s no need to be forceful. |
| Cukup dengan korupsi semua terpenuhi | We can just to enjoy it. (applause) |
| Kita tinggal menikmati | Corruption is all it needs, all can be fulfilled |

VERSE 2

| Ingin cukur dana rakyat desa | Wanting to cut the fund for village people |
| Bukan berarti harus ke desa | There’s no need to go to the village |
| Cukup dengan kolusi, semua terpenuhi | Collusion is all it needs, all can be fulfilled |
| Kita tinggal menikmati | We can just enjoy it. |

CHORUS

| Hey Indonesiaku (2X) | Hey, my Indonesia (2x) (crowd: response) |
| Tanah subur rakyat nganggur | The land is fertile, the people are unemployed (crowd response) |
| Hey Indonesiaku (2X) | Hey, my Indonesia (2x) (crowd response) |
| tanah subur kamu gusur | the people’s field you confiscate (crowd response) |
| Tanam padi tumbuh pabrik | We plant rice, it grows factory |
| Tanam jagung tumbuh Gedung | We plant corn, it grows buildings |
| Tanam modal tumbuk korupsi | We plant capital, it grows corruption (applause) |

CHORUS/CODA

| Tanam padi tumbuh pabrik | We plant rice it grows factory |
| Tanam jagung tumbuh Gedung | We plant corn, it grows buildings |
| Tanam demonstran tumbuh polisi | We plant demonstrators, it grows police (applause) |

Figure 17. Lyrics of Indonesia Oye

The imagined nation in the chorus depicts irony: “Hey, my Indonesia, the land is fertile, (but) the people are unemployed.” SPI’s musical performance traverses between semantic meaning
and reminiscence of post-colonial imaging of a nation state. Like the original song “Semua ada Disini,” the chorus of “Indonesia Oye” demands a call and response mode of interaction. While this can be regarded as a call for unity, it pushes further the notion of imagined community raised in the original song. But it responds through a mode of self-mockery: “Hey, my Indonesia, the land is fertile, but the people are unemployed.” The depiction of victimized members of the society through a cheerful music performance is ironic. During the performance the paradox is shared and performed collectively with the audience: Planting rice only to grow as a factory, planting corn only to grow as buildings, and investing capital only to grow corruption. The imagined prosperous nation-state with all its potentials is contradictory to the circumstances in 1998 where unemployment, land confiscation, and corruption were commonly practiced. SPI’s aksi offers an interplay between the imagined and dystopic reality. This subversion into dystopia, however, is comically realistic, even in the context of aksi: “We plant demonstrators, it grows police.”

In The Revolution will not be Televised, Noriko Manabe states that political circumstances at a particular time call for different levels of musical participation (Manabe, 2015). The various ways in which music entangles with the political scene and sound events was discussed in chapter 2. The song “We Shall Overcome” was sung as an activist song by students marching in the streets. The patriotic song “Maju Tak Gentar” was sung spontaneously during another march. In the case of “Indonesia Oye”, SPI takes the underlying theme of unification and subverts it.

Enjoying the detail of rhetoric that touches actual issues of corruption and the more engaging issue of the military force (the police) “Indonesia Oye” also calls for a similar approach to historical reflection and nostalgia that appeared in several oratories in the recording. The intertwining of history and memory plays a large part in fueling nationally inflected movements in Indonesia (Lee, 2016,3). “Indonesia Oye” encourages the audience to think about the
geographical and territorial aspects of the nation-state. It relates to certain imaginings of the nation in Indonesia’s history, such as of the Youth Pledge of 1928 and the spirit of independence in 1945. Both of these events were mentioned during the aksi by other orators. In “Indonesia Oye,” the imagined community is re-questioned, re-affirmed, and re-performed through satiric and comical sounds of the struggle.

