

**Royalty and Nationalism in Thailand and Colonial Indonesia, 1908 - 1942:
Case Study of the Courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta**

Research MA Thesis
The Institute for History
Leiden University



Ghamal Satya Mohammad
ghamalsatya@gmail.com
S1416278

Supervisor: Dr. J. Thomas Lindblad

Colonial and Global History Programme
August 2016

Contents

Royal titles in the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta.....	3
Chapter 1. Introduction	5
Historiographical considerations.....	9
Research question.....	11
Research method.....	12
Organization.....	13
Chapter 2. The origin and foundation of nationalism: Similarities and differences	15
2.1. The royal court of Yogyakarta and Thailand.....	15
2.2. Kingship and legitimacy in Yogyakarta and Thailand.....	19
2.3. The different authorities of Yogyakarta and Thailand.....	24
2.4. Overview.....	29
Chapter 3. Modernization from different perspectives, 1850 – 1910	30
3.1. The origins of modernization policies.....	30
3.2. The position of indigenous religion in the modernization...	37
3.3. The establishment of modern education.....	42
3.4. Overview.....	49
Chapter 4. Royalty and Nationalism on the move, 1910 – 1930.....	51
4.1. Nationalism from the royalty.....	52
4.2. The network of young nationalists, 1920 – 1930.....	62
4.3. Overview.....	69
Chapter 5. Reaffirming identity: Thailand and Yogyakarta during 1930 – 1942.....	70
5.1. New Identities in Thailand and Yogyakarta.....	70
5.2. Reaffirming the royal identity, 1938 – 1942.....	82
5.3. Overview.....	91
Chapter 6. Conclusion.....	93
Bibliography	99

Royal titles in the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta

The court of Thailand

Rama	(the king of Thailand from Chakri dynasty)
Chao fa	(title of a prince or princess of the highest rank – here it refers to ‘prince’)
Phra ong Chao	(title of a second-rank prince or princess – here it refers to ‘prince’)
Mom Chao	(M.C; title of a grandson or granddaughter of a king)
Mom Rajawongse	(M.R; title of a son or daughter of Mom Chao)
Mom Luang	(M.L; title of a son or daughter of Mom Rajawongse)
Chao Phraya	(the highest title of nobility or high official)
Phraya/Phya	(title of a nobility or second rank official)
Phra	(title of a nobility or third rank official)
Luang	(title of nobility or fourth rank officials)
Nai	(title of an official without nobility status)

The court of Yogyakarta

Sultan Hamengku Buwono Yogyakarta)	(The Sultan of Kasultanan Yogyakarta)
Kanjeng Gusti Pangeran Adipati Ario Pakualam	(K.G.P.A.A. Paku Alam; The ruler of Pakualam – here it refers to ‘Prince Pakualam’)
Kanjeng Gusti Pangeran Haryo	(K.G.P.H; title of a high senior prince – here it refers to ‘prince’)
Kanjeng Pangeran Haryo	(K.P.H; title of a senior prince – here it refers to ‘prince’)
Bendara Pangeran Haryo	(B.P.H; title of a senior prince – here it refers to ‘prince’)

Gusti Raden Mas	(G.R.M; title of a junior prince – here it refers to ‘prince’)
Gusti Raden Ayu	(G.R.Ay; title of a junior princess)
Bendara Raden Mas	(B.R.M; title of a grandson of a king)
Bendara Raden Ajeng	(B.R.Aj; title of a granddaughter of a king)
Raden Mas	(R.M; title of a son of a prince or princess or lower)
Raden Ayu or Raden Ajeng	(R.A. or R.Aj; title of a daughter of a prince or princess or lower)
Raden Tumenggung	(R.T; title of a high courtier or official in the rank of a regent)
Raden Ngabehi	(R.Ng; title of a middle rank official)

Chapter 1

Introduction

It is not long ago since the elites by noble birth (the royal family) were ‘accepted’ as the main, if not the sole, source of admiration. Their long-term establishment as the political elite is an evidence of their “enchantment” in society, even though on such condition of “inequality”. The royal family would take part in state politics in a certain dynastic realm, which then ensured their hereditary right to rule. Until 1760, the ‘enchantment of inequality’ as a consequence of the monarchy state still prevailed and was considered ‘modern’.¹ By the end of the 18th century, inequality was no longer viewed as absolutely enchanting, and progressed to substantial transformation. From then on, “nationalism”, or the affection and identity of one’s own “nation”, became increasingly popular. An eminent scholar on this subject such as Anderson (1983) argues that modernization process from printing press to western education played a significant role in the development of nationalism. The ‘great revolutions’ in England (Industrial Revolution) and French (French Revolution), as Hobsbawm (1962) puts it, contributed to the concept of nationalism with an alternative to the state model: a nation-state. French monarchy, following the French Revolution was changed into a ‘republic’. Its reigning monarch and royal family members were either beheaded or confined to prison. The Marxist idea, which started to gain prominence in the 1860s, regarded all monarchs and the royal families as obstacles to economic and social progress.

The changes in political system and new ideas under a ‘modern political system’ suggests royal tradition to be in conflict (in the form of ‘either/or’) with egalitarian principles. In practice, however, we often find that the combination between the two worked quite well. One successful example from Europe is England. Since the people forced a constitutional monarchy in 16th century, the king and queen of England only

¹ I quoted the phrase “enchantment of inequality” from an informal discussion with Anthony Reid (Emeritus Professor of History at Australian National University) during a conference at Universitas Indonesia, Depok (mid-August 2015).

became symbols of the country. The royal family of England did not have the privilege to rule the government anymore. At the same time, the royal family of England was, and still is, able to retain more or less its social standings in the society. With a slogan, “God save the Queen” the British devoted their nationalism towards the “Nation” and the “Monarch” up until the present. With this combination, England’s nationalism became the guiding principle to its people. During the age of imperialism, the power of the monarch of England and its popularity spread across continents. In the 19th century, a series of demonstration of imperial might (subjugation) in the East made Queen Victoria ‘the Empress of India’. In Asia, one example of a nation with a combination of monarch and constitution is Japan. This country was changed from centuries of isolation after the “Meiji restoration” (1867) following the Western model. The Meiji restoration transformed the *daimyo* (landlords)-dominated government of Tokugawa dynasty into a country of an effective bureaucratic machine. Along this transformation, the ‘emperor’ and ‘emperor system’ (*tennosei*) led Japan into modernization. At this time, some of the old traditions being practiced in the monarchy still continued. As in England, the monarch in Japan is regarded as the representation of the ‘ancient continuity’.² The ‘people’s nationalism’ in these two countries advanced into a combination of “nation”, “parliament”, and “monarch”. The two countries diffused the idea of monarchy, nationalism and democracy together. About this condition, Grenfeld argues that,

“Originally, nationalism developed as democracy; where the conditions of such original development persisted, the identity between the two was maintained. But as nationalism spread in different conditions and the emphasis in the idea of the nation moved from the sovereign character to the uniqueness of the people, the original equivalence between it and democratic principles was lost. One implication of this, which should be emphasized, is that democracy may not be exportable. It may be an inherent predisposition in certain nations (inherent in their very definitions as nations – that is, the original national

² It may be of interest to quote it here that, speaking to his official after Japan’s defeat in December 1945, Emperor Hirohito still considered himself not as a human with limited capacity, but as a descendant of the Gods. See: Peter Michael Wetzler, *Hirohito and War: Imperial Tradition and Military Decision Making in Prewar Japan* (Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press: 1998): 3.

concept), yet entirely alien to others, and the ability to adopt and develop it in the latter may require a change of identity.”³

On the contrary to the notion that modernization brings forward the idea of nationalism, Grenfield argues on the existence of a ‘unique character’ or ‘identity’ of each country that determine a nation. From this model, she proposes to see the development of nationalism from its own unique process, rather than as product of knowledge transfer.

Recent focus of Southeast Asia studies has moved from the explanation based on “Western impact and Asia’s response” to the explanation of “indigenous dynamism”. But in the context of the study of nationalism in Southeast Asia, it still receives less attention. From Western impact and Asia’s response model, nationalism is explained as merely a product of western ideas of political wisdom. This model tends to place the monarchy system in Southeast Asia as ‘traditional’. The introduction of Western education disseminated the ethical rationale into the people and brought forward nationalism. But this factor is overlooked when explaining the social change in Southeast Asia during the 19th to 20th century. As explained by Grenfeld, an explanation to the development of nationalism in Southeast Asia should able to connect the identity of the indigenous to nationalism. A comparative-historical study of nationalism between two countries in Southeast Asia with a common ground in culture and conception of kingship may explain clearer what factors that relevant to the development of nationalism. My research will highlight in particular the court of Thailand and the court of Yogyakarta.⁴ The common ground between the two courts are the ‘Indic’ (Indian) influence in the royal traditions which dated back before the present dynasty existed. Traditionally, the king is perceived as the source of all political power within the states.⁵ The religious character in royal traditions of the courts of Bangkok and Yogyakarta creates strong character of the courts in both places.

³ Liah Grenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press: 1992): 12.

⁴ To emphasize on the royalty as unit of comparison, this research will give emphasis on the court where it originated. The court of Yogyakarta refers to the Kasultanan Yogyakarta and Pakualaman royal houses, while the court of Thailand refers to the royal house that became the epicenter of Thai politics, which centered in Bangkok. From this point on, I will use “the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta” to refer to the three royal houses.

⁵ Robert Heine-Geldern, *Conceptions of State and Kingship in Southeast Asia* (Ithaca, Cornell Data Paper Number 18: 1956): 10.

In the first half of the 20th century, the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta were almost at complete opposite sides in terms of political situations. Yogyakarta was part of colonial Indonesia under the Dutch colonial government. In a territory referred to by the Dutch as *Vorstenlanden*, or the principalities, two royal houses in Yogyakarta: Kasultanan and Pakualaman (here it refers to “the court of Yogyakarta”) were entitled the rights to govern Yogyakarta principalities in Central Java. Other half of *Vorstenlanden*, Surakarta principalities, were under the administration of two royal houses: Kasunanan and Mangkunegaran. Each royal house financed its own expenses, but they increasingly depended on Dutch financial support. Thailand, on the other hand, retained full political sovereignty.⁶ The court of Thailand, under the ruler of Chakri dynasty controlled the center of mainland Southeast Asia, from the central bank of Chao Phraya river into Chiang Mai in its North and Pattani in its South. Since late 19th century until the end of World War II, Thailand served as a buffer zone between two colonial powers: The British in Burma and French in Indochina.

My research looks into the role of the courts of Yogyakarta and Thailand, including the royal families, in the search of identity and nationalism during 1908 - 1942. In terms of territory, Thailand is of course larger than Yogyakarta principalities. In terms of political influence, the courts of Yogyakarta and Thailand have demonstrated similar quality to ‘adapt’ to changes in the society and to uphold ‘ancient continuity’. Yogyakarta is the only place where the traditional courts can still serve as a local political ruler (*swatantra*). The present Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono X (r. 1989 – present) of Kasultanan Yogyakarta is a governor of Special Region of Yogyakarta – which size is equal to the size of the earlier territory of Yogyakarta under Dutch and Japanese rule. Together with Prince Pakualam IX (r. 1938 – 2015) as vice governor, Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono X governs Yogyakarta in a republican setting of Indonesia. His role as a Sultan and a governor is a legacy of his father, the late Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX (r. 1940 – 1988). During his reign, Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX served both as a governor and minister under Soekarno (in office 1945 – 1967) and Soeharto (in office 1967 – 1998) presidencies. It is worth to mentioned

⁶ From its foundation in the late 18th century, the kingdom was called Siam. This name changed to Thailand, meaning ‘the land of the free’ from 1939 up until the present. In this paper, I will use the term Thailand to refer to Siam before 1939.

here that in the period of 1973 - 1978, Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX was the vice-president of Indonesia.⁷ In Thailand, too, the power of the present King Bhumibol Adulyadej (Rama IX, r. 1946 – present) as a symbol of national unity is quite strong. A traveler to Bangkok today would notice how the capital is decorated with King Bhumibol's portraits and the king's yellow flags despite the military rule in Thailand since the revolution of 1932. It was King Bhumibol who brought an amicable settlement between the military and Thaksin Shinawatra's faction during the political turmoil of Thailand in 2014. In spite of limited power given to the two rulers after political change in the early 20th century, the king in Thailand and the sultan in Yogyakarta still have political significance.

My research highlights the development of nationalism in Thailand and colonial Indonesia with focus on the royalty at the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta. Not only that the comparative study of this subject is still given less attention, but in the historiography of Indonesia there seems to be a tendency to neglect the royalty in the nationalist movement. As I will explain in later chapters, the royalty took part actively in the discourse of nationalism.

Historiographical considerations

This thesis applies a comparative-historical method. It explores the characteristics and determinants of historical phenomena by focusing on causal processes.⁸ The court of Yogyakarta and the court of Bangkok are two units of analysis. Earlier comparative study on this matter, *Java –Thailand: A Comparative Perspective* by Niels Mulder (1983) focus on the culture of the two places and did not touch upon royalty and nationalism. But it gives a baseline on the comparative study between Thailand and Yogyakarta.⁹ Earlier studies of nationalism in colonial Indonesia and Thailand are focusing on the development

⁷ Arguably, at the time he became vice president, Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX was the second most important person in Indonesia. His appointment as a vice president of the Republic gives the gravity of a sultan in the Republic of Indonesia.

⁸ Matthew Lange, *Comparative-Historical Methods: An Introduction* (London, SAGE Publications Ltd.: 2013): 14.

⁹ Mulder stated that, "Consequently it became apparent that comparison among more or less related cultures could lead to refinement of description of both of them while opening eyes for those commonalities, regularities, and variations that may lead to later theoretical understanding. See: Niels Mulder, *Java – Thailand: A Comparative Perspective* (Yogyakarta, Gadjah Mada University Press: 1983): vi.

of a new (educated) elite class. The classical work on this subject is Van Niel (1960) *The Emergence of modern Indonesia Elite*. His work gives emphasis on the change among the elites in Java during the period 1900 – 1927. According to Van Niel, the Dutch Ethical Policy contributed to the emergence of *priyayi* (Javanese aristocrats that served under Dutch administration) who received modern education. But Van Niel did not explain much on the development of the royal family from *Vorstenlanden* in this process. Similar to Van Niel, other scholar such as Sutherland (1979) in *The Making of a Bureaucratic Elite: The Colonial Transformation of Javanese Priyayi* also focuses on the *priyayi* in general. In this topic on colonial Indonesia, considerable attention has been given to the development of “urban elite”, “educated elite”, “modern elite”, “bureaucratic elite”, “political elite”, and “indigenous organization” that represent the emergence of “national consciousness”.

In the study of nationalism in Java, few scholars have discussed the role of the royalty in the nationalist movement. The study by Larson (1987) *Prelude to Revolution: Palaces and Politics in Surakarta, 1912 - 1942* shows that the royal houses of Kasunanan and Mangkunegaran in Surakarta supported the activities of nationalist organization such as the *Sarekat Islam* in Surakarta during the period 1912 - 1942. However, Larson only limits its work on Surakarta principalities. The work by Nagazumi (1967) *The Origin and The Earlier Years of Boedi Oetomo, 1908 - 1918* explains in limited extent the role of the court of Yogyakarta in *Boedi Oetomo*, the first national organization. Nagazumi describes how *Boedi Oetomo* became the organization for lower *priyayi* (administrative or bureaucratic elite of Java) and royal family members of the principalities with primary concern in education.

The study by O'Malley (1977) *Indonesia in the Great Depression: A Study of East Sumatra and Jogjakarta in the 1930's* and his article (1978) on *Pakempalan Kawulo Ngajogjakarta* (PKN) points to the role of mass organization from Yogyakarta, *Pakempalan Kawoela Ngayogyakarta* (Association of the Subjects of Yogyakarta) that related to Kasultanan of Yogyakarta. Another important work for this study is from Scherer (1975) *Harmony and Dissonance: Early Nationalist Thoughts in Java*. Scherer compares nationalist thought of Soewardi Soeryaningrat, Dr. Soetomo and Dr. Tjipto Mangunkusumo. She explains that the three figures were the representative of different

nationalist thoughts in Java at their time. In regard to the role of royal family, Scherer explains on the 'benefit' that Soewardi had as a member of the royalty from Pakualaman. With his connection to the royalty, Soewardi did not need to be as radical as Tjipto Mangoenkoesoemo to influence the wider public and yet still being regarded as the leader of the nationalist.

In the case of Thailand, the topic of nationalism in Thailand emphasize the royalty and the 1932 coup party (the People's Party). This topic is divided in the period before 1932 and after 1932. The court of Bangkok occupies the focus of attention during the period before 1932. After 1932, the royal family is superseded by the attention toward the People's Party. To explain nationalism from the royalty, "official nationalism" model from Anderson (1983) tells how this country differ from the condition in colonial Indonesia. In Thailand, nationalism was a product of the absolute monarch during the period of King Vajiravudh (Rama VI, r. 1910 – 1925).

A study by Vella (1978) *Chaiyo! King Vajiravudh and the Development of Thai Nationalism* is helpful to understand how official nationalism took place. Vella explains King Vajiravudh's efforts to bring official nationalism into practice, such as in school curriculum, in youth organization, in the military campaign, and in article publications to the public. Other study of nationalism during the reign of King Vajiravudh is the work by Greene (1999) *Absolute Dreams: Thai Government under Rama VI, 1910 – 1925*. Greene mentions many historical events during the reign of King Vajiravudh that was not covered in the study by Vella on the same subject.

After the period of King Vajiravudh, the study of nationalism in Thailand focused on King Prajadhipok and the 1932 Revolution. Batson (1984) seminal work *The End of the Absolute Monarchy in Siam* highlights on the events and developments in Thailand during the period of King Prajadhipok until around 1935.

Although these works do discuss the royalty and nationalism, they focus on specific period in Thailand or Yogyakarta. None of the works here is about a comparative study of royalty and nationalism in the period 1908 – 1942.

Research Question

The studies of royalty and nationalism in the courts of Yogyakarta and Thailand are still limited in number. The court of Thailand received more attention by scholars due to the role of the court of Bangkok in politics of Thailand. The court of Yogyakarta, on the other hand, was less studied in relation to nationalism because of the much emphasized on nationalism from educated elites outside the courts. Comparative study of the royalty and nationalism in the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta is not yet studied by earlier scholar. Considering this situation, this thesis intends to contribute to the study of royalty and nationalism in Thailand and colonial Indonesia, with a case study of the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta. I address one main question: “How did the royal courts of Yogyakarta and Thailand reconcile the idea of nation with egalitarian idea during 1908 - 1945?” To support this investigation, three sub-questions are posed: “What was the origin and foundation of nationalism in Thailand and colonial Indonesia?”, “Why did it change in the period of 1908 – 1945?”, “How did the royal family react to the challenges of nationalism?”

Research Method

This research uses historical research method to explain the problems pose in the research question. It means that relevant primary sources as well as secondary sources will be studied and interpreted. The primary sources in this research consist of newspaper articles, published articles, and archives written during the period under research. Newspaper articles from Thailand that are used for this study include Thai-based English-language newspaper such as *The Siam Observer*, *Bangkok Daily Mail*, and *Bangkok Times Weekly Mail*. For Western-based English-language newspaper, this study uses *The Washington Post* and *The New York Post*. Newspaper articles from colonial Indonesia include Indonesian-language newspaper *Oetoesan Indonesia* and Javanese – Indonesian-language newspaper *Kawoela*.

The English-language materials from Thailand that became the primary source for this study, including: *A Siam Miscellany* by “Asvabahu”, the pen name of King Vajiravudh (1912) and *The Buddhist Attitude towards National Defence and Administration: A Special Allocution* by Prince Vajiranana. Colonial Indonesia sources, including: “Het Javaansch

Nationalisme in de Indische Beweging” in *Soembangsih: Gedenkboek Boedi Oetomo*, by Soewardi Soeryaningrat (1918)

The archives used in this paper include *Sabda Dalem Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX* (12 December 1941) and *Oendang-Oendang Papatih Dalem (Koti Samutyokan) Jogjakarta* (3 August 1942). For the archival documents covering events in Thailand, I rely on translated documents from secondary sources.

All the materials for this study are carefully chosen according to the period and connection with the topic of this study. For instance, to explain nationalist thought of the court of Bangkok in the period of 1908 - 1930, I will look upon selected writings of King Vajiravudh during 1910 – 1925, and so on. The selected materials were then analyzed and interpreted to answer the research questions.