Through the analysis of SPI’s songs “Indonesia Oye” and “OTB Jare Soeharto,” we are able to explore the microscopic aspects of performance framed within aksi. SPI was able to engage with protesters via reminiscence, reflection, facts, and entertainment. However rudimentary the musical presentation (and considering that SPI’s guitar is slightly out of tune), the performance provides the foundations of an aesthetic experienced by protesters in the audience. Aesthetic properties are hybrid properties, mixtures of both objective aspects and evaluative aspects (Fenner, 2008). In such a case, the evaluative aspects of their performance should not be limited to a single performance. Experiencing SPI’s performance should also take account of more qualitative aspects which contribute to the understanding of the moment. As Dewey has stated, “things, objects, are only focal points of a here and now in a hole that stretches out indefinitely. Any experience, even the most ordinary, has an indefinite total setting” (Dewey, 2005, 201). SPI’s performance is a heightened experience of the everyday life of an oppressed society which performers and audience share. The everyday life of the urban poor society has shaped their performance during the protest.

Now that we have analyzed the static dimensions of the performance, new questions are raised about the deeper meaning of their performance. What is the meaning of SPI’s performance for the audience? How are such experiences related to the main themes of the aksi?

Drawing from Hanah Arendt and Walter Benjamin, John W. Scott states that “...the story- teller takes what he tells from experience- his own or that reported by others. And he in turn makes it the experience of those who are listening to his tale.
The best storytellers interpret, but they don't offer easy explanations for what they re-count. The interpretation is not didactic, but more like what a pianist does when he "interprets" a musical composition. Through the subtlety of their presentation and the deftness of their interpretation, storytellers open their readers' imaginations; in this way the "story's richness and germinative power endures" (Scott, 2011, 204).

Incorporating their experience as members of a marginalized group, SPI’s stories represent the society in which they are a part: those who live on the streets, working in informal sectors, often subject to economic oppression, and often considered as a nuisance for urban development projects. This society includes street hawkers, street-buskers, beggars, and the homeless, or those whose homes are prone to eviction. As busking songs are transmitted from one busker to another, through social engagement, experiences are passed on.

Reflecting on the notion of presentational performance during the aksi, SPI’s song list is constructed within a certain dramaturgy, the compiling of events that provides meaning to the audience and defines why they are there (Barba, 2010:10). The order in which the four songs were performed demonstrates the escalation of discourse to action. The first song “Kentut Sosial” (Social Fart) provides metaphorical abstraction through an unpleasant intrusion to the senses. The two proceeding songs (“OTB Jare Soeharto” and “Indonesia Oye”) explore realities of the street. The last song, “Turun ke Jalan” (Descend to the Streets) offers a solution: protest. Moreover, SPI’s performance aligns with musical behavior as a function of political circumstances. SPI’s songs are confrontational (protests), deliberative (collaborative), and pragmatic (solution-oriented). To the protesters, who are mostly students, SPI’s aksi is a spectacle of the other. Their embodied experience of the streets is presented through a musical act. Unlike student orators, who can only represent the interests of the urban poor, SPI presents the authentic voice of rakyat.
5.0 Conclusion

Defining the soundscape of *aksi* in 1998 demonstrates the nature, sound texture, and meaning of political activism that contributed to the downfall of Soeharto. It is hoped that this study can be used to understand student activism in Indonesia. It would be interesting to compare the soundscape of ’98 with other soundscapes of political activism in modern Indonesian history. In the global context, further study would draw comparative material from other protest movements in the twenty-first century, such as the Umbrella Movement in Hong Kong (Anderson, 2016; Gan, 2017; Ngok Ma, and Edmund W. Cheng, 2019), development and new genres of mobilization and activism, especially communication technology and youth movements in Arab protests (Gerges, 2014; Al-Saleh, 2015), Tahir Square Protests in Egypt (Sowers and Toensing, 2012; Gunning and Baron, 2014; Sika, 2017), the Thai “red-shirt” movement (Tausig, 2019), and the nuclear in Fukushima (Manabe, 2015), among others.

Defining the soundscape of ’98 through the framing of *aksi* as performance considers the importance of sound and style of expressions. Forms of expression and their semantic meanings function as historical indicators. Performances by two non-student orators, Butet Kartaredjasa and SPI, document their experiences of the New Order within a specific culture of demonstration that integrates sound and music. The sounding of Butet Kartaredjasa and SPI incorporate both social and material elements against the background of a turbulent history. Kartaredjasa’s speech emphasizes the military personnel (*aparat*) while SPI reacts to a number of New Order policies through music. The relations between these performers to the overall *aksi* is linked by narratives of lived experience, history, and memory. The military and governmental policy of the New Order regime was delivered many times during political *aksi*, and indeed many times throughout 1997-
1998. Kartaredjasa’s and SPI’s aesthetic *aksi* meld deep engagements with the culture of the New Order and its vernacular expressions with political *aksi*.