The secondary sources used in this research are selected according to the topics of royalty and nationalism in Yogyakarta and Thailand. Most of the secondary sources of this study are published materials in English, Dutch, and Indonesian languages. I rely on secondary sources in English to interpret key documents on Thailand. For instance, a book by Pridi Banomyong (2000) *Pridi by Pridi: Selected Writings on Life, Politics, and Economy* is useful because it provides numbers of translated documents regarding the People’s Party of Thailand and Thai Constitution of 1932. Other important book that provides translated Thai documents is *Siam’s Political Future: Documents from the End of the Absolute Monarchy* by Benjamin Batson (1974). Aside from these sources, I also use memoirs, biographies, and articles written by key figures of Thailand and Yogyakarta after the period of this research. They are considered as firsthand accounts and will be used accordingly, such as “Political Memoirs of Mom Rajawongse (M.R.) Seni Pramoj”, in *Portraits of Thai Politics* by Jayanta Kumar Ray (1972), *Tahta untuk Rakyat: Celah-Celah Kehidupan Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX* (Throne for The People: The Life of Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX) by Atmakusumah (ed. 1982), and *The Old Siamese Conception of the Monarchy* by Prince Dhani Nivat (1954). They provide insights and historical facts that are useful to this research.

Organization

The organization of this paper follows the structure of research questions, and each chapter will directly relate to the relevant sub-question. There are six chapters in total. The first chapter is the introduction. The second chapter examines the origin and foundation of royalty and nationalism in the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta. The third chapter presents comparative study between Ethical policy in colonial Indonesia and Modernization policy in Thailand with focus on modern education in the two places during 1850 - 1900. Here the second and third chapter are intended to answer sub-question one. The fourth chapter investigates the change in the nationalism and identity of Thailand and Yogyakarta during 1908 – 1930. The fifth chapter discuss about nationalism and identity in the period of 1930 – 1942. The fourth and the fifth chapter serve to answer sub-question two. The explanation for sub-question three is integrated into all chapters. The sixth chapter is the conclusion.

Chapter 2

The origin and foundation of nationalism: Similarities and differences

The courts of Yogyakarta and Thailand were among the oldest in Southeast Asia that survived the political change in the period of the 20th century. Their royal ancestries dated back to at least the 13th century of the Majapahit Empire in Java and the kingdom of Sukhotai in the mainland Southeast Asia. The royal history of Yogyakarta court extends even further to the period of Old Mataram - Singosari that occupied Central and East Java around 8th – 12th century. With such a long history and the close proximity to each other, one might wonder about parallel features between the courts of Yogyakarta and Thailand. The similar characteristics between them were the high degree of Indic influence and its ‘cultural adjustment’ to their own local settings, termed by Coedes (1968) as the “Indianized states of Southeast Asia”.¹⁰ Later development soon generated differences between the two royal courts. Firstly, from the period of 16th century onwards, Islam gradually came to be the major religion of Java. While Hindu – Buddhist influence has continued to dominate Thailand until the present era, the teaching of Islam in Java assimilated the earlier Hindu-Buddhist tradition of the court of Majapahit into an Islamic tradition. The Islamic states of Java emerged from the foundation of the courts of Demak (c. 1475 -1548) – Pajang (c. 1568 – 1586) - and Mataram (c. 1587 – 1755). In addition, from the 19th century onwards the Dutch colonial power became ‘the ruler of all Java’. This is in contrast with Thailand where the period of 19th century marked the rise of the court of Thailand as one hegemonic power in mainland Southeast Asia. This chapter discuss their

¹⁰ George Coedes, *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia* (Honolulu, East-West Center: 1968): 2.

similarities and differences that will explain the origin and foundation of nationalism from Thailand and Yogyakarta before the period of 20th century.

2.1. The royal courts of Yogyakarta and Thailand

The court of Yogyakarta

The Islamic court of Mataram was founded by Panembahan Senopati (Sutawijaya, r. 1584 – 1601). For more than 150 years the Islamic court of Mataram from its capitals Plered and Kartasura ruled the major territory of Java and its inhabitants.¹¹ The history of Mataram was filled with series of conflicts that led to the separation of the kingdom in 1755. The third ruler of Mataram, Sultan Agung (r. 1613 – 1645), obliterated the emerging forces of Tuban, Lasem, Jepara, to Surabaya in the Northern Coast of Java. His *mancanegara* (periphery) consisted of the land of Priangan in Western Java to Madura island. In the time of Sultan Agung, the Dutch *Vereenigde Oost Indische Compagnie* (VOC) in Batavia was an emerging trading post. The VOC became Sultan Agung's adversary to rule Java under Mataram. His first and second attack on Batavia, in 1628 and 1629, ended up in failure. After Sultan Agung's death, Mataram was badly shaken by internal conflicts and the secession of its vassal kingdoms. Moreover, Mataram rulers after Sultan Agung increasingly relied on the VOC which increasingly became a 'war band' in the affair of Java and its surroundings. The VOC demanded land concessions and economic privileges from its involvement in a conflict. The period of Mataram kingdom as one royal house came to an end during the reign of Paku Buwono II (r. 1726 – 1743). In his last two years as a king of Mataram, the Mataram capital at Kartasura was ransacked by the coalition of the Chinese and Javanese, led by Mas Garendi (Sunan Kuning). Pakubuwono II successfully reclaimed back the throne of Mataram with the help of the Dutch VOC. As a grant for helping to oust the rebel, the VOC received a narrow strip along the entire coast and along all rivers flowing into the Java sea from Mataram in 1743.¹²

¹¹ Kraton Plered was situated in the present day Bantul, Yogyakarta. Kraton Kartasura was situated in the present day Sukoharjo, near Surakarta.

¹² M.C. Ricklefs, *A History of Modern Indonesia Since c. 1300* (Hongkong, Macmillan: 1993): 92.

In response to this decision, Prince Mangkubumi (the future Sultan Hamengkubuwono I), and Raden Mas Said (the future ruler of Mangkunegaran Surakarta in 1757) declared war against Mataram court. The war escalated further when Pakubuwono II signed a contract which ceded the entire territory of Mataram to the VOC on 11 December 1749.¹³ It was ended, at least partially, with the split (also known as *palihan nagari*) of Mataram territory in two: Kasunanan Surakarta (under Sunan Pakubuwono III, r. 1749 - 1788) in its capital of Surakarta and Kasultanan Ngayogyakarta (under Prince Mangkubumi, r. 1755 - 1792) in its capital of Yogyakarta.¹⁴ Prince Mangkubumi, after he became the ruler of Yogyakarta, hold the title Sultan (Islamic ruler) as for Sultan Agung. His ruling title was “*Sultan Hamengkubuwono Senopati ing Ngalaga Khalifatullah Abdurrachman Sayidin Panatagama Sinuhun ing Ngayogyakarta Kaping P*”. This title is continued by his successor of the throne of Yogyakarta. Another royal house in Yogyakarta, Kadipaten Pakualaman did not emerge directly from the *palihan nagari* of 1755. It was founded in the year 1813 as a result of a conflict between the Sultan Hamengku Buwono II and the British interregnum government. The brother of Sultan Hamengku Buwono II, Prince Notokusumo, was granted a status and a territory to establish a small principality in the East of Yogyakarta. He became the ruler of Kadipaten Pakualaman with a ruling title *Kanjeng Gusti Pangeran Adipati Ario Paku Alam I* (Paku Alam I, r. 1813 – 1829). From this period onwards, two royal houses are established in Yogyakarta. They are equal in status as part of the *Vorstenlanden* of Yogyakarta.

It is important to mention here that the court of Yogyakarta was founded as a ‘rebel court’, as compared to other courts in the principalities. Sultan Hamengku Buwono I was proclaimed by the rebel faction as a contending *susuhunan* (a title for a king) of Mataram as early as 1749. Ricklefs stated that Sultan Hamengku Buwono I was “the most able ruler from the Mataram royal family since Sultan Agung”.¹⁵ He strongly opposed any attempt

¹³ Ricklefs, *A History*: 95.

¹⁴ The war continued until 1757 when Raden Mas Said, one of the leaders in the war against Mataram and the VOC, agreed to receive a portion of land in Surakarta. He became the ruler of Mangkunegaran court in Surakarta with the title *Kanjeng Gusti Pangeran Adipati Mangkunegara I*. His title bore him a junior to Surakarta royal court, similar to Paku Alam court in Yogyakarta.

¹⁵ M. C. Ricklefs, *Yogyakarta under Sultan Mangkubumi, 1749 – 1792: A History of the Division of Java* (London, Oxford University Press: 1974): 344.

by the Dutch to intrude the sovereignty of Javanese kings in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. Only gradually, the influence of the Dutch increased, whereas the sovereignty of Yogyakarta was lost due to a combination of factors, such as internal conflicts within the palace and the efforts by the Dutch to control the courts. By 1873, a concept of familial relations was established to address one another, between the rulers of *Vorstenlanden* and the Dutch colonial government.¹⁶ The Governor-General was formally addressed as the ‘grandpa’ or *eyang*, and the Governor of Yogyakarta as a ‘little brother’ of the Sultan.

The court of Thailand

In Thailand, a different situation shaped the development of the court. The court of Thailand owed its foundation to the court of Ayutthaya from the first half of the 14th century. During its course for about five centuries, the court of Ayutthaya strengthened the control of the area in the center of Thailand to the north (Sukhotai territory) and to the south (Pattani territory). The history of Ayutthaya up until the establishment of the court of Bangkok was filled with the struggle of hegemony over the mainland, between kingdoms such as Sukhotai, Chiang Mai, Luang Prabang, Burma, and the Malay states in the south. The hegemonic power used a ‘tributary system’ as a way to control its vassal. The royal blood line of Ayutthaya begun by King Uthong (Ramathibodi I, r. 1351 - 1369) when he established the kingdom of Ayutthaya. During the reign of King Trailok (r. 1448 – 1488), the kingdom of Sukhotai in the North and Ayutthaya in South was integrated peacefully under Ayutthaya. Having royal lineage from both the royal family of Sukhotai from his mother and Ayutthaya from his father, King Trailok became the successor of both Sukhotai and Ayutthaya dynasties. Kasetsiri said that the unification of the two kingdoms was a success both “spiritually” and “culturally” as it used a “permanent non-military basis” such as the influence of the *sangha* (Buddhist monk) community, a way that became an imprint for the court of Thailand to unite its outer territories in the later period.¹⁷ There were a total of six dynasties that ruled Ayutthaya between 1351 – 1767. Ayutthaya also

¹⁶ George D. Larson, *Prelude to Revolution: Palaces and Politics in Surakarta, 1912 – 1942* (Leiden, KITLV: 1987): 19.

¹⁷ Charnvit Kasetsiri, “Buddhism and Political Integration in Early Ayutthaya: 1351 – 1448”, *Archaeology (Borankhadi)* 4: 4 (April 1973), in Charnvit Kasetsiri, *Studies in Thai and Southeast Asian History* (Bangkok, The Foundation for The Promotion of Social Science and Humanities Textbooks Projects: 2015): 172 – 173.

experienced several major wars against the Burmese which made the Siamese as a vassal of the Burmese.¹⁸

The Thai emerged again as an independent kingdom from the period of King Naresuan (1590 – 1605). During his period, Ayutthaya became the destination of European traders. Different from the rulers of Mataram dynasty, the kings of Ayutthaya did not rely on Western war bands such as the VOC or the French to help them in the political affairs of the kingdom. Compared with Mataram, the period of the 17th to early 18th century Thailand was relatively peaceful from internal struggle. In the period of King Narai (r. 1656 – 1688), the English, French, and the Persian tried to influence the court. The growing influence of Constantine Phaulkon (a French-Greek) alarmed the Thai royal officials, but Phaulkon remained in the court due to King Narai's admiration to western curiosities.¹⁹ After the king's death, Phaulkon was killed, and the French was expelled from Ayutthaya.²⁰ The greatest threat of the court of Ayutthaya, therefore, was not the Westerners but the Burmese. In the second half the 18th century the conflict with the Burmese developed again into series of war. In 1767, after a year of siege, the royal Burmese troops finally occupied the capital and ended the reign of Ayutthaya. During this year of turbulence, a new court emerged in the river basin of Thonburi. A former Ayutthaya General, Taksin was able to pacify the internal conflicts due to the Burmese attack. Taksin (r. 1776 – 1782) became the king of Thonburi which aimed to reinstate the former influence of Ayutthaya in the mainland Southeast Asia. He reintegrated former vassals of Ayutthaya such as Luang Prabang and Vientiane (both are now part of Laos) to his kingdom. The conflict within the *sangha* community and Taksin's officers over his claim as a new Buddha *Boddhisatva* (incarnation of the Buddha) ended king Taksin's reign. General Chakri, a former general of the court in Thonburi was enthroned as the new king. He established the Chakri dynasty from Bangkok, at the opposite side of Thonburi in the Chao Phraya river. His reign title was “*Phra Bat Somdet Phra Paramorucha Mahachakkriborommanat Phra Phutthayotfa Chulalok*” or King Yotfa (Rama I, r. 1782 -

¹⁸ Chris Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit, *A History of Thailand* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 2014): 11- 13.

¹⁹ W.D (real name unknown), ‘Brief History of Siam, with a Detail of the Leading Events in Its Annals’, *The Chinese Repository*, XX, 7 (July 1851): 348.

²⁰ Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit, *A History*: 14.

1809). During his reign, King Yotfa strengthened the kingdom with royal marriage and tributary system to Chiang Mai, Cambodia, and Pattani. In 1890, during the heyday of colonialism in Southeast Asia, the court of Thailand had become a true hegemonic power in mainland Southeast Asia.

2.2. Kingship and legitimacy in Yogyakarta and Thailand

Kingship is a basic element of royalty. Legitimacy, on the other hand, is the acceptance of a ruler's status to govern the people. Royal tradition played role as the source to bind the population and the royal elites together in one 'common identity'. In Yogyakarta and Thailand, the conception of kingship derived from the tradition of religion. Scholars such as Moertono and Wales describe the combination between the old tradition and a newer tradition (Buddhist and Islam) as the characteristic of kingship in the two places.²¹ The basic conception of kingship in Yogyakarta and Thailand was adopted from Hinduism – Indic civilization. The king was regarded as a royal god (*dewaraja*), or a great deity in the human form, blessed by Hindu God Siva the Destroyer or Wishnu the Sustainer. With this concept, every command of the king would be associated with the will of the Supreme Being. In the contemporary Java, the idea of a royal God only persists in the *wayang* mythology, a popular Javanese shadow play.²² The influence of Islam modified the old conception of kingship into the Islamic tradition of a virtuous *caliph* – or ruler in the Islamic tradition of royalty. The sultan of Yogyakarta ruled the people according to *Al-Qur'an* (Islamic bible) and *Al-Hadits* (the teaching of prophet Mohammad). The title sultan for the ruler of Kasultanan royal house was a demonstration of the court's adherence to Islamic law and tradition. The sultan was '*kalifatullah*' (God's representative on earth) and '*sayidin panatagama*' ('the leader who manage and rule according to Islamic religion'). With the influence of Islam, the sultan of Yogyakarta was

²¹ For the study of Java in this matter, see Soemarsaid Moertono, *State and Statecraft in Old Java: A Study of the Later Mataram Period, 16th to 19th Century* (Ithaca, Cornell Modern Indonesia Project: 1981); For the study of Thailand, see H.G. Quaritch Wales, *Siamese State Ceremonies: Their History and Function with Supplementary Notes* (Richmond, Curzon Press: 1992).

²² One of the most popular wayang stories, *Wahyu Makutarama* tells about the ancient guiding principle of a just ruler, the *Astabrata* (eight kingly virtues), which derived from the story of Mahabharata.

not consider a deity, but given the right and responsibility as a ‘representative’ of the supreme being, which still made his rule absolute.²³

In Thailand, Buddhism modified the previous conception of kingship from an absolute royal god to *Boddhisatva* or an emanation of the Buddha.²⁴ The king of Chakri dynasty uses a royal name *Rama*, or a hero-God from Hindu Mahabharata. Prince Dhani Nivat (1954) stated that the king is a ‘lord of righteousness’ whose task is to abide steadfast and inspire the population to do good deeds. The relationship between the king and his people is reflected in the teaching that a king is essentially “elected by the people”. Moreover, according to the ancient Buddhist teaching of *Thammasat*, a king does not automatically become a truly respected king.²⁵ He should put his every effort to become the lord of righteousness before he can be called the *chakravatin*, or the universal sovereign.²⁶ As it was in Java with the influence of Islam, the characteristic of a king from Buddhism does not render its absolute character. Another element of kingship in Thailand is the paternalistic nature of a king toward his people. Thailand conception of monarchy regarded the king as a father of the people “..whose advice was sought and expended in all matters and whose judgment was accepted by all.”²⁷ Given with these elements, Yogyakarta and Thailand shared similar conception of kingship, that is the king as an absolute ruler under religion of Islam or Buddhism respectively.

With regard to the conception of kingship, the king requires ‘legitimacy’ with a characteristic following the tradition in specific society. In the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta, there was a tradition to retain legitimation of kingship through religious-cultural means. Hence, the element of legitimacy in Yogyakarta can be more situational than in Thailand. There are three aspects of cultural legitimacy for a sultan in Java - Yogyakarta. Firstly, there is a belief that anyone can be a king according to the Divine’s will. The courts of Yogyakarta recognized certain sign of legitimacy from revelation from

²³ Moertono, *State*: 29.

²⁴ Wales, *Siamese*: 31.

²⁵ Prince Dhani Nivat, ‘The Old Siamese Conception of Monarchy’, in *The Siam Society Fiftieth Anniversary Commemorative Publication – Selected Articles from the Siam Society Journal*. (Bangkok, Siam Society: 1954): 94.

²⁶ Dhani Nivat, ‘The Old Siamese Conception of Monarchy’: 92.

²⁷ Dhani Nivat, ‘The Old Siamese Conception of Monarchy’: 93.

God (*wahyu*) with the so called '*pulung keraton*'. This revelation could fall into anyone who is destined to be king. *Pulung keraton* was visualized in different forms such as "a star of bright luminance", a "dazzling blue", "green, or white ball of light", and its appearance could not be anticipated nor predicted.²⁸ The royal ancestors of Mataram dynasty was told in the Javanese *Babad Tanah Jawi* to receive *pulung keraton* as a legitimacy to rule.²⁹ In the context of the history of Java, the *pulung keraton* was suitable with the character of Javanese court which experience perpetual political change. Secondly, the source of legitimacy for Javanese king lies in the possession of *pusaka ageng* or 'major heirloom with divine power' of the court. This is also related to situational element of legitimacy as it required an effort of the 'right king' to control *pusaka ageng*, as well as the ability to contain its spiritual power. Examples of *pusaka ageng* of Yogyakarta court, include the spear of Kyai Plered, *keris* (dagger) Joko Piturun, the vest of Antakusuma, and the spear of Barukuping.

Thirdly, legitimacy of the king comes from the structured tradition of Javanese court for legitimacy in the form of a specific ritual. It is the recognition of Widjojo Koesoemo flower, the sacred flower of Java that can only be obtained at a specific site near the island of Nusakambangan (Southern Sea).³⁰ In the 19th century, this tradition became intensified as an important court ceremony, conducted each time after the enthronement of a new Javanese king. There are also other court rituals of great importance in Yogyakarta. The yearly ritual to mount Merapi is connected with the ancient image of Javanese king as 'the lord of the mountain'. In this ritual, the court retinues would bring *sesajen* (offering) to the deity in Merapi. Another ritual, the *labuhan* of the Southern Sea is related to the legend of the relationship between the reigning king or sultan of Java and Nyi Loro Kidul, the goddess of the Southern Sea. *Garebeg* ritual, the celebration of the birth of the prophet Mohammad involves the people in general. This ritual also functioned as a demonstration of Sultan's authority toward his realm, as it required attendance from all *bupati* (regent) in

²⁸ Moertono, *State*: 56.

²⁹ J.J. Ras, *Masyarakat dan Kesusastran di Jawa* (Jakarta, Pustaka Obor: 2014): 268.

³⁰ Even though the tradition was more documented as a tradition of Kasultanan of Surakarta, there was also some reports on this tradition from the court of Yogyakarta as well. For more information on Widjojo Koesoemo, see: Ghamal Satya Mohammad, 'Widjojo Koesoemo Between Tradition and Science: 1830 – 1939' (Bachelor thesis, Leiden University: 2014).

his territory. Any sign of hesitation, in the old days, would mean disloyalty to the sultan. When the authority of the sultan declined, so did the numbers of his regent that could present in *Garebeg*. This ritual always involved the sultan, his royal officials, and the Dutch governor of Yogyakarta. Cultural legitimacy, therefore, was very important for Yogyakarta as it became the only ‘direct’ source of legitimacy over the throne.

Interestingly, the sovereign court of Bangkok also perceived legitimacy of kingship through religious – cultural means as an important factor despite the already wide influence of the court toward its entire kingdom. The legitimacy of the king of Thailand was structured under royal traditions that originated from the time of Ayutthaya.³¹ There was no ‘situational’ concept of legitimacy in the form of a sign from divine source such as *pulung keraton*, which could immediately shift the legitimacy of a dynastic ruler to the chosen one. The would-be king would claim to have the character of extraordinary *barami* (in Pali, *parami*), or ‘virtue’ according to Buddhism, which subject to approval by the royal elites and the *sangha* (Buddhist monk) community.³² Once chosen as a king, the legitimacy of the king derived from the use of sacred objects in the court rituals. Therefore, the legitimacy of kingship in Thailand remains a ‘structured’ one. The main aspect of the court ritual is the presence of the Siamese royal regalia, such as the Great White Umbrella of State (*Brah sveta chatra*), the Sword of Victory (*Brah sen kharga jayasri*), the fan (*Batvalvijani*), and the Great Crown of Victory (*Brah maha bijaya mankut*) with a total of 20 items. Unlike Yogyakarta which recorded the narrative of its major heirlooms, the story regarding Siamese Royal Regalia is not much known. But the Siamese royal regalia occupies the highest value as symbols of the monarch that “befit the high dignity of the king” through the “power” it possess.³³ For instance, there was a belief that the Great White Umbrella is a vessel of the goddesses who “care for earth”. In the Great Sword of Siam, the court believes in its power to control ‘lightning’, ‘thunderbolt’, and ‘poisons’.

Beside the royal regalia, the court of Thailand holds Eight Weapons of Sovereignty, such as the bow (*Brah sen dhanu*), the trident (*Brah sen tri*), the discus (*Brah*

³¹ Wales, *Siamese*: 5.

³² Charles F. Keyes, *Thailand: Buddhist Kingdom as Modern Nation State* (Colorado, Westview Press: 1987): 39.

³³ Wales, *Siamese*: 84.

sen cakra), and the Gun of the Saton (*Brah sen pu'n kham menam saton*) with a total of eight items.³⁴ Compare to the 'mystery' of the story in royal regalia, these weapons are well known in Thailand due to their connection with the historic battles during the time of Ayutthaya. The Siamese Royal Regalia and Eight Weapons of Sovereignty would be exhibited as part of the ceremony during important court rituals. One of the rituals, the Drinking of the Water of Allegiance (*bidhi srisaccpankan*), is a great importance for the legitimacy of the state specifically. This ritual takes place twice a year in the fifth month (*Chaitra*) and the tenth month (*Bhadrapada*) of the Thai calendar, conducted at the royal chapel in the capital or its comparable in the provincial government. During the ritual, the monks would recite sacred mantras, and then all the court officials –from royal family into civil service members - would drink the water from a water vessels contacted with the Great Sword of Siam. On the ceremony, the *brahmans* (Sangha or Buddhist priest) would read out the Oath. I will quote a translation of the first sentence of the Oath that was made during Rama IV's reign, as follow:

“We, the slaves of the Lord Buddh, beg to offer to His Majesty, Prabath Somdetch Pra Chula Chaum Klow [King Rama IV] the king, this personal oath, pledging our loyalty, in the immediate presence of the god Buddh, the sacred teachings and the sacred priests... If we see with our eyes, hear with our ears, or know that others are about to do evil to his Majesty, but delay with evil intent, with ingratitude, and lack of honesty... We pray the deities of lands and forest... may plague us with evil, destroy our lives, effect our destruction and death by breakage, by severance..”³⁵

Similar to *Garebeg* ceremony in Java, the Drinking the Water of Allegiance ceremony was functioned as a ritual to control the state and its apparatus with cultural means. The court ritual was as a tool for legitimacy of kingship, which also functioned as political legitimacy of the king. Thailand used cultural tradition as a legitimacy in culture and politics, while Yogyakarta used cultural tradition only for cultural one. But in both Thailand and Yogyakarta, cultural tradition was a tool to create a common identity between the ruler and the people. The common identity for the people was shaped by royal traditions.

³⁴ Wales, *Siamese*: 83.

³⁵ Wales, *Siamese*: 194.

2.3. The different authorities of Yogyakarta and Thailand

The term “authority” means the ability to implement the concept of kingship and legitimacy of the ruler to govern the kingdom. There are two contrasting situations that can be observed in relation to the authority of the sultan of Yogyakarta and the king of Thailand. At the court of Yogyakarta, the sultan was a ‘vassal ruler’, or a subordinate to the Dutch in colonial Indonesia. The court had to abide to the political contract signed by the sultan and the Dutch governor of Yogyakarta. The decline of the sultan’s authority was not in an instant but rather a gradual development. Before the period of 19th century, the court of Yogyakarta did not perceive itself as inferior to the VOC, nor that the VOC had the actual power at that time to subjugate the court under Western ‘dominance’. The court of Yogyakarta was part of the ‘divided Java’, along with the authority of Surakarta and the Dutch since the second half of the 18th century. Traditionally, the territorial authority of Javanese court depended upon the influence of the king and its court into the periphery, where the vassal would send ‘tribute’ or submission to the center power. The territory of Yogyakarta, in this regards, followed three division of areas: the *negara* (inner realm – highest authority of the sultan), *negaragung* (outer realm – considerable authority of the sultan), and *mancanegara* (periphery – less authority of sultan). The contest of the territorial authority of former Mataram court was more prevalent between Yogyakarta and Surakarta in this century, with the Dutch functioned as an ‘arbitrator’ whose authority was accepted by all. The many decades of relative peace (1757- 1825) in Java shifted the perception of the Javanese elites from the struggle over the sovereignty of Mataram into the effort to preserve peace as their priority.³⁶ Simultaneously, the Dutch began to view the courts of Java as their subordinates.

The demise of the VOC in 1799 was followed with the gradual establishment of the Dutch ‘colonial authority’. Colonial ‘administrators’ such as Governor-General Herman Willem Daendels (in office 1808 - 1811) and British Lieutenant-Governor-Thomas Stamford Raffles (in office 1811 – 1816) imposed the policy to weakened the authority of

³⁶ Ricklefs, *Yogyakarta*: 633.

the court, such as annexation of the Yogyakarta territory.³⁷ This annexation was a gradual process, starting from the annexation as a result of a new agreements between Yogyakarta and the Dutch in 1811, the split of Yogyakarta territory to establish Pakualaman in 1812, and the annexation as a consequence of the Java War (1825 – 1830). By 1850, all Yogyakarta's former *mancanegara* territory had already belonged to the Dutch. In the internal affairs of the palace, the Dutch had the right to appoint the suitable *patih* (vizier) in the Yogyakarta *keraton* (court). The Dutch increasingly played a role as a decision maker to nominate a sultan in the 19th century onward. The role of the Dutch as an 'arbitrator' was enhanced in the 19th century as having the authority to keep the royal stamp of Yogyakarta.³⁸

From 19th century onwards, the Dutch challenged the authority of the royal court by using the court symbol and regalia such as royal parasol to be used by its own officer from the rank of Dutch high officer to Javanese high *priyayi*. In terms of financial matters, the court of Yogyakarta increasingly depended on the Dutch assistance. The court budgets and expenditures should get the approval from the Dutch. Not to mention that the sultan received 'financial aids' by the Dutch government. In the context of traditional authority of the sultan, the effort by the Dutch to tighten the control of the monarchy was a threat to the existence of Yogyakarta royalty. At first, the court responded by defying the colonial authority. But severe punishment such as banishment of the court member, including the sultan, would follow if such an act was known to the Dutch government. The fear of a new war after 1830 made the Dutch to gradually abolished the regular troops of the court of Yogyakarta.

At the end of 19th century, a combination of effective administration and control of the population created a stable colonial authority where the sultan and the royal family of Yogyakarta became part of the colonial system of the Dutch Colonial government. There was no innovation in traditional bureaucracy or Javanese law code from within the court circle, except the ones introduced by the Dutch such as land reform or the abolition of *lungguh* system (land appointed to a person by the king) and the introduction of the *Adat*

³⁷ Ricklefs, *Yogyakarta*: 552.

³⁸ Soeratman, Darsiti. *Kehidupan Dunia Keraton Surakarta, 1830 – 1939* (Yogyakarta, Taman Siswa: 1989): 67.

law (customary law) in Java, which regulated the indigenous affairs in Colonial Indonesia. Nevertheless, the sultan and his royal family still remained at the apex of indigenous society. At the same time, they had very limited authority in terms of political, economy, and military power. This situation became characteristic of Javanese nationalism in the 20th century. The sultan and the princes, fearing the sanction of the Dutch that could affect their positions, usually did not give an open support for nationalist movement. The royalty, without showing open hostility to the Dutch, held the spirit of ‘anti-colonialism’. One form of early anti-colonialism from the Javanese can be found in the prophecy of Joyoboyo. According to this prophecy, the Javanese would attain prosperity after series of calamities and conflicts. In one version of this prophecy, the Dutch (the “Pringgiers”) would be expelled by the army from Turkey (the “Ngroem”).³⁹ Another more popular version of this prophecy in the 20th century is the arrival of the ‘yellow people’ (the Japanese) who would expel the Dutch from Java.⁴⁰ The Japanese were to stay in Java for the lifespan of a corn (maize) plant (“*seumur jagung*”) before the Javanese could be entirely free from foreign rule.

In the sovereign court of Thailand, the king exercised his authority over its entire kingdom. In this regard, the court of Thailand was more similar to the Dutch as one hegemonic power instead of the small authority of Yogyakarta. Up until late 19th century, the authority of the king of Thailand to his vassal states such as Chiang Mai and Pattani was implemented under “tributary system”.⁴¹ Traditionally, the territory was governed according to *muang luang* (the capital and its surrounding – with the highest authority of the king), *muang* (the greater realm – considerable authority of the king), and the periphery (the vassal states – less authority of the Thai king). Under the tributary system, the vassal states of the court were required to send tributes periodically to Bangkok. As part of the tributary system, the king maintained familial relationship in the form of marriage

³⁹ J.A.B. Wiselius, ‘Djaja Baja: Zijn Leven en Profetieën’, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Laan-, en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, 19, 1 (1872): 190 – 191.

⁴⁰ Denys Lombard, *Nusa Jawa: Silang Budaya: Kajian Sejarah Terpadu Bagian 3: Warisan Kerajaan-Kerajaan Konsentris* (Jakarta, Gramedia: 1996): 104.

⁴¹ Under the tributary system, the court of Thailand received tributes from its vassal states regularly. It was a show of recognition from the vassal states in Thailand’s domain. In return, Thailand would provide help to the vassal in case of difficulty.

exchanges with his vassal. The bond between the central court and its vassal was loose. At first, tributary system was suitable for the court of Bangkok since it could able to exercise authority to domestic rulers. The growing influence of the western colonial power such as the British and French in the mainland made the court of Bangkok to find the means to secure the kingdom's territorial integrity. Another reason for a reform was to ensure the provincial elite's authority to the central government.⁴² Therefore, from the period of 1892 – 1915, Prince Damrong, the then Minister of the Interior implemented an administrative and territorial reform (*Thesaphiban* system) in entire Thailand. With the *Thesaphiban* or provincial administration system, the country was divided into provinces, each with its provincial capital. The vassal court as a semi-independent institution in Thai's traditional administration was abolished, and replaced by civil administration of the province.⁴³ After 1915, there were no longer any vassal states in Thailand. All this reform took place in less than two decades of the history of Thailand.

In order to implement *thesaphiban* system, Thailand needed to have a clear and unchallenged political authority in its realm, as it would deal with influential leaders in the local level. The command of the military, in this regard, was important to ensure that legitimacy of the central government would be observed. The military was an important element of the court of Bangkok since its foundation in 1782. Since the early Bangkok period, the king was a commander of the Thai army. King Yotfa (Rama I) was a former army general at Taksin's court in Thonburi. He experienced the periods of turbulence from the time he ascended to the throne. With the command of a more advanced Thai regular troops, Rama I expanded his control to the peripheries. The period of 19th century to early 20th century saw increasing prominence of Thai military. The command of more advance Thai military was needed to secure the territory of Thailand from outside power such as the British and French. With the aftermath of French gunboat incident (or the Paknam crisis) in 1893, Thailand lost the influence of Lao territory in the upper of Mekong river such as

⁴² Tej Bunnag, *The Provincial Administration of Siam, 1892 – 1915: The Ministry of the interior under Prince Damrong Rajanubhab* (Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press: 1977): 137.

⁴³ Bunnag, *The Provincial*: 140.

Luang Prabang, to the French colony.⁴⁴ In 1904 and 1907 another Thai influenced of Lao territory at the lower Mekong river such as Sayaburi and Battambang were annexed to the French.⁴⁵ In 1909, the British forced Thailand to surrender the Malay states of Kedah, Kelantan, Trengganu and Perlis. Combined with the loss of territory to France, Siam had lost 233.099 square kilometers of territory during the period of 1893 - 1909.⁴⁶

Despite the conflicts with the colonial power resulting in the annexation of its territory, the authority of the court of Thailand was still strong. Thailand sought to maintain its sovereignty which was achieved since the attack of the Burmese in 1767. Compared with Yogyakarta, the origin of Thai nationalism, or the source of identity in Thailand, is its sovereignty. The policies such as territorial and administration reform were needed to raise the standard of the country in order to maintain the sovereignty of Thailand. The reform in judicial aspect of Thailand, for instance, resulted in the acceptance of Western powers to Thai codes. One example of the acceptance of Western power to Thai codes can be seen in the Treaty between Great Britain and Siam in 1909. It regulated not only new territorial jurisdiction but also recorded the willingness of the British to be recognized under modern Thai codes, namely the penal code, the civil and commercial codes, the codes of procedure, and the law for organization of courts, the ones that surely benefited the British in Thailand.⁴⁷ It was in contrast with the court of Yogyakarta where the Dutch was the one to introduce judicial reform in the court. The vision of Thai court to modernization combined the ancient tradition of royalty with the western principles in the military, politics, and legal matters.

2.4. Overview

The courts of Yogyakarta and Thailand emerged as sovereign courts at first. But this situation changed in 19th century when Yogyakarta became a subordinate to the Dutch

⁴⁴ On 13 July 1893, French gunboats attacked Thailand's forts in Bangkok. The French won the military engagement against Thailand. It gave the French a bargaining position to force a treaty to Thailand.

⁴⁵ Richard Shaw Stetson, *Siam's Diplomacy of Independence, 1855 – 1909, in the Context of Anglo – French Interest* (Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, New York University: 1969): 100, 114.

⁴⁶ Stetson, *Siam's Diplomacy*: 141.

⁴⁷ 'Treaty Between Great Britain and Siam', *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 3, No. 4, Supplement: Official Documents (October 1909): 299.

colonial government. It resulted in the dependency of the court of Yogyakarta to the Dutch. At the same time, it triggered anti-colonialist sentiments at the court of Yogyakarta. Dutch subordination of the court of Yogyakarta became the common ground that unite the royalty and the people of Java. Dutch colonialism was the origin of nationalism from the royalty. In Thailand, it was Thai sovereignty that led to the birth of nationalism. The vision to maintain its sovereignty was the drive of modernization in Thailand. This chapter also explains that royal tradition played a central role as a foundation of nationalism in Yogyakarta and Thailand. It was the mechanism from the royalty to create a common bond between the ruler and the people.

Chapter 3

Modernization from different perspectives, 1850 - 1910

In this chapter, I discuss the effort toward ‘modernization’ that took place in Thailand and colonial Indonesia. Untouched by colonial rule, Thailand increasingly saw the threat of Western dominance in Asia which might also in turn affected the sovereignty of the country. Modernization of the kingdom was considered as a way to resist the West penetration. For the Dutch, who became the ruler of all Java, the need was to turn the land into profit. For nearly 70 years after the Java War, the Dutch focus was to build the colonial economy. The period of 1830 – 1870 was the period of Cultivation System (*Cultuurstelsel*). The period of 1870 – 1890 was the period of liberalization in colonial Indonesia in which the Dutch attracted foreign firms to invest in the colony. It was only in 1901 that the Dutch introduced ‘Ethical Policy’ which aimed to ‘enlighten’ the indigenous with Western knowledge. In Thailand, similar policies were already pursued several decades earlier. The effort from a different perspective in Thailand and colonial Indonesia

created two different outcomes. Firstly, in the field of religion, the Dutch weakened the potential strength of Islam as an element of political change in the population. This condition was in contrast with Thailand where the court of Bangkok incorporated Buddhism as part of the modernization policy which centered in the court. Secondly, the search of modern education in Bangkok did not neglect the monastery as part of government education project. The Dutch government, on the other hand, introduced a secular education and neglect the *pesantren*. Thus, we will see in this chapter how the perspectives from Bangkok and Batavia contributed to the development of Thailand and Yogyakarta.

3.1. The origins of modernization policies

Modernization policy in Thailand

The effort toward modernization began as a royal tradition in Thailand. King Mongkut (Rama IV, r. 1851 - 1868) was the first monarch of Thailand to introduce the policy to 'become modern' to respond the increasing threat of colonial power in its territory. Thailand had every reason to distrust the west in view of the 17th century Ayutthayan experience of Phaulkon, the Greek-French adventurer to the court of King Narai. But in the 19th century, Thailand was a small country compared to the military might of the British and French. Most of the time, Thailand had to adjust with the need of the West to retain its sovereignty. In 1826, the Treaty of Burney opened the economic prospect of Thailand's foreign trade with the British. From this time onward, Westerners from England, Germany, and the United States came to Thailand.⁴⁸ But at this period there was still no further interest from Thai royalty to the study of western science, the tool for modernization, before the period of King Mongkut. His experience as a Buddhist monk taught him the importance of religious knowledge and Western science. At first, Mongkut was educated in the Grand Palace where he studied Pali language, Thai, and military science. Later on, Mongkut learned English, Latin, Astronomy during the time as a Buddhist monk. When he became king at the age of 40, King Mongkut promoted his interest of western knowledge in the court circle and aimed for the country's

⁴⁸ Rong Syamananda, *A History of Thailand* (Bangkok, Chulalongkorn University Press: 1993): 115.

modernization.⁴⁹ From the period of King Mongkut onwards, Thai royal family was obliged to be skillful with English and western subjects such as Arithmetic. King Mongkut invited British tutor, the famous Anna Leonowens, to teach western science to his children.⁵⁰ It was during the period of King Mongkut that the British naval show-off force appeared in Bangkok waters to enforce the Treaty of Bowring in 1855, which called for further economic concessions and ‘free trade’ with the British. As a means to balance the British in Thai economy, the court of Bangkok invited other Western power to ratify the same treaty as the British in Thailand. The curiosity toward western science in combination with diplomatic reception to the French and British envoys ultimately led to his death in 1867. During the ‘science trip’ event to view the eclipse in a place called Hua Wan, near the Samrotyoi beach in the province of Pattani, King Mongkut caught malaria.⁵¹ He was succeeded by his son, Chulalongkorn (Rama V, r. 1868 - 1910).

King Chulalongkorn expanded the interest of Western knowledge into the policy of modernization. He realized that Thai government sectors were ineffective and needed reform according to western example. In a letter to his brother Prince Damrong, he stated that:

“... Our country is surrounded by countries which are strictly ruled by more powerful nations. We must have relations along the frontier. One cannot remain aloof as before. There are three ways to safeguard our country internally and externally; to negotiate settlements, to maintain strength to keep peace, and to reform the administrative system...”⁵²

Before the modernization policy was implemented, the king in 1871 travelled to the British colony of Singapore and the Dutch colony of Java. As stated by Sartrapoong, the journey was a “success”, for the king of Thailand was given an appropriate and royal reception by

⁴⁹ John Blofeld, *King Maha Mongkut of Siam* (Bangkok, Siam Society: 1987): 67.

⁵⁰ Anna Leonowens was a British woman hired as a tutor for the children of King Mongkut. She was immortalized in the movie picture ‘The King and I’ (1956). For a recent study of Anna Leonowens, see: Alfred Habegger, *Masked: The Life of Anna Leonowens, Schoolmistress at the Court of Siam* (Madison, University of Wisconsin Press: 2014).

⁵¹ Blofeld, *King*: 85.