The study of sound and music during protest in Indonesia 1998 provides insights about how *aksi* embodies the notion of *rakyat* in different ways. Within the realm of political history student groups are often portrayed as the main actors who brought about political reform through protest. Studies of political history can sometimes generate canonic narratives that obscure the particulars of other historical actors and events. A study of sound and music is one way of re-emphasizing the actions that led to political change in Indonesia. Vernacular expressions in performance can reveal voices that historians of politics cannot hear. The soundscape of 1998 provided myriad vernacular expressions showing discontent of the authoritarian government, as well as discourses about the positionality of *rakyat* (“the people”).

The elements of protest that are discussed in this thesis are sound, language, and music. As these elements are intertwined during *aksi*, the elaboration of the structures, associations, and meanings demonstrate the humble and creative ways that protesters turned their embodied experience of the New Order regime into an aesthetic performance. Butet Kartaredjasa’s *aksi* were a satirical form of expression where his artistic culture embraced elements of *wong cilik* (“the little people”) and subverted the performative sound of the New Order into a much-desired government-associated speech in support of *rakyat*.

In Kartaredjasa’s *aksi*, language and sound were significant aspects in tracing performative aspects of speech and sound in the New Order. He built on language associations embedded through history in the Javanese culture, through changes of regimes, and the everyday habit of speaking and listening. The study of sound and language was not restricted to sound materiality and rhetoric. It stretched to possible ways of extending the sound materiality and speech rhetoric
into the search for meaning. When the awareness of these aspects became part of aksi on the protest stage, it created paradox. On the one hand, it clarified that sound and language when performed are means of power that legitimize the oppressor and frighten the oppressed. On the other hand, the emphasis on the rakyat highlighted the potential power of the people and the possibility for new meanings to emerge through struggle.

As stated in my introduction, the flame of the New Order has not vanished. The riots that followed the 2019 presidential election is a manifestation of the New Order’s existence. Aside from the oppression waged by government forces against demonstrators, the New Order mentality has been passed down through administrative channels in the form of policies and regulations, and culturally in the behavior of the society.

However, the dynamics of politics in Indonesia have changed since 1998. Some of those protesters who took part in aksi ’98 are now privileged actors in governmental institutions or political parties, together with New Order individuals who still hold prominent positions in the government. In national politics, there is a thin line between those who are exponents of the New Order regime and those who claim to be Reformist. A new generation of millennial activists participated in aksi in September and November 2019, and these raise further questions about representing the interests of all Indonesians in the future.

Doreen Lee’s understanding of political protest in 1998 has provided us with insights about performance through the activist’s archive. Student performances were defined and elaborated as demo-culture. This thesis builds on Lee’s work by emphasizing a different kind of demo-culture that bridges aesthetics and politics. Aksi, therefore, is never a singular form. Whereas demo or political aksi are signified by direct forms of expression such as oratories by student activists,
Kartaredjasa and SPI’s *aksi* highlight ways to think about *rakyat* as the overarching subject of *reformasi*.

Understanding aesthetic *aksi* is also a way to understand the meaning of performance in the context of which it was performed. Both experiences of the music and music’s meaning change according to the style-competence of the listener, and to the social situation which they occur (Green, 1988, 141). Music and other performance forms are manifestations of everyday life infused by politics, society, and culture. The melding of these aspects into one single performance require us to look for their obscured meaning. This study contributes to how notions of *rakyat* were defined, used, embraced, and articulated through various members of the society.

During protests, music performances were considered to be an intermission to a series of angst-driven speeches. These speeches were intended to generate thought, energy, and time into the manifestation of *aksi*. My aim was to show how sound and music were integral to the overall performance event of *Reformasi*. Through this microscopic analysis of sound and music, it is hoped that the notion of *Reformasi* was maintained. This thesis offers a way to understand how vernacular expressions work as means of dissent. This inquiry into sound and music offers a perspective on the past that acknowledges the present and anticipates the future. This is to say that ethnomusicologists and sound studies scholars should find ways to articulate the connections between sonic expression and the larger constellation of social and political life.
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