⁵² Letter of King Chulalongkorn to Prince Damrong Number 132/454 (18 January 1895), National Library of Thailand, Bangkok, as quoted in Stetson, *Siam's Diplomacy*: 143.

the British and the Dutch.⁵³ Thailand at that time needed recognition by colonial power as a sovereign country. This event was a continuation of King Mongkut's ideal to reach the west through its own standard of diplomatic gesture. Furthermore, the reason for this journey was to conduct a survey on the situation in the Western colonies in Southeast Asia. During his visit of 1871, King Chulalongkorn was not able to visit the principalities. But he would then visited Java again in 1896 and 1901.⁵⁴ Making it a kind of royal custom for the king and royal family of Thailand to visit Java during the period of 1871 - 1932.⁵⁵

When he returned back to Thailand, King Chulalongkorn made a "silent coup" to unite the fragmented areas of Thailand into one national body.⁵⁶ He implemented several reforms in the government, such as the provincial administration, the command of the modern armed force, financial reform, and the abolition of slavery. I have explained about provincial administration in earlier chapter. In the armed force, King Chulalongkorn raised the numbers of troops into 15.000 royal soldiers and 3.000 marines between the period of 1870 – 1880 alone.⁵⁷ Revenues from taxes were strictly regulated, as the tax farmers (mostly the Chinese) now had to send their tax collecting directly to a Revenue Office in Bangkok. The abolition of slavery in 1874 was a measure to regulate labour more efficiently in Thailand. The economic aspect of the abolition of slavery was that the 'free men' would have to work more for three months in a year or pay the government 18 *baht*, while previously the slaves who were the majority of ordinary Thai citizens only had to

⁵³ Kannikar Sartraproong, *A True Hero: King Chulalongkorn of Siam's Visit to Singapore and Java in 1871* (Bangkok, Tana Press and Graphic: 2004): 231.

⁵⁴ King Chulalongkorn eventually visited the principalities in his second and third visits. But he did not visit Yogyakarta.

⁵⁵ The full journeys of Thai kings and royal family in the long period of 1871 – 1932 have not been fully studied by scholars so as to reveal their geopolitical significance. In 1929, the Dutch Governor General in Batavia made a speech to welcome King Prajadhipok (Rama VII) in which he said that, "I am sure this development has been greatly stimulated by the repeated personal visits to Java paid by the King of Siam and by members of the Siamese Royal family, and I trust that also this visit of Your Majesty will promote and strengthen the bonds of good will prevailing between Siam and the Netherlands Indies and will be effective to a steady development of our common interest in the commercial and economic fields." This speech was quoted from the article entitled "Siam and Java" (interestingly, not 'Siam and the Dutch'), in *Bangkok Daily Mail* (1 July 1929).

⁵⁶ The term silent coup to refer to provincial administration reform of King Chulalongkorn was coined in the classic work of Reginald Le May (1936). See: Reginald Le May, *An Asian Arcady* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1936): 54.

⁵⁷ A.J. Loftus, *The Kingdom of Siam: Its Progress and Prospects* (Huntingdon, 1891): 5.

work for eight days or pay 1 *baht* 50 *stangs*.⁵⁸ In all these reforms, we can see that the court of Thailand had a pragmatic approach without neglecting the financial aspect toward a stable government. Thailand was supervised by experts from Western countries such as Germany, Denmark, France, and England in the government ministries and state projects. Along with this development, one key feature of modernization policy by Thailand was the improvement of education sector *à la* Thai. Primary education throughout the population was given by the service of the sangha community. The royal elites received the privilege to receive the higher education, with a gradually increasing number of the ordinary people. This approach created a pattern of modern elite which centered in Bangkok.

The Dutch Ethical Policy

‘Ethical Policy’ is equivalent to modernization policy in colonial Indonesia. It refers to wide range of aspect from economic, social, and also political modernization in colonial historiography.⁵⁹ As an idea, Ethical Policy originated from the ‘sympathy’ of the Dutch toward the condition of the indigenous population in colonial Indonesia at the end of the 19th century. At that time, the Dutch realized that so much profit had been given from the colony since their early ventures in the East but the natives (such as the Javanese) were still poor and backward. Van Deventer, a Dutch lawyer and a former colonial official wrote an article about “debt of honor” (*Een ereschuld*) in 1899. In this article, van Deventer stated that the people of the Netherlands were indebted to the natives in the colony from the huge profits they acquired up until that time. He stated further that this debt was based on ‘fairness’ (*rechtvaardigheid*) and ‘honesty’ (*eerlijkheid*). According to Van Deventer,

“Denzulken worde dan in herinnering gebracht, dat in Nederland de welvaart der gegoede klassen, waartoe zij behooren, ten nauwste samenhangt met het behoud onzer koloniën in Oost-Indië en dat er geen beter middel bestaat om dat behoud te waarborgen, dan een politiek van rechtvaardigheid en eerlijkheid. Want alleen daardoor zullen wij ons duurzaam kunnen verzekeren van een macht, waartegen de sterkste landingslegers niet zouden zijn opgewassen: de achting, de liefde, de trouw der talrijke bevolking van insulinde. Nog is het

⁵⁸ Bunnag, *The Provincial*: 57.

⁵⁹ Elsbeth Locher-Scholten, *Ethiek in Fragmenten: Vijf Studies over Koloniaal Denken en Doen van Nederlanders in de Indonesische Archipel, 1877 – 1942* (Utrecht, HES Publisher: 1981): 201.

niet te laat: de groote meerderheid der Inlanders is tevreden, of althans niet ontevreden, onder Nederlands heerschappij, weet niet beter of het behoort zoo.”⁶⁰

The article by Van Deventer urged the Netherlands government in The Hague to launch the Ethical Policy. Going further back in the 1860s, the book by writer Multatuli (Eduard Doues Dekker) *Max Havelaar* also showed the need to develop the colony in ethical way.⁶¹ But only from the end of the 19th did the Ethical Policy gain momentum. This idea was elevated further in 1901, when Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands’ delivered the Ethical Policy. She stated,

“As a Christian Power, the Netherlands is duty-bound to improve the legal position of the native Christians in the Indian Archipelago, to lend firmer support to the Christian mission, and to permeate the entire governmental system with the realization that the Netherlands has a moral obligation towards the population of these areas.”⁶²

On the reason behind the Ethical Policy, Queen Wilhelmina explicitly stated that the “Christian mission” and “moral obligation” from the Dutch imperial domination were the motives behind the drive for humanitarian concerns in the colony. Religious and moral motives surpassed the financial concern and created an urge toward the implementation of Ethical policy in the colony. It was on the contrary to the financial situation of the Netherlands at that time, which suffered from heavy spending due to ‘colonial wars’ in areas such as Aceh War (1873 – 1904) and Bali War (*puputan*, 1906, 1908).⁶³

As a product of the Dutch colonial government, the Ethical Policy was not the same as the policy which came from the indigenous people itself as in Thailand. In the Ethical Policy, the Dutch supremacy in colonial Indonesia was regarded as a virtue from the Dutch

⁶⁰ C.Th. van Deventer, “Een Ereschuld” (March – June 1899), in H.T. Colenbrander and J.E. Stokvis, *Leven en Arbeid van Mr. C.Th. van Deventer*, Vol. 2 (Amsterdam, P.N. Van Kampen en Zoon: 1916): 42 – 43.

⁶¹ Max Havelaar has been translated into many languages, as well as Indonesian language. On the Dutch language version of Max Havelaar, see: Multatuli, *Max Havelaar* (Amsterdam, Van Oorschot: 1949).

⁶² Ernest van Raalte and Chris de Moor, *Troonredes, Openingsredes, Inhuldigingredes, 1814 – 1963* (‘S-Gravenhage, Staatuitsgeverij: 1964) as quoted in Harry J. Benda, ‘The Pattern of Administrative Reforms in the Closing Years of Dutch Rule in Indonesia’, *Journal of Asian Studies*, 25 (1966): 592.

⁶³ Eduard J.M. Schmutzgers, *Dutch Colonial Policy and The Search for Identity in Indonesia, 1920 – 1931* (Leiden, Brill: 1977): 13.

as the ‘top elite’ in the colonial society down to the indigenous people, including to the Javanese royal elite, which was considered as the group ‘in need of help’. P. Brooshooft, a journalist and ardent supporter of Ethical Policy stated that,

“What shall become the drive toward the realization of this duty is the humanism, that is the feeling of justice, the realization that we have to give the Javanese, who have been dependent to us against their own will, something of our best. That is the noble desire of a strong man to help the weak with a sense of justice.”⁶⁴

With the implementation of Ethical Policy, improvements were made in the structure of colonial population, which included basic ideas such as: education, irrigation, emigration, and welfare.⁶⁵ However, there were several disadvantages of the Ethical Policy that related to the development of the court of Yogyakarta. Firstly, ethical policy created a new modern elite in colonial Indonesia oriented toward the West (including Batavia and The Netherlands) that gradually neglected the traditional political institution (the *keraton*) and its culture. It is true that the Ethical Policy promoted the Javanese elite such as the *priyayi* class a better chance in Western education and government position. But the emergence of western education and the opening of new positions in bureaucracy shifted the allegiance of many of these elites to the Dutch colonial government. Secondly, another problem of ethical policy is its failure to address equality among the Dutch and the indigenous in colonial bureaucracy. R.M. Koesoemo Joedha, a prince from the royal house of Pakualaman was one of the promising members of the Yogyakarta elite. From the age of eight, he went to the Netherlands and received primary and secondary education there. In 1904, he became the first Javanese to pass the Dutch examination for higher official (*Grootambtenaars-examen*) from Leiden. Upon his return to Java, Koesoemo Joedha worked as an *aspirant controleur* in the Dutch administration.⁶⁶ However, half a year later

⁶⁴ P. Brooshooft, *De Ethische Koers in de Koloniale Politiek* (Amsterdam, 1901): 7, as quoted in Locher-Scholten, *Ethiek*: 239.

⁶⁵ Schmutzers, *Dutch*: 14.

⁶⁶ The Dutch colonial bureaucracy was divided according to the Dutch (European) administration and indigenous administration. The ranks in Dutch administration, from the top to the lowest, include: resident, assistant resident, first class *controleur*, second class *controleur*, and aspirant *controleur*. The ranks in indigenous administration include: regent, district head, under district head, 1st class funder district head, and

he was soon transferred to the native credit division (*Volkskredietwezen*). Similar fate also happened to R.M. Sajogo, a cousin of Koesoemo Joedha. Together with Koesoemo Joedha, he was educated in the Netherlands and passed Dutch examination for higher official. Upon his return to Java, he was not raised as a high officer. Instead, he became a *mantri polisi*, one of the lowest positions in the indigenous administration.⁶⁷ A third disadvantage of Ethical Policy to the court of Yogyakarta was the association of Islam as ‘problematic’ in the colony, given the fact that the majority of populations were Muslims. As I will explain in the next section, there was a gradual effort to reduce the influence of Islam. It was in contrast with Thailand where the court of Thailand incorporated the religion of Buddhism as part of its modernization policy.

3.2. The position of indigenous religion in the modernization

Buddhism as an integral part of the court of Bangkok

One strength of the court of Bangkok is its support to the existing people’s religion of Thailand: Theravada Buddhism (“the way of the elder”). It has been the religion of the majority of Thai people since at least the time of Ayutthaya. The court of Thailand also continues the tradition to uphold Buddhism in the court. The kings of Thailand, from Mongkut to Prajadhipok spent some time as a Buddhist monk during their lifetime. It was to fulfill their task as the “defender of religion”.⁶⁸ In turn, the king encouraged all Thai males to receive Buddhist education in the monastery (*wat*). The process of Theravada Buddhism to become an integral part of the court and the whole Thailand took place gradually. It can be said that the effort to integrate the Buddhist institution in Thailand was also in line with the struggle to unite the kingdom under the influence of Bangkok. This

^{2nd} class under district head. In: Clive Day, *The Policy and Administration of the Dutch in Java* (Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press: 1972): 418.

⁶⁷ *Mantri Polisi* was not listed in the ranks of indigenous administration by Clive Day, but according to Sutherland this rank was equal to “untrained functionaries” and “youth who had just left the OSVIA”. On the discussion of indigenous administration, the case of Koesoemo Joedha and Sajogo, see: Heather Sutherland, *The Making of a Bureaucratic Elite: The Colonial Transformation of the Javanese Priyayi* (Singapore, Heinemann Educational Books: 1979): 52 – 53.

⁶⁸ The word ‘religion’ here refers solely to Buddhism. Only during the reign of King Vajiravudh (Rama VI) onwards that religion (*sasana*) also included all religion recognized in Thailand. For discussion on the king as defender of religion, see: Yoneo Ishii, *Sangha, State, and Society: Thai Buddhism in History* (Honolulu, The University of Hawaii Press: 1986): 67.

process began by King Yotfa, the founder of Chakri dynasty, who revived the sacred Buddhist ritual of Ayutthaya and reformed the *Sangha* institution along the establishment of ‘the new Buddhist kingdom of Thailand’ centered in Bangkok.⁶⁹ At that time, the Buddhist institution and its sangha in Thailand were still not unified. The kingdom was divided into different practices of Buddhism, and the practices often mixed with local beliefs. For instance, the practice of the Buddhism in the North was different than the Buddhism practiced in the central plain. King Mongkut was an early reformer who made a concentrated effort to unify all kinds of Buddhism practice in Thailand with the standard of Buddhist scriptures instrumented from Bangkok. The Buddhist order supported by King Mongkut and the royal court was known as the *Dhammayut* or *Thammayutnikai*. The Buddhist order of *Dhammayut* sought to ‘purify’ the practice of Buddhism away from local variants by emphasizing on the teaching of *Tripitaka* (the ancient Buddhist text).⁷⁰

During the time of King Mongkut, there existed two kinds of Buddhist institution in Thailand: the monastery and the *sangha* supported by the court of Bangkok and the local monastery and the *sangha* not supported by the court of Bangkok. The local temple and its *sangha* were related to the local political hierarchy. The vassal court of Chiang Mai in North Thailand, for instance, was linked to the abbot and the local *sangha* of Chiang Mai. The influence of Bangkok was limited in the local population, as the authority in the local area was strong between the *sangha* and local leadership. The independence of the local *sangha* was also demonstrated in the ordination of the new *sangha*. According to the earlier tradition, the *sangha* belonging to any temple could confer an honorific title to its junior independently. Moreover, the *sangha* did not have to be registered in a specific monastery. King Chulalongkorn realized that this ‘local authority’ of the *sangha* was in conflict with the court-supported *sangha*. Therefore, beginning in 1900s King Chulalongkorn extended the reform of Thai Buddhist institution into an effort to register all *sangha* under the authority of Bangkok.

In 1902, *Sangha Administration Act* was promulgated. Three basic principles of this law, including: the incorporation of all *sangha* into one unified structure which based

⁶⁹ Keyes, *Thailand*: 40.

⁷⁰ Ishii, *Sangha*: 64.

from the court of Thailand, the hierarchical order of the *sangha* that permitted the higher *sangha* to revoke the decision of the lower *sangha*, and the establishment of standardized *sangha* curriculum throughout Thailand.⁷¹ With the ‘control’ of Buddhism, the court of Thailand gained more influence in the population. The highest rank in the Thai Buddhist order since 1902 is the ‘supreme patriarch’ (*Sangharat* – literally, “the king of the sangha”). The appointment of the position of supreme patriarch depends on the recommendation of the king of Thailand. The candidate for the supreme patriarch also has to be the brother of the king. Thus, making it the affair of the court as well. Due to the strategic position of supreme patriarch, the person should also be the king’s trustee. At the time of the promulgation of *Sangha* Administration Act in 1902, the supreme patriarch of Thailand was Prince Vajiranana (also known as Wachirayan), the brother of King Chulalongkorn. In a speech before the announcement of the *Sangha* Administration Act, Supreme Patriarch Vajiranana said,

“Although monks are already subject to the law contained in the *vinaya* [regulation for the Sangha], they must also subject themselves to the authority which derives from the specific and general laws of the State. In addition, they should also follow local customs which are not contrary to these other two sets of law. In sum, monks must obey three types of laws: the law of the land, the *vinaya* and custom. This act is the law of the land; thus, it should be known, understood, and followed correctly.”⁷²

From this speech, Prince Vajiranana stressed on the ‘law of the land’ that exist vis-à-vis the religious law for all *sangha*. The implementation of this law helped to integrate the *sangha* community in Thailand under direct order of the court.

The integration of the monastery and the *sangha* into the court of Thailand also meant that the royalty would find it easier to get the support from the *sangha* in relation to important political decision. I quote here the statement of support from Prince Vajiranana about the king’s plan to join World War I (1914 – 1918). He stated,

⁷¹ Charles F. Keyes, ‘Buddhism and National Integration in Thailand’, *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 30, 3 (May, 1971): 555.

⁷² Keyes, ‘Buddhism and National Integration in Thailand’: 555-556.

“The defence against external foes is one of the policies of governance, and is one that cannot be neglected. War generally occurs suddenly... Therefore, war must be prepared for, even in time of peace, otherwise one would not be in time and one would be in a disadvantageous position toward one’s foe.”⁷³

As illustrated by a statement above, the *sangha* - court of Thailand relationship created a support system between the government as an instrument for action and the religious community as an instrument to raise moral support of the population. It succeeded in creating a “religio-national identity” of Thailand.⁷⁴

The decline of political Islam in the court of Yogyakarta

For centuries, Islam has been the religion of the majority of Javanese population. The early process of Islamization of Java took place in a traditional way that follow the Javanese custom of ‘*mondok*’, or the way of spending some time to learn Islamic knowledge in a religious school (*pesantren*). As an Islamic kingdom, the royal family of Mataram was associated with *pesantren* and Islamic center in Java such as Giri and Demak, either by becoming a *santri* (pious student of Islam) or through marriage ties with the descendant of prominent Islamic *ulama* (Islamic scholar or authority in Islamic religion).⁷⁵ In the beginning, the court of Yogyakarta continued the earlier tradition of Mataram to uphold Islam as a religion of the state, along with the position of sultan as the “defender of Islamic religion”. However, in terms of political influence, Islam gradually lost prominence in the court of Yogyakarta from the second half of the 19th century due to the Dutch imposition in the cultural and religious sphere.⁷⁶ Already in the 1810s, the promising candidate to integrate Islam to the court of Yogyakarta, the *ulama*-prince

⁷³ The speech of Supreme Patriarch Vajiranana was also translated into English, probably to reach the wider English audience, in Prince Vajiranana, *The Buddhist Attitude towards National Defence and Administration* (no place of publication: 1916): 19.

⁷⁴ Jacob I. Ricks, ‘National Identity and The Geo-Soul: Spiritually Mapping Siam’, *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 8, 1 (2008): 121.

⁷⁵ In Java, the most prominent Islamic *ulama* is the Wali Songo (the Nine Saints) of Java. Giri was associated with Sunan Giri, one of the Wali Songo. Demak was associated with the first Islamic Sultanate of Java and the mosque of Demak.

⁷⁶ M.C. Ricklefs, *Polarising Javanese Society: Islamic and Other Visions, c. 1830 – 1930* (Leiden, KITLV: 2007): 53.

Diponegoro, was not chosen as the successor of the throne of Yogyakarta. He was then to lead the war against the principalities and the Dutch from his base in Selarong, Central Java. In the context of combining the religious authority with political authority, Prince Diponegoro was the last prince of Yogyakarta able to do so. The end of Java War in 1830 marked the end of the ‘old order’ in Java, and its demise was changed into the new colonial rule of the Dutch throughout Java. While the Dutch continued to let Yogyakarta exist as semi-autonomous court in colonial Indonesia, its ‘potential’ political power especially the relationship between the court and Islamic *ulama* was severely reduced.

There were at least two efforts from the Dutch to decrease political Islam in the court of Yogyakarta and colonial Indonesia in general. First and foremost, the Dutch restricted the development of *ulama* by giving specific limitation for those who wanted to undertake the *hajj* pilgrimage to Mecca.⁷⁷ For the Dutch authority, *hajj* pilgrimage to Mecca was related to the rise of political Islam which could bring unrest in the colony. In the early period of 19th century, the Dutch restricted the chance to undertake *hajj* pilgrimage by increasing the passport cost in 1825 and 1831. From 1859 until the beginning of 20th century, the security for the pilgrim was tightened. The returning pilgrims had to undergo the so-called ‘*haji*-examination’ before they were conferred with the title ‘*haji*’ in front of their names.⁷⁸ The suspicion of the Dutch toward Islam and the *hajj* was lowered at the end of the 19th century with the effort of Adviser of the Indigenous Affair, Dr. Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje. On political Islam that connected to the pilgrimage, he stated:

“Van belang is hoofdzakelijk het feit, dat sedert ongeveer twee en eene halve eeuw een nog al aanzienlijk getal Inlanders te Mekka jaren doorbrengt om er te studeren. Deze omstandigheid heft ten gevolge gehad, dat de daar heerschende methoden van studie en onderwijs gaandeweg de vroeger van Voor-Indie geïmporteerde hebben verdrongen, en wat nog meer zegt, dat de – gelukkig niet de meerderheid vormende – *hiervoor vatbare* studereenden in dat international-Mohammedaansche milieu met panislamitische denkbeelden kennis maken, die op hunne gezindheid jegens het Europeesche bestuurvan

⁷⁷ Among muslim population of Indonesia, the title ‘haji’ is very prestigious to this day.

⁷⁸ J. Vredenburg, ‘The Haddj. Some of its Features and Functions in Indonesia’, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 118, 1 (1962): 99.

hun vaderland ongunstig kunnen werken...De eenige middelen, die zich aanbevelen, zijn indirecte, langzaam maar zeker werkende, die den zin der Inlanders in andere richting leiden. Elke stap, dien men de Inlanders verder brengt in de richting onzer cultuur, leidt hen evenver af van de bedevaartzucht.”⁷⁹

According to Snouck Hurgronje, the rise of political Islam could be prevented with a gradual assimilation of the indigenous population to the culture of the Netherlands. In this matter, the court of Yogyakarta only became the ‘bystander’ in the ebb and flow of the Javanese pilgrimage to Mecca because they did not have any authority to involve in this regulation. Secondly, in the late 19th century the Dutch colonial government passed the law to regulate all ‘*ulama* official’ from the rank of *Imam* (leader of a mosque) into lower position in the mosque administration under Dutch territory (except the principalities) to become part of the bureaucratic corps.⁸⁰ In the context of political authority and religion, we are reminded of a similar effort by the court of Thailand to integrate all *sangha* under the authority of Bangkok. In colonial Indonesia, the Dutch managed to integrate the religious institution of Islam to the Dutch secular bureaucracy.

Another factor related to the development of Islam in the colony was the degree of participation of the new generation of Javanese Muslim to Islamic education. According to Dhofier, the unsupportive role of the Dutch toward Islamic education contributed to the creation of *santri* and *abangan* distinction in Java.⁸¹ In the early 20th century, *pesantren* had to compete with the emerging western-style education. The elites among the population, such as Yogyakarta royal family were more keen on receiving western-style and secular education. The earlier tradition of the court to send member of the royal family to *pesantren* was no longer being practiced in the 20th century and replaced by the practice to send the children to the best western-style education that they could get. Therefore, we

⁷⁹ C. Snouck Hurgronje, *Nederland en De Islam* (Leiden, Brill: 1915): 58.

⁸⁰ Ibnu Qoyim Ismail, *Kiai Penghulu Jawa: Peranannya di Masa Kolonia* (Jakarta, Gema Insani Press: 1997): 87.

⁸¹ The term *santri* and *abangan* were coined by Clifford Geertz. *Santri* is the Muslim who adhere to Islamic rules, and the *abangan* is the Muslim who do not observe strict Islamic rule and incline toward Javanese tradition and belief. See: Clifford Geertz, *Religion of Java* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press: 1976); On the unsupportive role of the Dutch to the *pesantren*, see: Zamakhsyari Dhofier, *Tradisi Pesantren: Studi Pandangan Hidup Kyai dan Visinya Mengenai Masa Depan Indonesia* (Jakarta, LP3ES: 2011): 22.

do not see the ‘religio-national identity’ as one element of the court of Yogyakarta. The identity which emerged in Yogyakarta was ‘modern’ and ‘secular’ Javanese.

3.3. The establishment of modern education

The effort to create Thai model of modern education

Education cannot be separated from government, as it provides the necessary skills for an official to govern ‘properly’ following the established administration system. In the court of Thailand, education was of primary interest for the royal family and high nobles to govern the country from the basis of royal descents. To prepare suitable candidates for government position in Thailand, the Corps of Royal Pages was established as the Thai court’s learning institution in the civil service and military science. The king would choose his officers from the members of the Royal Pages. Besides the government, Buddhist institution also played role in education. Since the period of Ayutthaya, the monastery has become the institution for Buddhist learning. According to Buddhism, all males were required to spend some time in the monastery to learn Buddhist scripture, and therefore, also learn to read and write. In relation to the vision of modernization, the court of Thailand sought to learn western knowledge by opening English school in Bangkok and sending students abroad, especially to England. It combined the western-style education and traditional monastery education in Thailand.

During the period of King Chulalongkorn, the study of western knowledge became institutionalized in the form of a ‘school’. In 1872, after his return from a journey to Singapore and Java, King Chulalongkorn established the first English school in Bangkok. It was intended to give basic knowledge of Western science to the royal family who would need to interact more closely with the westerner. Francis George Patterson, an Englishman, was hired to teach English, French, and mathematics. However, the early Western education in Thailand was not organized in a firm manner. In less than a year the pupils dropped significantly from nearly 50 pupils in the beginning of 1872 to less than five students in 1873.⁸² Interestingly, the remaining students of Patterson would be important

⁸² David K. Wyatt, *The Politics of Reform in Thailand: Education in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn* (New Haven, Yale University Press: 1969): 70.

government figures in King Chulalongkorn period later on, including: Prince Damrong Rajanubhab (Minister of Public Instruction), Prince Devawongse (Minister of Foreign Affairs), Prince Phanurangsi (Minister of War), and Prince Vajiranana (Supreme Patriarch).⁸³ After the closing of the school taught by Patterson, the government established several other English schools, including Suan Anand (named after the palace of Suan Anand) led by American Missionary Dr. Mcfarlan in 1879 and the New School led by an Indian Baboo Ramsamy in 1888. A separate English department was also established in the new school of the Corps of Royal Page at Suan Kulap, Bangkok which established by Prince Damrong (the then Minister of Public Instruction) in 1884.

Apart from providing education of Western knowledge from the court member, the court also sent members of royal family and high nobles to study abroad. As early as 1875, several Thai students were sent to Raffles Colleges in Singapore and to colleges in England. Other countries such as France and Germany also began to receive Thai students from the end of 1870s onwards. The new skills and ideas that these students could offer to the court of Bangkok after their education were consider helpful to Thailand. However, their rather progressive ideas sometimes were not appreciated by the court of Thailand. Prince Prisdang, for instance, was the first Siamese who graduated from university in England. He obtained a degree in engineering from King's College, London in 1876. After graduation, he joined Thailand's diplomatic service as Thai Minister for European countries and The United States. In 1885, Prince Prisdang made a proposal for the first Siamese constitution, which call for "equality before the law" and a change towards a "civilized" form of government such as the European system.⁸⁴ King Chulalongkorn immediately rejected this western influenced proposal in the same year. In his reply, King Chulalongkorn reflected his concern of the idea. According to King Chulalongkorn, Thailand still did not need a constitution. King Chulalongkorn stated, "How much we suffered we know [sic] and remembered well. Therefore, why should we not want less power which will only bring us happiness and security to the kingdom? You must

⁸³ Wyatt, *The Politics*: 71.

⁸⁴ Sumet Jumsai, 'Prince Prisdang and The Proposal for The First Siamese Constitution, 1885', *Journal of the Siam Society*, 92 (2004): 101.

understand that we shall not be king if we are forced to step down like the kings of Europe.’⁸⁵ The idea of Prince Prisdang then faded after his return to Thailand.

The effort to combine the Western education and Buddhist institution for education in Thailand begun in the reign of King Chulalongkorn. He planned to broaden the educational facilities to general public, because broader chance for education would also provide better trained and qualified workers of Thailand. Therefore, during the time when Prince Damrong became the Minister of Public Instruction in the 1880s, the Prince’s primary task was to extend the education project to general public.⁸⁶ In 1884, Prince Damrong executed the plan to establish school in the monastery of Thailand. He realized the strategic role of monastery and the *sangha* as a learning institution both as a religious and general knowledge. In order to do so, the government improved the education facilities in the monasteries, as well as free distribution of Thai textbook.⁸⁷ The education project focused on the monasteries in Bangkok area at first. Gradually, the provincial monasteries also became Thai institution for general education.

The exclusive reliance on monasteries to provide mass education only lasted for short period. In the period of 1900 onwards, Thailand achieved a new ‘level’ of modern education in the country. It was due to the emergence of various types of school, from private schools, missionary schools, the schools of specific ministries, and monastery education in Bangkok and the provinces. In 1910, a new regulation classified types of school in Thailand, from elementary education (*munlasuksa*), primary education (*Prathomsuksa*), secondary education (*Matthayomsuksa*), and higher education (*udomsuksa*).⁸⁸ When King Vajiravudh (Rama VI, r. 1910 - 1925) ascended to the throne of Thailand, the modernization of education sector continued in Bangkok and the provinces, with a challenge to expand and employ schools with competent teachers. Compared to the situation in the second half of the 19th century, the number of schools

⁸⁵ Chai-anand Smudhvanich, *Documents in Thai Politics and Government, 1874 – 1934* (in Thai): 76 – 81, as quoted from Jumsai, ‘Prince Prisdang and The Proposal for The First Siamese Constitution, 1885’: 111.

⁸⁶ Wyatt, *The Politics*: 112.

⁸⁷ Wyatt, *The Politics*: 223.

⁸⁸ From this period onwards, the monastery schools were part of elementary education (*Munlasuksa*) level. In: Wyatt, *The Politics*: 250.

jumped from only 16 schools in 1884 to 622 schools in 1910.⁸⁹ The government also provided scholarships to ordinary people as long as the person demonstrated academic merit to receive education abroad.⁹⁰ Thus, in Thailand we see how the court did not lose the chance to combine the existing religious institution into its education system during the early stage of modern educational development. We also see the role of the royalty to plan and to implement modern education so that it could correspond to Thai character.

The Dutch secular mode of modern education for the Javanese

Education for the Javanese in Yogyakarta was divided into ‘religious’ and ‘secular’ types of education. The *pesantren* served as traditional education institution to the Javanese from the ordinary people up to the royal family of Yogyakarta. The secular type of education was conducted outside the *pesantren*, by the help of a ‘private tutor’ such as parents or Javanese *guru* (teacher). For instance, royal family member would hire private tutor to teach their sons and daughter the proper knowledge of reading and writing in Javanese, while the *pesantren* would be the place to learn Arabic and Islamic studies under supervision of a Javanese *ulama*. With regard to the preparation of candidates for courtier, a special training was traditionally done by private tutor. The court of Yogyakarta did not have special institution such as Corps of Royal Pages as in Thailand for this matter. Therefore, in terms of internal politics, the selection of the sultan’s close-aide courtiers after period of succession was a fragile matter, for there was no ‘standardize’ ground for the sultan to appoint an officer. On the other hand, the Dutch also developed its own model of education in the colony which later would influence the court of Yogyakarta. The model by the Dutch was separation of “European education” and “indigenous education” in colonial Indonesia. According to Kroeskamp, this distinction was not meant to create

⁸⁹ The data for 1910 include the monasteries (numbering to 420) in Thailand. The rest include public and private school (elementary education), general school and special school (primary education), secondary education, and school for higher education such as Medical School, King’s College Sixth Form (prototype of Chulalongkorn University), Midwives school, and Royal Military College. In: Wyatt, *The Politics*: 356.

⁹⁰ In 1919, there were 31 Thai students who were sent abroad, ranging from England (majority of Thai students), the United States, Germany, France, The Phillipines, and Hongkong. From their titles, about 26 of them were public officers (*nai*, not a royal family), 4 of them were royal family (*Mom Chao* and *Mom Luang*), and 1 person without any title (military officer). Their major varied from medicine, engineering, agriculture, commerce, and teaching. In: *The Siam Observer* (1 October 1919).

dualism in education based on races, but it was intended to distinguish between the education curriculum based on European curriculum and the indigenous education (Christian mission curriculum).⁹¹ However, if we look at the language instruction in education, the distinction based on races is visible. I quote R.A Kartini in which she said,

“As early as 1895 there was a decree that without the special permission of His Excellency the Governor-General no native child (from six to seven years old) who could not speak Dutch would be admitted to the free grammar school for Europeans. How can a native child of six or seven years learn Dutch? He would have had to have a Dutch governess, and before he is able to learn the Netherland language, the child must first know his own language, and necessarily know how to read and write.”⁹²

According to this statement by Kartini, the distinction between the Dutch and the indigenous had been established since the earliest education. Instead of providing equal education to the Dutch and the indigenous, the colonial government focused on the establishment of schools that could benefit the Dutch colonial state. From the second half of the 19th century onward, there were more Javanese who were educated and hired to fill the position such as medical doctor, government sector, teacher, and police institution. The level of education became a way to determine whether a person could be accepted in the bureaucracy. Gradually, the Dutch modern education became accepted by the Javanese elites in Yogyakarta as a proper model of education.

Before the period of 1900, the development of modern education in Java was rather slow. The primary factor that contributed to this situation was the ‘Dutch’ model that did not integrate the existing model of indigenous education into their plan for modern school. Rather, it introduced a new model of education in Java. The first Dutch school – *Europeesche Lagere School* (ELS) - was opened as early as 1817, but it did not interest the indigenous to the Dutch school. Western approach and the traditional indigenous approach to a problem were different at the very basic. In reading, for instance, Javanese text would require its reader to sing (*nembang*), while western text did not. The elimination of

⁹¹ H. Kroeskamp, *Early Schoolmasters in a Developing Country: A History of Experiments in School Education in 19th century Indonesia* (Assen, Van Gorcum & Comp.: 1974): 26.

⁹² R.A. Kartini, *Letters of a Javanese Princess* (New York, Norton: 1964): 56.

tembang (metrical form) as part of the subject in government school before 1871 made the Javanese parents felt unease to the Dutch curriculum.⁹³ By pulling out their children from school, Javanese parents could still choose to educate their children by private tutor, where the lesson could be adjusted according to certain needs. The re-instalment of *tembang* in the government school in 1871 diminished the negative perception toward the Dutch school in Java.⁹⁴

In the second half of the 19th century onwards, modern education began to enter deeper into the need of the Javanese because the Dutch regulation required certain education level for acceptance in the government. More schools, including the school for higher education level for the indigenous were open in the cities, including Batavia (*School Tot Opleiding van Inlandsche Artsen - STOVIA*), Bandung (*Opleiding School voor Inlandsche Ambtenaaren- OSVIA*), Surabaya (*Nederlandsch Indische Artsen School - NIAS*), and Surakarta (*Hollandsche Indische Kweekschool*). The increase of school facilities after 1900 was due to the implementation of Ethical Policy as the driving force of providing the indigenous with modern education. It brought an improved standard in the colonial bureaucracy that became the backbone of colonial system.

Yogyakarta was rather late in following the trend of modern education. While the first *kweekschool* (teacher school) was established in Surakarta as early as 1852, Yogyakarta did not have an effective modern school prior to 1890. The Sultan was reluctant to accept Dutch education or to allow Dutch to be spoken in the court. However, Sultan Hamengku Buwono VII (r. 1877 – 1921) opened the first modern school for the elites of Yogyakarta in 1890. The school was built in Srimanganti, a part of the Sultan's *kraton* of Yogyakarta. Sultan Hamengku Buwono VII regulated that those who wanted to succeed their father in the court should have certificate of completion from that school.⁹⁵ It is clear that the aim was to create the first school for court officials of Yogyakarta. As it was in the other area of Java, the 'certificate' of education became part of the requirement for acceptance into the court bureaucracy. Shortly, the school also received low level

⁹³ Kroeskamp, *Early Schoolmasters*: 342.

⁹⁴ Kroeskamp, *Early Schoolmasters*: 342.

⁹⁵ Abdurrachman Surjomihardjo, *Kota Yogyakarta Tempo Doeloe: Sejarah Sosial 1880 – 1930* (Depok, Komunitas Bambu: 1998): 67.

courtier (*abdi dalem*) to be educated there. The Dutch contributed to the school financially and integrated it into *Eerste School met Basa Kedaton*.⁹⁶ After the establishment of this school, other modern schools with Dutch support were opened in Yogyakarta, such *Kweekschool*, Protestant School, and primary school reaching a total of 86 schools by 1908.⁹⁷ The Dutch also opened primary school for ordinary people, *Tweede School* after 1900.

The willingness of the indigenous Javanese in Yogyakarta to accept the modern school was due to the Dutch government and Yogyakarta court's joint regulation. The gradual progress of modern school replaced the position of *pesantren* and private tutor in the society. While formally the court of Yogyakarta placed Islam as the religion of the kingdom, modern education clearly gave no adequate support for Islamic education. The establishment of *Muhammadiyah*, an Islamic organization by Kyai Haji (K.H.) Ahmad Dahlan from the village of Kauman, Yogyakarta in 1912 was a response of the Islamic community in Yogyakarta to the Western influence that penetrated the society. *Muhammadiyah* launched its own *Muhammadiyah* Islamic school in Yogyakarta and its surroundings to fulfil the need to learn Islam in modern school. Until the late colonial period, the effort by *Muhammadiyah* only posed as an 'alternative' to modern education in Yogyakarta that was already under heavy influence of Dutch secular education.

Despite the reluctance of the Sultan to open modern education in Yogyakarta before 1890, the royal family of Yogyakarta was among the first indigenous to receive modern education in the colony. In particular, the family of Pakualaman was known to achieve high level of education. They were the first to support the new colonial era with indigenous lawyer, indigenous doctor, engineer, as well as certified woman teacher.⁹⁸ Together with other educated elites, the young *keraton* elites contributed to shape the

⁹⁶ The Fundamental Education Decree of 1892 stated that primary school in the colony was divided into two categories: The *Eerste School*, intended for the children of indigenous chiefs and prominent persons; The *Tweede-School*, intended for the children of the indigenous population in general. See: Kroeskamp, *Early Schoolmasters*: 430.

⁹⁷ *Basa Kedaton* means the special language being used only in the *kraton*; Surjomihardjo, *Kota Yogyakarta*: 71.

⁹⁸ Sutherland, *The Making*: 47.

modern era in the 20th century, and participated in the discourse of nationalism in colonial Indonesia.

3.4. Overview

The period of 1850 – 1910 was the transition period from the old society to the new society influenced by the West. In both Thailand and Yogyakarta, this period was marked by progress toward Western model of the state. The key aspect was centralization and modern education. In Yogyakarta, the Dutch penetration in 1850 onwards changed the court into the Dutch orbit more than before. A possible element of political power in Yogyakarta was reduced, such as Islam, but at the court of Thailand, Buddhism was incorporated into court institution. It made the court of Thailand had greater control of the population. In the two places, modern education created new educated elites with diverse social background. The royalty also took part in modern education and became among the first to receive modern education.

Chapter 4

Royalty and Nationalism on the move, 1910 – 1930

In the previous chapter, I argued that modernization in Thailand and colonial Indonesia brought the two countries into a new development. Due to the different perspectives of modernization, the two countries emphasized different element of education. The court of Thailand integrated traditional element of Thailand such as the monasteries and the sangha into their modernization project. It created Thai elites with a strong element of Buddhism. In colonial Indonesia, the Dutch suspicion towards Islam curtailed the activities of *pesantren* and the *ulama*. The link between Yogyakarta with *pesantren* and the *ulama* outside the court gradually decreased. The influence of Dutch modern education with its secular approach paved the way to the creation of modern and ‘cultured’ Javanese. In the period of 1910-1930, it shows that this identity was not static, but it changed according to “the age in motion”.⁹⁹ The official nationalism of Thailand by King Vajiravudh was a product of his time, which related to the search of a ‘true’ Thai who was loyal to his king. In Yogyakarta, the royal family members who were able to express the idea of nationalism more freely were those outside the immediate court circle. Raden Mas (R.M.) Soewardi Soeryaningrat contributed strongly to the secular and anti-colonialist elements of nationalism. In this period, the interaction between the elites educated abroad

⁹⁹ I borrowed this term from Takashi Siraishi. I refer to the dynamism of the nationalist movement that characterized the early 20th century in Java. Takashi Siraishi, *An Age in Motion: Popular Radicalism in Java, 1912 – 1926* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press: 1990).

and at home created new form of nationalism. Thailand nationalism found its more egalitarian identity, as it moved from absolute monarchy to constitutional monarchy. In colonial Indonesia, a local - 'Javanese nationalism' started to shift into 'Indonesian nationalism', encompassing the region of Yogyakarta – Java – Indies –into the new conception of "Indonesia". This process in both countries was possible from the dynamism that became the character of this period, where the traditional elites and the new elites participated in the creation of a new identity.

4.1. Nationalism from the royalty

Official nationalism from King Vajiravudh

In 1910, King Vajiravudh (Rama VI) succeeded to the throne of Thailand after his august father, King Chulalongkorn, had passed away. He inherited the authority as an absolute monarch from his father. He was well equipped with western knowledge as he had been educated in England from his childhood to college in Oxford. His coronation in November 1911 made him the first Thai monarch who received education from abroad. The coronation ceremony was also a demonstration of Thailand sovereignty status as well as King Vajiravudh's vision of Thai nationalism as he wanted to build an image of modern Thai which is equal to the West. The diplomatic gesture to acknowledge Thailand's sovereignty can be seen from the arrival of 25 royal representatives and special representatives of fourteen governments, including powerful countries such as England, France, the United States, Russia and Japan to the coronation ceremony.¹⁰⁰ For the king, the ceremony was a good start. He commented that the success of the coronation ceremony "...shows that we Siamese...are the first nation [in Asia] to have attempted, and accomplished with unqualified success, such a great undertaking involving the great nations of the world."¹⁰¹ Similar to the king's view of the coronation, foreign newspapers also reported about the coronation in positive tone. One article in *The New York Times* praised the success of the coronation ceremony.¹⁰² *The Manchester Guardian* highly

¹⁰⁰ Walter Francis Vella, *Chaiyo! King Vajiravudh and the Development of Thai Nationalism* (Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press: 1978): 19.

¹⁰¹ Vella, *Chaiyo!*: 21.

¹⁰² *The New York Times* (3 December 1911).

attributed the elaborate preparation of the coronation to Thai modernization. It stated, “For one notable characteristic of young Siam is that, however deeply its students, princes, or commoners may have imbibed the teachings of the West, they remain true Siamese in spite of all temptations to belong to other nation.”¹⁰³ Thus, King Vajiravudh, in his early year as king, already cemented a strong opinion of Thailand’s success in modernization. On the one hand, Thailand sought to be modern according to the western standard. On the other, Thailand still retained its traditional aspect of the kingdom. *Washington Post* confronted the two aspects of modern and traditional Thailand by highlighting on the huge numbers of royal family that the monarch of Thailand had to manage. It stated,

“Officially he [King Vajiravudh] is styled Half-Brother of the Sun, Brother of the Moon, Arbitrator of the Ebb and Flow of the Tides, and Lord of the Golden Umbrella. Also, he has 1,203 brothers and sisters, 604 stepmothers, and other relatives in proportion... Besides looking after his [late King Chulalongkorn] wives, the king took care of all the surviving wives of all his predecessors. They formed a little city of about 5,000 women. A similar duty devolves upon his successor. The new king must take care of all his ancestors wives, of all his own wives, who will increase by leaps and bounds every year, and all of his brothers and sisters.”¹⁰⁴

During his reign of fifteen years, King Vajiravudh retained this aspect of the monarchy by becoming a ‘patron’ to the royal family, and also to the entire country.

King Vajiravudh used his authority and power to introduce ‘official nationalism’ which he found to be the most appropriate one in Thailand situation. He formulated a slogan of “nation (*chat*), Buddhism (*satsana*), and the king (*phramahakesat*)” for Thailand to stressed on the unity of the three elements as one in Thailand. To put it into practice, King Vajiravudh established several mass organizations in Thailand. The most important organization during the time of King Vajiravudh was the Wild Tiger Corps (*Sua Pa*), established in 1911. It was a civil-based paramilitary corps of Thailand which purpose was to assist Thailand military forces. According to King Vajiravudh, the aim of the Wild Tiger Corps was to “...instill in the minds of the people of our own race love and loyalty towards

¹⁰³ *The Manchester Guardian* (1 December 1911).

¹⁰⁴ *Washington Post* (4 February 1912).

the high authority that controls and maintains with justice and equity the political independence of nation, devotion to Fatherland, King, and Religion, and not the least of all the preservation of mutual friendship.¹⁰⁵ Once accepted as member of the corps, the person (restricted to male only) would join the rank just as the king's loyal troops. Wild Tiger Corps was also founded on the basis of military hierarchy where social hierarchy of Thailand such as princely rank or wealth status was not recognized. Ranks in the Wild Tiger Corps had to be recognized by all its members with a goal to bring "a new spirit of unity to the nation".¹⁰⁶ The regular activities of the Corps were "war maneuver" and "drill" which being practiced by the whole units. The king also took part to inspect the drill and participated in the war maneuver, which reminded us of the theater play when he was still a crown prince. The Wild Tiger Corps remained in existence until the end of King Vajiravudh's reign. His successor, King Prajadhipok disbanded this corps in the first year of his reign.¹⁰⁷ Beside the Wild Tiger Corps, King Vajiravudh also created an organization for the younger generation of Thailand, the Tiger Cubs (*Luk Sua*) or Thai Boy Scouts in 1911. The Tiger Cubs aimed to 'unite' the Thai under 'royal patronage' since their early youth.

Together with the creation of national organizations, King Vajiravudh used the press as a tool to spread his ideas to the people. He himself wrote numerous articles about social politics, and often with different pen names.¹⁰⁸ King Vajiravudh's writing during the period of 1912 – 1914, for instance, reflected his view on the principles of official nationalism. In the article on "Education and Unrest in the East", Vajiravudh expressed the need for the people to "carry out the work as effective as the Europeans" by getting education along the same lines as the Europeans themselves.¹⁰⁹ He mentioned Japan as the

¹⁰⁵ Stephen Lyon Wakeman Greene, *Absolute Dreams: Thai Government under Rama VI, 1910 – 1925* (Bangkok, White Lotus: 1999): 42.

¹⁰⁶ Vella, *Chaiyo!*: 36.

¹⁰⁷ Vella, *Chaiyo!*: 53.

¹⁰⁸ King Vajiravudh had several pen names, including Sri Ayudhya, Ramachitti, and Asvabahu. The latter was the king's pen name for the writing about social and politics of Thailand. In: Kenneth Perry Landon, *The Chinese in Thailand* (New York, Russel&Russel: 1973): 33.

¹⁰⁹ Asvabahu, 'Education and Unrest in The East', *A Siam Miscellany: A Reprint of Articles Written by "Asvabahu" to the "Siam Observer" and Appearing in its Columns during The Period of August 5, to December 31, 1912* (Bangkok, Siam Observer Printing Office): 19.

sole example for Thailand in Asia. “The Japanese..”, according to King Vajiravudh, “...have not been content to simply talk and boast of their knowledge; nor have they wasted their time in running down their own country and speaking ill of their own people before foreigners.” Moreover, he stated that “..what suits one country does not necessarily suit another country as well”.¹¹⁰ This hints at the country’s progress of modernization along Thai’s own character. In other section, he stated that the unrest in the East (he uses India as an example) was caused by unemployment. According to King Vajiravudh, the inability of the government to create job opportunity for the university graduates would lead to the creation of ‘nationalists’. These people would then become journalists to criticize the government. Once being suppressed by the government, they would become more bitter against the government. In the next phase after that, King Vajiravudh explained that,

“..these gutter journalists began to allow their thoughts to wander toward politics, and it was not long before they actually blossomed out into so-called “Nationalists.” Secret associations began to spring up, whose business was agitation, and sedition if they dared to preach it... Matters became worse and worse. The Indian government had to deport some of the more violent agitators. But It was too late to have any good effect. From sedition, the young Indians proceeded to crimes of violence, and even to assassination and bomb outrages. The unrest was soon an apparent fact ”¹¹¹

In this excerpt of his writings, it is clear that King Vajiravudh differentiated his teaching of ‘love to the country’ with respect to the nation, king and religion to the ‘nationalist movement’, which he viewed as radical and troublesome for the society. He did not mention about anti-colonial movement in India or other place in Asia. On other occasions, King Vajiravudh’s official nationalism emphasized the national unity of all races living in Thailand. He attacked the Chinese who did not become Thai citizens after all the fortunes that the Chinese acquired in Thailand, by labelling them as the “Jews of The East”.¹¹² From his writings, King Vajiravudh’s official nationalism was designed to integrate all

¹¹⁰ Asvabahu, “Education and Unrest in The East”: 21.

¹¹¹ Asvabahu, ‘Education and Unrest in The East’: 25.

¹¹² Asvabahu, ‘The Jews of the East’ (1914), in Landon, *The Chinese*: 34 – 43.

people of Thailand into one. However, during his reign, resentment toward absolute monarchy increased, especially the demand for a more egalitarian aspect in the field of social, political, and economic life in Thailand.

Soewardi Soeryaningrat's Anti-Colonialism Ideal

Under Dutch colonialism, the two rulers of Yogyakarta had to maintain a good relationship with the Dutch Colonial government under threat of dethronement or exile. The acceptance to colonial authority meant the granting of the courts' privilege in society. Under colonial government supervision, the two royal houses of Yogyakarta were able to organize royal ceremonies with pomp, including the ceremony of the enthronement of the sultan and the Pakualam (*jumenengan dalem*), the ceremony of the birthday of the sultan, and the right to govern the principality of Yogyakarta. The first grade prince and princess (the immediate kin of the ruling monarch) retained their privilege in social (highest social rank) and economy (receive regular 'royal' salary). In such a situation which require no particular demand for 'self-improvisation', only few princes who managed to progress beyond their basic privileges. Most of these princes were from the royal family of Pakualaman. Since the reign of Prince Paku Alam V (r. 1878 – 1900), Pakualam princes were keen on receiving higher education in a hope that when they graduated, high government positions would be available for them.

Among them, Prince Soeryaningrat (the son of Prince Pakualam III, r. 1858 - 1864) was one of the old generation princes of Pakualaman who only received traditional Javanese education. His two sons became the 'early nationalist' of Java.¹¹³ The first son, R.M. Soeryopranoto, was an active member of *Sarekat Islam* (SI), an Islamic political organization from 1912. Prince Soeryopranoto was also known as the 'prince of strike' (*raja pemogokan*) due to his involvement in leading the labor unrest under the banner of Sarekat Islam (SI).¹¹⁴ The second son, R.M. Soewardi Soeryaningrat (later changed his name into Ki Hadjar Dewantara) was an influential nationalist until the period of the

¹¹³ I follow the term 'early nationalist' of Java from Savitri Prastiti Scherer, *Harmony and Dissonance: Early Nationalist Thought in Java* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press: 1975).

¹¹⁴ Bambang Sokawati Dewantara, *Raja Mogok, R.M. Soerjopranoto: Sebuah Kenangan* (Jakarta, Hasta Mitra: 1983).

Republic. Scherer explained that the reason behind Prince Soeryaningrat family's 'radical' position was the financial difficulty and seclusion from the court power that the family received at that moment.¹¹⁵ It is true that only the immediate kin of the ruler who could enter the best education (for European children) and receiving monthly salary. However, with that explanation Scherer did not take into account other royal family members outside the immediate kin of the ruler. Yet only the two sons of Prince Soeryaningrat who became the 'nationalists' from Yogyakarta royal family. One explanation for their involvement in the nationalist movement is the 'choice' they took and the network that they had gained from their education. The two brothers, not having had the privilege to be educated at OSVIA such as the ruling Pakualam's immediate circle, attended school for higher education together with ordinary Javanese.¹¹⁶ They became an activist in their respective schools (R.M. Soeryopranoto attended Agricultural School in Buitenzorg, while R.M. Soewardi Soeryaningrat attended STOVIA in Batavia). A list of social origin of STOVIA students and graduates in 1875 – 1904 below gives an illustration of the network that Soewardi had while attending the school.

Table 1. The Social Origins of STOVIA Students and Graduates, 1875 – 1904

Father position	Number of students	Number of graduates	Still at school
Sons of higher native officials			
King	1	-	-
Prince	3	1	1
Regent	10	6	1
Patih	14	11	5
Head-jaksa	7	3	2
Under collector	17	3	4
<i>Wedono</i>	61	11	13
Head <i>penghulu</i>	17	7	3

¹¹⁵ Scherer, *Harmony*: 86.

¹¹⁶ Bambang Sokawati Dewantara, *Nyi Hajar Dewantara Dalam Kisah dan Data* (Jakarta, Gunung Agung: 1979): 44.

Indigenous army officer	16	4	3
Sons of middle-ranking officials			
<i>Jaksa</i> (prosecutor)	12	4	2
Assistant Wedono	41	12	7
Dokter Jawa	37	5	5
Teacher	93	22	29
<i>Mantri</i>	83	19	16
Vaccinator	11	2	2

Continue – Table 1. The Social Origins of STOVIA Students and Graduates, 1875 – 1904

Father position	Number of students	Number of graduates	Still at school
Sons of lower officials and private persons			
Native veterinary surgeon	1	-	-
Clerk	25	8	4
Prison warder (<i>cipier</i>)	3	-	-
Telegraph operator	5	1	-
Typograph (<i>letterzetter</i>)	2	-	-
Drafftsman (<i>tekenaar</i>)	1	-	1
Superintendent (<i>opzichter</i>)	3	1	-
Soldier	7	1	1
Village head	30	11	4
Trader (<i>handelaar</i>)	7	-	1
Farmer	16	3	-
Artisan (<i>handwerklieden</i>)	12	1	1
Pilot (<i>loods</i>)	1	-	-
Watchman (<i>oppasser</i>)	3	1	-
Tram conductor	2	-	2
Cart driver	2	-	-
Village police	1	-	-
Labourer (<i>koelie</i>)	1	-	-
House servants (<i>bedinde</i>)	10	2	-

Officers on half pay (<i>ambtenaar op wachtgeld</i>)	2	-	-
Private and no profession	67	13	4
Unknown	110	11	10
Total	736	190	121

Source: *Jaarlijksch Verslag der School Tot Opleiding van Inlandse Artsen te Weltevreden Over den Cursus 1904 – 1905* (Batavia, Landsdrukkerij: 1906): 61 – 62.

From Table 1, we infer that the number of royal family members who attended STOVIA was very low during the entire period of 29 years. Most of the students came from middle to low ranking families. The interaction among diverse students of STOVIA provided the understanding of nationalism for Soewardi that was exceptional for Yogyakarta royal family of his time. His idea of nationalism was not limited to Javanese nationalism (such as adopted by many Javanese in this period) but ‘Indische’ nationalism. Soewardi’s letter to his fiancée, R.A. Sutartinah (later changed name into Nyi Hadjar Dewantara) around 1907 tells his view on the fate of different ethnic groups in colonial Indonesia. He stated, “At this school [STOVIA] I met my best friends from Andalas, Sulawesi, Ambon, Timor, and from all the places in the Netherlands Indies soil. Now I understand, not only in Pakualaman, but also all of Nusantara are waiting for the arrival of a liberator.”¹¹⁷

The national awakening of the indigenous people in colonial Indonesia began with the creation of an organization from ‘below’, although it was the elites who played the dominant role. In 1905, Dr. Wahidin Soedirohoesodo, a retired Javanese doctor began a tour throughout Java to set up a *studiefonds* in support of the education of future generation of Javanese. His effort was met with various responses from Javanese royal family and the regents in Java. In the end, Dr. Wahidin failed to gather the support he wanted. However, his meeting in STOVIA during the year 1908 inspired the students to create an organization for the indigenous which harbor many goals. On 20 May 1908, the students of STOVIA established *Boedi Oetomo* (BO), the first modern, social and political oriented organization in Colonial Indonesia. BO succeeded in attracting many Javanese *priyayi* and

¹¹⁷ Dewantara, *Nyi Hajar*: 55.

young Javanese, letting them gather together for the first time. It became a ‘stepping stone’ for the creation of other organization in colonial Indonesia, from Islam, radical, to moderate.¹¹⁸ With the sponsorship of Prince Notodirodjo from Pakualaman, BO successfully held its first congress in Yogyakarta at the same year. To many people, both the young and the old generation, the first congress of BO in Yogyakarta aroused great interest. Dr. Wahidin spoke about the importance of Javanese culture and identity, despite the influence of Western education in the colony.¹¹⁹

With regard to the general principle of BO, some of the young and progressive Javanese gradually felt that it was not suitable for their political ideals. For the congress agreed to create BO in a direction of ‘social’ organization with moderate political view, the view shared by older generation of Javanese *priyayi*. BO promoted Javanese nationalism as the organization’s ideal, with particular focus on education. In response, the courts of Yogyakarta and Surakarta supported BO, while the more progressive members left this organization, including Soewardi Soeryaningrat, Soeryopranoto, and Dr. Tjipto Mangoenkoesoemo in 1909. The two brothers soon joined *Sarekat Islam*, an Islamic organization founded by Haji Samanhudi and Oemar Said Tjokroaminoto. In 1912, Douwes Dekker, Dr. Tjipto Mangunkusumo, and Soewardi Soeryaningrat (known as ‘*Tiga Serangkai*’) established the *Indische Partij* (IP). For Soewardi, this organization was a realization of his vision on the unity of all ethnic groups who were colonized by the Dutch. This vision of nationalism was called ‘*Indische nationalism*’.

The important contribution of Soewardi Soeryaningrat to the development of nationalism was his anti-colonial writing, the first of its kind, directed against the Dutch government. This article, “*Als Ik Eens Nederlander Was, ...*” (If I Were A Dutchman,...) was published in Bandung, during the year 1913. Along with the free -publication of the article, it also appeared in *De Express* newspaper.¹²⁰ The original bilingual versions of this article – both in Malay and in Dutch, indicated that it was a well-planned move by Soewardi and his associates which aimed to reach wider population of Colonial Indonesia.

¹¹⁸ Akira Nagazumi, *The Dawn of Indonesian Nationalism: The Early Years of Boedi Oetomo, 1908 – 1918* (Tokyo, Institute of Developing Economies: 1972): 156.

¹¹⁹ Nagazumi, *The Dawn*: 46.

¹²⁰ The version of this article in *De Express* can be found in: “*Als Ik Eens Nederlander Was*”, *De Express* (19 July 1913).

At that time, the Dutch planned to celebrate the commemoration of 100 years of Dutch independence from French occupation. The people was then asked for donation in support of the celebration. Soewardi Soeryaningrat, Dr. Tjipto Mangunkusumo, Abdoel Moeis, and Wignyodisastro established *Comite Boemipoetra* (Indigenous Commission) to reject this celebration. At first, the Dutch Colonial government did not believe that Soewardi Soeryaningrat, a member of Pakualam royal family, gave such open criticism of the government. They rather accused Dr. Tjipto as the mastermind behind the writing of the article.¹²¹ However, about a week after the publication of “*Als Ik Eens Nederlander Was, ...*”, Soewardi published another article, “*Een voor Allen, Maar Ook Allen voor Een*” (One for All, But also All for One) which confirmed that it was he who wrote the first article.¹²²

The first article was considered provocative and dangerous by the Dutch because it did not only reject the Dutch celebration of independence, but also demanded independence for the colony. The concluding chapter clearly reflects the idea of independence, in which Soewardi said, “*Neen, voorwar, als ik Nederlander was, ik zou nimmer zulk jubileum willen vieren hier in een door ons overheerscht land. Eerst dat geknechte volk zijn vrijheid geven, dan pas onze eigen vrijheid herdenken.*”¹²³ In response, the Dutch imprisoned Soewardi Soeryaningrat, Dr. Tjipto and Douwes Dekker altogether. Pakualam royal family showed its support of Soewardi. Prince Soeryaningrat, who visited his son in the prison, encouraged Soewardi that “a true hero would not lick his own spit”.¹²⁴ *The Tiga Serangkai* was then sentenced to live in exile in the Netherlands.

After the banishment of *Tiga Serangkai*, nationalist movement in colonial Indonesia continued to progress. With the foundation of *Volksraad* (People’s Council) in 1918, the voice of indigenous population was represented in the *Volksraad* meeting by

¹²¹ Scherer, *Harmony*: 91.

¹²² *De Express* (28 July 1913).

¹²³ R.M. Soewardi Soeryaningrat, *Vlugschrift No. 1: Als Ik Eens Nederlander Was...* (Bandung, Indlansch Comite tot Herdenking van Neêrlands Honderdjarige Vrijheid: 1913): 16.

¹²⁴ As explained by Bambang Sokawati Dewantara, the son of Soewardi, Prince Soeryaningrat visited Soewardi in the prison with the appearance of Pakualaman royal parasol (kraton’s regalia) and royal entourages to show the dignity of the royal family. Prince Soeryaningrat told Soewardi that a true hero would not lick his own spit (*seorang pahlawan sejati tidak akan menjilat ludah sendiri*), which means that he should not withdraw from this path. It also means that Prince Soeryaningrat acknowledged the conduct of Soewardi. In: Dewantara, *Nyi Hajar*: 64 – 65.

representatives such as Dr. Radjiman Wedyodiningrat and Dr. Tjipto Mangunkusumo (he returned early in 1914 due to asthma). Organizations and political parties emerged in colonial Indonesia, including SI, Indonesian Communist Party (PKI), BO, *Muhammadiyah*, and youth ethnic group organizations such as *Tri Koro Dharmo*. In the following years of 1920 - 1930, the connection between the youth in the Netherlands and also within colonial Indonesia strengthened the nationalism ‘for’ all the people of the colony. Soewardi Soeryaningrat also remained active during his exile in the Netherlands. He established the *Indonesische Pers Bureau* (IPB) from The Hague to distribute news from the Netherlands to Indonesia and vice versa.¹²⁵ Soewardi returned back to Java in 1919 after Governor-General Johan Paul van Limburg Stirum (in office 1916 – 1921) revoked the sentence of *Tiga Serangkai*.

4.2. The network of young nationalists, 1920 – 1930

The rise of the pro-constitutional monarchy and the pro-absolute monarchy groups

The 1920s can be regarded as a period of uncertainty for Thailand. World War I (1914 – 1918) had ended with victory for the Allies. Thailand, whom also took part in the War and sided with the Allies in the final episode of the war, enjoyed greater confidence as a nation. The success in choosing the ‘winning side’ made Thailand became part of The League of Nations, becoming one of the only few members from Asia in the League.¹²⁶ Once again, Thailand felt proud of its path of modernization. The threat to the sovereignty, the primary concern of the court of Thailand in dealing with the West, also decreased after the war. However, the problem of Thailand which increasingly shared by the educated class was the lack of egalitarian principle in the country. King Vajiravudh’s effort to instill official nationalism to the people was met with growing dissatisfaction. Especially during the early years of the 1920s when the economy also began to decline and the government was unable to provide job opportunity. In 1925, when King Vajiravudh passed away in Bangkok, he left a personal debt amounting to 5.5 million baht in addition to 4.6 million

¹²⁵ Ki Hadjar Dewantara, “Tentang Indonesisch Pers Bureau di Den Haag”, *Dari Kebangunan Nasional sampai Proklamasi Kemerdekaan: Kenang-Kenangan Ki Hadjar Dewantara* (Jakarta, Pustaka Penerbit Endang: 1952): 97.

¹²⁶ For the role of Thailand in the League of Nations, see: Stefan Hell, *Siam and The League of Nations: Modernisation, Sovereignty and Multilateral Diplomacy, 1920 – 1940* (Bangkok, River Books: 2010).

baht of “outstanding advances” owed to the state treasury.¹²⁷ His successor, King Prajadhipok (Rama VII, r. 1925 - 1935), the brother of King Vajiravudh, entered the center of Thai politics in the same year with a heavy task to improve the failing financial and political situation of Thailand. In the following years, King Prajadhipok faced more aggravating ‘problem’ of Thailand’s absolute monarchy: the rise of the pro-constitutional monarchy group.

The emergence of the pro-constitutional monarchy group cannot be separated from the network of Thai students at this period. As stated by Batson, the students who were educated abroad formed a distinct group in Thailand. They demanded much more radical change in the society, especially since the reign of King Prajadhipok.¹²⁸ One figure in 1924 tells that there were 372 Thai students who were educated abroad. The distribution of these students according to the country of education, include France (24 students), England (301 students), and the United States (47 students).¹²⁹ Among these students, those who were educated in mainland Europe were more active in politics in this period. They were exposed to the current affairs of the world that gave birth to ‘anti-colonial movement’. In Bierville, France, for instance, the *Congress International Democratique* was held in August 1926 where democracy, socialism and communism became topics of discussion among progressive students. Due to Paris becoming one of the centers of progressive movements in Europe at this period, Thai students in France received more influence from progressive ideas. It is not surprising that *Association Siamoise d’Intellectualité et d’Assistance Mutuelle* (SIAM), the organization of Thai students in France (established in 1923) was active in politics. Prince Charoonsakdi, Thai minister in Paris and Thai student advisor wrote to king Prajadhipok that he was “frightened” by the members of SIAM because they discussed “very advanced political views” of “our own [Thai] domestic

¹²⁷ Ministry of Finance, *Report of The Financial Adviser, B.E 2469* (1926/1927), in Greene, *Absolute*: 169.

¹²⁸ Benjamin Batson, ed. *Siam’s Political Future: Documents from the End of the Absolute Monarchy* (Ithaca, Cornell Data Paper: 1974): 55.

¹²⁹ Compared to 1919, the number of students who were having education abroad in 1924 was very high. I assume that it is because the number provided here is the sum of all Thai students who still remained abroad from earlier years. In: *Bangkok Times* (15 April 1924), as quoted in Benjamin A. Batson, *The End of the Absolute Monarchy in Siam* (Singapore, Oxford University Press: 1984): 78.

politics”.¹³⁰ The most prominent member of SIAM, Pridi Banomyong was nearly recalled in 1926 due to student unrest in France. Pridi was then allowed to continue his education after his father, an ordinary Thai government official, sent a petition to King Prajadhipok. The comment by King Prajadhipok to Pridi reflected his positive belief in Pridi and the progressive students of Thailand:

“This Nai Pridi is intelligent but inclined to be a little brash, as is common among the young. Once he enters the government in a responsible position he will probably work well, and I don’t much believe that he will become a “serious danger to the government” as Prince Charoonsakdi has reported. If the government doesn’t use him in a manner commensurate with his knowledge, the things might develop in an undesirable way.”¹³¹

If Pridi was allowed to continue his education, SIAM was then disbanded by the order of King Prajadhipok. But the network of the ‘Thai students in France’ was already being established, with individuals such as Pridi Banomyong, Chom Charuratana, Phibun Songkhram, and Wichit Wathakan. They were part of the pro-constitutional monarchy group who would later involve in the 1932 revolution.

In England, Thai students educated here were mostly supportive to absolute monarchy. There was no student unrest from Thai students in England such as what happened in France at the same period. This situation related to the fact that many Thai students in England was associated with Bangkok royal family. *Samakkhi Samakhon* (Association for Thai Students Overseas) was under influence of the Thai royal family since its foundation by King Vajiravudh (at that time, a crown prince) in 1900.¹³² King Prajadhipok was also a student in England before his enthronement. Beside the two kings, many other Bangkok royal family members were educated in England. On the discourse of ‘democracy’ and ‘monarchy’ for the kingdom of Thailand at this period, Prince Chula Chakrabongse a Thai student in England stated his support to the monarchy. He wrote,

¹³⁰ Batson, *The End*: 80.

¹³¹ Chao Phya Mahithon to Chao Phya Phichaiyat, 10.1/7, National Archives of Thailand, Seventh Reign, Royal Secretariat, translated by Benjamin Batson in: Benjamin Batson, ‘Review: Thawatt Mokarapong, History of the Thai Revolution: A Study in Political Behaviour (Chalermnit, Bangkok: 1972)’, *Journal of the Siam Society*, 61, 2 (July 1973): 189 – 190.

¹³² Greene, *Absolute*: 3.

”We hear it said that this is the period of Democracy, so every country ought to embrace this form of government, or else that country is not progressive but reactionary... If a country thinks it needs Democracy, let it have Democracy. If a Democratic country thinks Absolutism is better, let it embrace Absolutism. The only thing is to make sure... Hobbes said that many good laws remain unpassed in a stupid assembly, but they would be put into effect at once by a good and strong king.”¹³³

But not all aspects of Thai monarchy were accepted by Thai students in England. Despite the conservatism of the students in England to the monarchy institution, they usually criticized Thai royal tradition, which they labelled as “old”. *Samaggi Sara*, the journal of the *Samaddhi Samakhon* often expressed its admiration toward the modern West. One article of *Samaggi Sara* on “Nationalism and Change” in 1928 criticized three fundamental aspects of Thailand: Buddhism, cultural tradition of Thailand, and Thai nationalism. According to this article, Thailand did not adopt the right method for a promising change in the society because it did not accept greater degree of western influence.¹³⁴ Such was the example of Western minded influence of Thai students in England. Toward the end of the 1920s, it solidified into a separated group of educated elite, different from the pro-constitutional monarchy group who consisted of the Thai graduates from French and the military officers who had received training in pre-war Germany.¹³⁵

From Soewardi’s Indies Nationalism to Indonesian nationalism

During the 1920s, it became clear that independence from colonial rule was an aspiration for indigenous people in colonial Indonesia. The difference lied in the view toward the conception of nationalism and the way to achieve its nationalist goal. The absence of central power of the indigenous in colonial Indonesia made nationalism a diverse conception in different place and different people. *Boedi Oetomo*, supported by the court of Yogyakarta and Surakarta, sought to strengthen Javanese nationalism through

¹³³ This is a republication article from *Samaggi Sara* (date unknown), in *Bangkok Daily Mail* (23 July 1929).

¹³⁴ *Bangkok Times* (4 February 1929), in Batson, ed. *Siam’s Political*: 57 – 59.

¹³⁵ It was Prince Damrong who expressed his satisfaction by stating that no students educated in England played an important in the 1932 coup. In: “Dormer to Orde”, F7317/4260/40, (8 September 1932) Public Record Office of England, London. As quoted in Batson, *The End*: 83.

culture and education. Following the Javanese character of *Boedi Oetomo*, there were youth organizations that represented different ethnics of in colonial Indonesia, from *Tri Koro Dharmo* (established in 1915 – changed into *Jong Java* in 1918), *Jong Sumateranen Bond* (established in 1917), *Jong Minahasa* (established in 1918), and *Jong Ambon* (established in 1918). Similar to Thailand, the period of 1920s marked the emergence of the new generation of youth that participated in politics and national identity. They would later replace the local nationalism with ‘Indonesian’ nationalism. Important development also took place in the Netherlands, where the students used the term Indonesia as a name for their political, non-cooperative organization. The youth in colonial Indonesia and the Netherlands created a new Indonesian nationalism that became the new identity of the people in colonial Indonesia.

One important factor of this change can be traced back from the role of Soewardi Soeryaningrat in the Netherlands. Soewardi, Dr. Tjipto Mangoenkoesoemo, and Dr. Douwes Dekker (*Tiga Serangkai*), made a deep influence in politics to the students from colonial Indonesia in the Netherlands. Since their arrival, *Indische Vereeniging* (Associations of the Indies – established in 1908) became more concern in politics.¹³⁶ Before coming back to Java at the end of 1918, Soewardi wrote about the ‘political importance’ of Indies nationalism as a conception for the nationalist movement in the colony. He opposed Javanese nationalism, which he said only had a ‘cultural importance’ and very limited in scope in the struggle against the Dutch. Soewardi wrote about ‘solidarity of the Indonesians’ together with Indies nationalism. In his own words:

*“Het Indisch nationalism, dat is ons aller strijdleuze, die alle Indonesiërs kan samenbrengen in een verbond van nationalistten. Dat is de liefde voor ons aller vereenigd vaderland, dat nu nog Nederlansch-Indië heet. Het Indisch nationalism is het wachtwoord in onze broederschap. Schouder aan schouder staan de Sumatranen, de Minahassers, de Amboineezen, de Javanen en alle andere overheerschte groepen van Indonesië, bereid en gereed tot den strijd voor ons gemeenschappelijk welzijn, voor ons aller ideal.”*¹³⁷

¹³⁶ Robert Elson, *The Idea of Indonesia; A History* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 2008): 22.

¹³⁷ Soewardi Soeryaningrat, “Het Javaansch Nationalisme in de Indische Beweging”, *Soembangsih: Gedenkboek Boedi-Oetomo, 20 Mei 1908 – 20 Mei 1918* (Amsterdam, Tijdschrift Nederlandsch Indie Oud&Nieuw: 1918): 29.

According to Soewardi, Indies nationalism was a tool of nationalist movement in order to unite all the people in the colony. ‘Indonesia’, on the other hand, referred to the land and people of Netherlands Indies.

After Soewardi was departed back to Java, new generation of students in the Netherlands modified the Indies nationalism (with colonial connotation) into Indonesian nationalism (with an independent Indonesia connotation). The students such as Mohammad Hatta, Natzir Pamuntjak, Achmad Soebardjo transformed the principles and name of *Indische Vereeniging* (IV) into a politically-oriented *Indonesische Vereeniging* (*Perhimpunan Indonesia*, PI) as early as 1922. PI was the first Indonesian organization to use the term Indonesia in its name.¹³⁸ Their political view was anti-colonial and ‘non-cooperation’, with a goal to achieve the independence of Indonesia. From that time on, PI became the promoter of Indonesian independence from abroad.¹³⁹ PI also participated in the congress such as Bierville, France in 1926 and the League of Anti Colonialism and Imperialism in Brussels, Belgium, in 1928. In response to the activity of the PI in politics, the Dutch government heavily warned the students not to participate in it. As a result, only a very few royal family members from Yogyakarta involved in PI during their study in the Netherlands. Noto Soeroto, the son of Prince Notodiredjo from Pakualam, was the founder of IV and a member of the PI for two years.¹⁴⁰ He was expelled from PI in 1924 due to his writing that somewhat praised Joannes Benedictus van Heutsz, a Dutch general in the Aceh War, in his obituary dedicated to him.¹⁴¹ From 1922 onwards, the radical students simply removed the older and pro-Dutch students from the scene. They created a network of ‘non-cooperator’ nationalists from their base in the Netherlands. Their influence grew

¹³⁸ Elson, *The Idea*: 46.

¹³⁹ In the same year of the foundation of PI, *Jama'ah al-Chairiah al-Talabijja al-Azhariah al-Djawiah* was founded in Egypt. See: William R. Roff, ‘Indonesian and Malay Students in Cairo in the 1920’s’, *Indonesia*, 9 (1970).

¹⁴⁰ Knowing that Noto Soeroto was involved in IV, Prince Notodirodjo persuaded Noto Soeroto to stop its activity in the organization immediately, as it would “..antagonize the European colonial official, who will probably think or say: ”There you are, there’s another one of those inexperienced Javanese starting to write against us.” in Notodiredjo to Noto Soeroto (June 12, 1909), Noto Soeroto family archive, as quoted from Madelon Djajadiningrat-Nieuwenhuis, ‘Noto Soeroto: His Ideas and the Late Colonial Intellectual Climate’, *Indonesia*, 55 (April 1993): 45.

¹⁴¹ J.B. van Heutsz was also a Governor-General of the Netherlands Indies (in office, 1904 – 1909); Harry A. Poeze, *Di Negeri Penjajah: Orang Indonesia di Negeri Belanda, 1600 – 1950* (Jakarta, KPG: 2014): 179.

high among the ‘Indonesian students’ in the Netherlands, while the influence of Noto Soeroto and the supporter of Javanese nationalism became smaller and confined in a very narrow group.¹⁴²

The establishment of the PI in the Netherlands did not immediately influence the nationalist movement in colonial Indonesia. Javanese nationalism with moderate political view such as *Boedi Oetomo* still prevailed as the prominent organization for the Javanese elites from Yogyakarta and Surakarta. Only at the end of the 1920s did *Boedi Oetomo* begin to lose its member considerably, a sign of its decrease in popularity. The opponent of Javanese nationalism in this period was not the Indies nationalism, but the growing influence of Indonesia nationalism. Van Miert stated that the Indo-European background of Douwes Dekker, one of the initiators of Indies nationalism beside Soewardi, was one reason that the idea of Indies nationalism was met with many oppositions.¹⁴³ When the *National Indische Partij* (NIP) was disbanded by the colonial government in 1923, Indies nationalism completely lost its political backer. After that, *Tiga Serangkai* decided to change their political activities to education sector. Soewardi Soeryaningrat was the first to enter education sector. In 1920, he helped his brother R.M. Soerjopranoto to run an indigenous school, *Adhi Dharma* (established in 1915). In 1922, Soewardi made his own school of *Taman Siswa*, established in Yogyakarta. Douwes Dekker followed Soewardi’s move by opening *Ksatria School* in Bandung, during the year 1924. Dr. Tjipto helped the *Algemeen Studieclub* by Dr. Soetomo in Surabaya.

As it was for the Indonesian students in the Netherlands, the drive toward Indonesian nationalism came from the youth. Influenced by the *Indonesian Nationalist Party* (PNI) led by nationalists such as Soekarno and the PI-Netherlands graduates, the youth organizations found the way to become united under a new secular, non-cooperative Indonesian nationalism. In the so-called ‘Second Youth Congress’, which was held on the 28 October 1928, the youths from organizations such as *Jong Java*, *Pemoeda Indonesia* (Indonesian Youth), *Persatuan Pemoeda Peladjar Indonesia* (Associations of Young

¹⁴² In 1924, Noto Soeroto, Iljas, and Amaroellah established *Indonesischë in The Vreemde*, an organization that promotes Javanese and Dutch culture to its members. They were secluded from the activities of the PI, which drew the attentions of many students from Colonial Indonesia. See: Poeze, *Di Negeri*: 179.

¹⁴³ Hans van Miert, *Dengan Semangat Berkobar: Nasionalisme dan Gerakan Pemuda di Indonesia, 1918 – 1930* (Jakarta, Hasta Mitra: 2003): 160.

Students of Indonesia - PPPI) created a congress resolution: The *Sumpah Pemuda* (Youth Pledge). The three principles of Youth Pledge: Indonesia as motherland, Indonesia as one nation, and Indonesia as one language were the basis of the emergence of Indonesian nationalism. From 1928, the youth organizations started to merge under the new *Indonesia Muda* (Young Indonesia) organization. By 1931, Indonesia Muda had combined *Jong Java*, *Jong Celebes*, *Pemoeda Indonesia*, *Sekar Roekoen*, *Pemoeda Soematra* under its organization.¹⁴⁴ It had a substantial impact for the popularity of Indonesian nationalism, as it conveyed a message that the term Indonesia was the new ‘trend’ in the nationalist movement based from the youth.

4.3. Overview

Royalty and Nationalism in Yogyakarta and Thailand showed different developments in the period 1910 – 1930. The progressive ideas from the West that penetrated the minds of young intellectual were implemented differently according to the situation in the respective country. But in general, this period marked the beginning of a ‘heterogeneous’ backgrounds of educated elites in Yogyakarta and Thailand. In this development, the royal family of Yogyakarta and Thailand took part as one active element for progress. In the first place, the royal family of Yogyakarta and Thailand still acquired the status as the top elites in the society. Both also had privilege to govern their respective court. Their extent of ‘nationalism’, however, was different. The royalty of Yogyakarta supported Javanese nationalism. But not all royal family members were convinced with Javanese nationalism. Due to educational experience with students from different ethnic backgrounds, young Soewardi Soeryaningrat of Pakualaman introduced Indies nationalism and anti-colonial nationalism for the people in colonial Indonesia. In the 1910- 1925, King Vajiravudh was the one who directed official nationalism to Thai people. In the 1920s, Thai nationalism of King Vajiravudh began to decline due to the rise of new educated elites who demanded equality in Thailand. They organized a plan to change drastically the

¹⁴⁴ *Kerapatan Besar-Indonesia Moeda Jang ke-I (29 Desember 1930 – 2 Januari 1931) di Surakarta (1931):* 1.

shape of the nation. In Colonial Indonesia, too, nationalism began to change course to the new Indonesian nationalism due to the young educated elites at this period.

Chapter 5

Reaffirming identity: Thailand and Yogyakarta during 1930 – 1942

In the period 1910 - 1930, both Thailand and Yogyakarta formulated a ‘new identity’ for their nationalism. While a group of Thai educated elites demanded constitutional monarchy, the court elites still persisted with absolute monarchy. This conception of constitutional monarchy was brought by Thai students who had been educated from French and the powerful clique of Pridi Banomyong. In colonial Indonesia, the students educated in the Netherlands and the colony had initiated the Youth Pledge of 1928 to affirm the identity of Indonesia. But it was not easy task to initiate these conceptions further into practice. The court of Thailand still refused to change the absolute monarchy into a constitutional monarchy. The court of Yogyakarta was still reluctant to support this new identity, in the fear of losing their Javanese identity. The Dutch also did not support the idea of Indonesia. The period of 1930 – 1942 marked a gradual change to ‘penetrate’ this ‘barrier’ for the new identity to take place in the two countries. As we will see in this chapter, there were individuals and groups who pushed further the new identity to Thailand and Yogyakarta at this period. The final period discussed here, 1939 – 1942, was a time of consolidation determining the identity in both Thailand and Yogyakarta.

5.1. New Identities in Thailand and Yogyakarta

Constitutional monarchy as the new identity for Thailand

The period of 1930 – 1940 was the period of a new identity of Thailand from the absolute monarchy of Thailand that placed the people as the king’s “children”, into the

constitutional monarchy that gave the ‘supreme power’ to all the people of Thailand. During his first years in power, King Prajadhipok already knew that a change of government was inevitable. But he did not anticipate that the change would be dictated by his people. The king considered many different ways to improve the quality of the monarchy to meet the principle of democracy and progress. As early as 1926, he wrote a memorandum to Dr. Francis B. Sayre, an American Adviser in Foreign Affairs to Siam, in which the principal point was to discuss about constitutional monarchy of Thailand.¹⁴⁵ But at that time Prajadhipok believed that for country with a rooted tradition of absolute monarchy such as Thailand, it was not easy to adopt such radical change. What Thailand needed, according to Prajadhipok, was a “good king”. In regards to parliamentary system, King Prajadhipok stated his “doubt” if it would work in Thailand. He also expressed his refusal to the idea of representative government.¹⁴⁶ In another occasion, King Prajadhipok stated that,

“It will certainly be better for the people first to control local affairs before they attempt to control state affairs through parliament. I sincerely believe that if reforms are gradually introduced in this way, a democratic form of government could possibly be introduced without too much harm. But the process must be gradual and carefully administered in doses.”¹⁴⁷

As a measure to introduce a ‘check and balances’ in the authority of the king, King Prajadhipok appointed the Supreme Council of Thailand with five original members, including Prince Bhanurangsi, Prince Bhoripat, Prince Naris, Prince Damrong, and Prince Chantaburi since the beginning of his reign.¹⁴⁸ They were all senior royal family members who already worked under King Chulalongkorn administration. The proposal to adopt constitutional monarchy was rejected by the Supreme Council. The Privy Council, the

¹⁴⁵ ‘King Prajadhipok’s Memorandum’, *Papers of Prince Damrong*, 47/32, National Archives of Bangkok, as cited in Batson, ed. *Siam’s Political*: 15.

¹⁴⁶ ‘King Prajadhipok’s Memorandum’: 15.

¹⁴⁷ Prudhisan Jumbala, “Prajadhipok: The King at the Transition to Constitutional Monarchy in Siam”, in Suchit Bumbongkarn and Prudhisan Jumbala, eds. *Monarchy and Constitutional Rule in Democratizing Thailand* (Bangkok, Institute of Thai Studies Chulalongkorn University: 2012): 132.

¹⁴⁸ Batson, *The End*: 32.

princely group who was given the task to study the Constitutional monarchy also rejected the idea for Thailand in 1927.¹⁴⁹ Therefore, the leading royal family members did not agree with the adoption of constitutional monarchy in Thailand. In his effort to find the possibility of a constitutional monarchy in Thailand, King Prajadhipok did not request the involvement of ordinary people of Thailand outside the royal family to look into the matter.

The ‘revolution’ came close in Thailand when the economy was falling by 1931. It was the period of the worldwide economic depression. The question of a ‘good king’ to control the situation was raised, as the public would easily blame the government in such economic failure. In his correspondence to Prince Dhani Nivat the Minister of Public Instruction about education in Italy, King Prajadhipok wrote about his admiration to the Fascist system of education. King Prajadhipok said,

“This is very “interesting.” They are able to teach their children to support the fascist system of government, but can we teach the Thai people to support the “absolute monarchy”? I very much doubt it, for if we begin now it is already too late... Actually, if we adopted the “Fascist system and established a “fascist party” it might be desirable and the best “way out.” But could we do it? If not, perhaps we should prepare for a change to a “constitutional monarchy” at the earliest possible moment, and direct education along that path.”¹⁵⁰

Before the court of Thailand could find the best possible solution to raise the public trust to the monarchy, the change was brought by force from a coalition of power between the civilians and the military outside the court circle. On 24 June 1932, the coup group under the name the People’s Party seized the control of the government. The leader was the notorious Thai student in France, Pridi Banomyong with other members such as Chom Charuratana, Phibun Songkhram, and Wichit Wathakan from the French graduates’ circle. Other important figure of the People Party was a military general named Phraya Phahon, who was educated in Germany. The military wing of the People’s Party immediately

¹⁴⁹ Batson, *The End*: 134.

¹⁵⁰ ”King Prajadhipok to Prince Dhani”, *Seventh Reign*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 38/17, National Archives of Bangkok, in Batson, ed. *Siam’s Political*: 96.

occupied Bangkok and detained high princes of Thailand. On the day of the coup, the People's Party distributed pamphlets in Bangkok, the "*Announcement of The People's Party No. 1*". The pamphlet begun with a phrase "All the People.." It continued,

"When this king succeeded his elder brother, people at first hoped that he would govern protectively. But matters have not turned out as they hoped. The king maintains his power above the law as before. He appoints court relatives and toadies without merit or knowledge to important positions, without listening to the voice of the people. He allows officials to use the power of their office dishonestly, taking bribes in government construction and purchasing, and seeking profits from changes in the price of money, which squanders the wealth of the country. He elevates those of royal blood (*phuak chao*) to have special rights more than the people. He governs without principle. The country's affairs are left to the mercy of fate, as can be seen from the depression of the economy and the hardships of making a living – something the people know all about already."¹⁵¹

From this 'revolutionary' pamphlet of the Peoples' Party, it was clear that the attack was directed at the absolute monarch and the royal family of Thailand. The adversary to the absolute monarch and the royal family, according the People's Party, was "the people" who were abused by their power and privilege. The People party proposed a solution to create a government by an assembly, "so that many minds can debate and contribute".¹⁵² They invited the king to stay on the throne, but threatened to depose the king on charge of state treason and changed the form of government completely to republic if the king refused to accept their demands.¹⁵³ What is also interesting in the pamphlet is that the People's Party sought for Thailand's "complete independence".¹⁵⁴ King Prajadhipok, having no desire to bring Thailand into civil war decided to agree with the demand of the People's Party.

From the period of 24 June 1932 onwards, the bloodless coup in Thailand ended the absolute monarchy rule. The king was given a symbolic position as a constitutional

¹⁵¹ 'Announcement of The People's Party No. 1 (1932)', in Pridi Banomyong, *Pridi by Pridi: Selected Writings on Life, Politics and Economy* (Chiang Mai, Silkworm Books: 2000): 70.

¹⁵² 'Announcement of The People's Party No. 1 (1932)': 71.

¹⁵³ 'Announcement of The People's Party No. 1 (1932)': 71 – 72.

¹⁵⁴ 'Announcement of The People's Party No. 1 (1932)': 73.

monarch, but the royal family was completely stripped from their privileges in the politics, social, and economy of Thailand. The attempt to seize control of the royal family properties was halted by Phraya Manopakorn, the new Prime Minister of Thailand.¹⁵⁵ Prince Boriphath, one powerful member of the Court of Bangkok was sent to exile in Bandung, West Java.¹⁵⁶ The royal branch of government such as the Supreme Council was abolished. The new National Assembly was elected democratically in November. In all this political development, it is not hard to notice that the 1932 revolution was an affair to shift the power from the king and royal family into the People's Party and the ordinary Thai people. The cultural tradition of Thailand and the king's legitimacy that became the fundament of the Thai monarchy did not change at all. As quoted from Wilson, on the day of a National Assembly meeting to draft a new constitution, the chair of the committee announced that "...debate would have to be over quickly because the royal astrologers had selected 10 December as most auspicious day for promulgation and in the meantime it must be copied in three great manuscripts."¹⁵⁷ The National Assembly meetings then proceeded to fulfil the date. In December, the proclamation of 1932 Constitution of Thailand was followed with state rituals and celebrations.¹⁵⁸ The influence of the king also remained high as a unifying symbol of Thailand even after the 1932 Revolution. Despite the attack of the king and royal family in the Announcement pamphlet of the People's Party, the new constitution of 1932 still placed the monarchy as a source of legitimacy in Thai political system.

Political stability was the price of the 1932 revolution that could not easily be maintained by the new constitutional government. The monarchy, after having ruled Thailand for centuries with absolute power, refused to remain idle completely in response to the new government of Thailand. But their response varied according to what they chose fit. In 1933, with the financial support of King Prajadhipok, Prince Bowaradej launched a

¹⁵⁵ Batson, *The End*: 245.

¹⁵⁶ Prince Boriphath was the only high prince who was sent to exile by the decision of the new government. After the coup, several other high princes voluntarily lived abroad, including Prince Damrong (Penang), Prince Purachatra (Singapore), and King Prajadhipok (Cranleigh, England).

¹⁵⁷ David A. Wilson, *Politics in Thailand* (Cornell, Cornell University Press: 1962): 15.

¹⁵⁸ Wilson, *Politics*: 15.

military offensive to the new government.¹⁵⁹ The battle took place between the new government force led by Phibun Songkhram against the provincial army of Prince Bowaradej in the outskirts of Bangkok. This conflict ended with the victory of the new government and raised Phibun Songkhram into prominence in Thai politics. Prince Bowaradej was exiled to Saigon, where he lived to his death. Other leaders of the ‘rebellion’ were either captured or killed in action.¹⁶⁰ This event became the only major physical conflict erupted between the reactionary group (the monarchy) and the new government. Leading princes who allegedly involved in the rebellion moved to Penang included Prince Damrong and Prince Sawat.¹⁶¹ The majority of royal family, however, did not involve in the rebellion. With the wealth they acquired from pre-1932 situation, they chose to secure their economic and social positions in the new era of Thailand. A few members of the royal family decided to join the new government as the Adviser of the new government. They were called “democratic royal princes”, with the leading figures such as Prince Aditya (Regency Council), Prince Sakol (Adviser in the Ministry of the Interior), and Prince Wan (Adviser in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs).¹⁶²

Within members of a new government of Thailand after 1932, series of conflicts took place that only ended temporarily in the beginning of the first Phibun government (1938 – 1941). Resentments also ascended between the initiators of the 1932 revolution themselves. For instance, by the order of the first Prime Minister of Thailand Phraya Manopakorn, Pridi Banomyong was sent to ‘study abroad’. Many people in the government dislike Pridi for his alleged support to Communism. In 1933, it was Phraya Manopakorn who was deposed from power. Phraya Phahon launched the ‘second coup’ to the government and made him the second Prime Minister in 1933.¹⁶³ The government lost much prestige when King Prajadhiphok abdicated from the throne of Thailand in 1935. Therefore, despite the importance of constitutional monarchy to distribute the power to the people and instill the nationalism ‘from the ordinary people’, Thailand fell into political

¹⁵⁹ Scot Barme, *Luang Wichit Wathakan and the Creation of Thai Identity* (Singapore, ISEAS: 1993): 85.

¹⁶⁰ Batson, ed. *Siam's Political*: 99.

¹⁶¹ Barme, *Luang Wichit*: 85.

¹⁶² M. Sivaram, “Siam in Transition”, *Siam Today 1* (1936), as cited in Batson, *The End*: 253.

¹⁶³ Batson, ed. *Siam's Political*: 98.

instability. The change from the absolute monarchy to the constitutional monarchy gave rise to the ‘military dictatorship’ in Thailand.

Yogyakarta under the influence of Indonesian nationalism

During the 1930s, Yogyakarta became a center of the emerging Indonesian nationalism. The development in this period suggested a significant progress in Yogyakarta just in time when the nationalist activities in Batavia and other colonial cities received difficulties as a result of heavier surveillance by the Dutch Colonial authority.¹⁶⁴ With regard to the Sultan and the Pakualam positions in the nationalist movement, we have discussed that the Courts of Yogyakarta, under the aegis of the Dutch colonial government, hardly make any statement of support to the nationalist. On the other hand, the Kasultanan and the Pakualaman courts in Yogyakarta were supportive to the moderate and cooperative methods in relations with the Dutch government, with a particular interest to Javanese nationalism. By 1930s, there was a gradual shift in the perception toward ‘Indonesian solidarity, and Indonesian nationalism from the proponent of Javanese nationalism. It was evidenced by *Boedi Oetomo*, an organization of *kraton* circle, which suffered a decline in membership during the first half of 1930. In 1935, *Boedi Oetomo* only had 736 members.¹⁶⁵ *Boedi Oetomo* was overshadowed by the emergence of two Yogyakarta-based organizations led by members of the royal family. Firstly, I refer to the role of Ki Hadjar Dewantara (R.M. Soewardi Soeryaningrat) and *Taman Siswa*. In 1930, *Taman Siswa* had ‘woken up’ from its eight year of “abstinence from public speech” (*tapa diam*), denoting on the period of absence from mass propaganda.¹⁶⁶ Starting from this period, *Taman Siswa* became an agent of Indonesian nationalism in education sector. Secondly, Prince Soerjodiningrat from the Kasultanan established an organization for Javanese peasants, the

¹⁶⁴ After the 1926 PKI rebellion, the Dutch government became more repressive to Indonesian nationalist movement. One example of the intense surveillance of the Dutch was the dissolution of Indonesian Nationalist Party (PNI) in 1929.

¹⁶⁵ *Boedi Oetomo* then fused into *Partai Bangsa Indonesia* (PBI) to create the new *Partai Indonesia Raja* (Greater Indonesia Party - Parindra). However, as a national party, its growth was still “unimpressive” in numbers. See: Susan Abeyasekare, ‘Partai Indonesia Raja, 1936 – 1942: A Study in Cooperative Nationalism’, *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 3, 2 (1972): 263.

¹⁶⁶ The policy of *tapa diam* was a strategy used by the leader of *Taman Siswa* to focus primarily on the establishment of schools, from Yogyakarta to many of its school branches. In: Sajoga, ‘Riwayat Perjuangan *Taman Siswa*, 1922 – 1952’, *Buku Peringatan Taman Siswa 30 Tahun* (1952): 207.

Pakempalan Kawoelo Ngayogyakarta (Associations of Subjects of Yogyakarta - PKN) in 1930. The involvement of prince from Kasultanan royal family as the initiator and the leading figure in a mass organization was quite unique. With PKN, the idea of Indonesian solidarity, one principle for nationalism, was promoted to the ordinary people. Different than in Thailand at this period, the new ‘identity’ of Indonesia was accepted by royal family members from the courts themselves. They promoted Indonesian solidarity within their respective positions in the society. Creating a kind of ‘Indonesian nationalism with Javanese clothes’ that characterized Indonesian nationalism in Yogyakarta.

Taman Siswa in Yogyakarta was the pioneer in national education of Indonesia. At the time when colonial education only targeted education for the elites, *Taman Siswa* offered the importance of *volkschool* (the low-rank school for ordinary people). According to the school leader (*dictateur*) Ki Hadjar Dewantara, education (*onderwijs*) and upbringing (*opvoeding*) should aim to free the people so they could take part in the ‘national unity’.¹⁶⁷ In the 1930, before the First Congress of *Taman Siswa* took place in Yogyakarta, the school already had 52 branches and 6.500 pupils in total, with 23 branches in East Java, 13 in Central Java, 9 in West Java, 3 in Sumatra, 3 in Kalimantan, and one in Madura.¹⁶⁸ The first congress was an essential step for *Taman Siswa* because it resulted in the agreement of all the branches on the vision of ‘Indonesian national solidarity’. After the first congress, *Taman Siswa* became a broad national movement in education, which centered in Yogyakarta. *Taman Siswa* could turn into a tool for national agitation whenever they see appropriate. In 1932, for instance, the Grand Meeting (*Rapat Besar*) of *Taman Siswa* in Yogyakarta led by Ki Mangunsarkoro decided to “..eliminate all subjects that connected to colonialism, especially in the children education level”.¹⁶⁹

As a response, the government passed the *Wilde Scholen Ordonnantie* in the same year. This regulation required *Taman Siswa* and other private schools (*sekolah partikelir*) to follow Dutch curriculum, and to have authorization for schools and teachers before the study could begin. In a short time, wild school ordinance became a national issue in education. Many organizations, including *Boedi Oetomo*, *Muhammadiyah*, *Pendidikan*

¹⁶⁷ Sajoga, ‘Riwayat Perjuangan Taman Siswa, 1922 – 1952’: 195.

¹⁶⁸ Sajoga, ‘Riwayat Perjuangan Taman Siswa, 1922 – 1952’: 207.

¹⁶⁹ Sajoga, ‘Riwayat Perjuangan Taman Siswa, 1922 – 1952’: 216.

Nasional Indonesia (Indonesian Education Party – the new PNI), *Jong Islamieten Bond*, and *Indonesia Muda* sent a protest to the Dutch government.¹⁷⁰ In 1933, amid the pressure in the *Volksraad*, the Dutch government revoked the Wild School Ordinance. This ‘victory’ was not only important for *Taman Siswa*’s existence, but also for the acknowledgement of indigenous schools.

Despite the school’s minimum educational facilities as well as financial difficulties, *Taman Siswa* school particularly in Yogyakarta showed a high rate “educational excellence” for its time.¹⁷¹ Many of its students passed government examinations. *Taman Siswa* appeared as a threat to the Dutch government due the affiliation of the teachers with nationalist parties and public meeting that inspire nationalism among the population. The existence of *Taman Siswa* meant the active part of indigenous education in promoting Indonesian nationalism. Because, according to Ki Hadjar Dewantara,

“Education with colonial spirit offers nothing to our own national livelihood. The reliance to that kind of education would only entangled us into dependency. This situation cannot be eliminated only with political movement. Therefore, we should not only focus on outward movement, but we also need to emphasize on the importance to spread the seed of living with freedom [benih hidup merdeka] to the people, that is education with our own national sentiment.”¹⁷²

At the end of the 1930s, *Taman Siswa* continued to flourish in Yogyakarta and other areas of colonial Indonesia. The data for 1942 shows that *Taman Siswa* had 199 branches and 207 higher institutions which spread from Sumatera, Java, Bali, Kalimantan to Sulawesi with total students numbering to 20.000.¹⁷³ In the development of *Taman Siswa*, both the Kasultanan and Pakualaman of Yogyakarta played role as an exponent of *Taman Siswa* in various forms of support.¹⁷⁴ It shows that the relationship between *Taman Siswa*

¹⁷⁰ Sajoga, ‘Riwayat Perjuangan Taman Siswa, 1922 – 1952’: 220 – 221.

¹⁷¹ Ruth T. McVey, ‘Taman Siswa and the Indonesian National Awakening’, *Indonesia*, 4 (October 1967): 192

¹⁷² Sajoga, ‘Riwayat Perjuangan Taman Siswa, 1922 – 1952’: 192.

¹⁷³ Sajoga, ‘Riwayat Perjuangan Taman Siswa, 1922 – 1952’: 220 – 221.

¹⁷⁴ The courts of Yogyakarta played important part to support *Taman Siswa*. The fact that *Taman Siswa* emerged from Yogyakarta cannot be neglected as evidence of the two *kraton* support for this organization.

and the court authorities was the key factor of the emergence of *Taman Siswa* in this period.

Another promoter of Indonesian nationalism from Yogyakarta was the PKN. It was founded by Prince Soerjadiningrat from Kasultanan Yogyakarta in 1930. Unlike Soewardi Soeryaningrat, Prince Soerjadiningrat did not get formal education. He was taught in Javanese arts and basic knowledge such as reading and writing from private tutor at the *keraton*. He learned other skills and subjects mostly by self-taught. His background as the Kasultanan court's agrarian inspector made him know by experience that the peasants were constantly exploited because they did not know how to read and write. The fact that the royal family played little role in the people's welfare was an object of his concern. In the beginning of 1930s, great depression affected the economy of Yogyakarta. The urge to create an organization for the peasants increased more than before. With the approval of Sultan Hamengku Buwono VIII (r. 1921 – 1939), Prince Soerjadiningrat established PKN. He was assisted by several high princes of Kasultanan Yogyakarta, including Prince Tedjokusumo (sub-chairman for social affairs of PKN), Prince Djojowinoto (sub-chairman for political affairs of PKN), Prince Hadikusumo (sub-chairman for economic affairs of PKN), and Prince Hadiwinoto (treasurer).¹⁷⁵ In only two years after its establishment, PKN already reached about 300.000 members.¹⁷⁶ PKN also had its branch for the youth, the *PKN Moeda* (Young PKN) which organized its first congress in 1934.¹⁷⁷ PKN was surely a mass organization with considerable significance for Yogyakarta, and, as *Taman Siswa* school, it concerned on the basic need of the people to earned a better living condition. The activities of the PKN, including short courses on agricultural techniques, organizing schools in the villages, and advocacy for its members attracted many people from the rural area of Yogyakarta. The popularity of the PKN shows that, despite the nationalists and the

Pakualaman royal family was closely connected to the foundation of *Taman Siswa*. Sultan Hamengku Buwono VIII also gave support to *Taman Siswa*. For Pakualaman royal family's relation with *Taman Siswa*, see: Kenji Tsuchiya, 'The Taman Siswa Movement – Its Early Eight Years and Javanese Background', *Journal of Southeast Asia Studies*, 6, 2 (September 1975): 165 – 167; For Kasultanan royal family's relation with *Taman Siswa*, see: "Sambutan Hamengkubuwono IX", *Buku Peringatan*: 30, and John Monfries, *A Prince in a Republic: The Life of Sultan Hamengkubuwono IX of Yogyakarta* (Singapore, ISEAS: 2015): 30.

¹⁷⁵ William Joseph O'Malley, *Indonesia in the Great Depression: A Study of East Sumatra and Jogjakarta in the 1930's* (unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, Cornell University: 1977): 344.

¹⁷⁶ *Oetoesan Indonesia* (20 July 1933).

¹⁷⁷ *Oetoesan Indonesia* (31 July 1934).

communists influence in Java during this period, many people who lived in the rural area of Yogyakarta principality still put their faith to the sultan and the royal family.

Prince Soerjadinigrat and other princes of Kasultanan Yogyakarta viewed that their service in PKN was part of their task as the Javanese noblemen. Prince Soerjadinigrat used the phrase “Royal family for the people” (*Bangsawan untuk Rakyat*) to describe his connection to the members of PKN.¹⁷⁸ In contrast with PKN’s ‘potential’, Prince Soerjadinigrat did not turn PKN into political organization. The organization limited its activities to social and education sectors for Javanese peasants. However, during the time when political parties were thrived in this period, it became a matter of speculation among intellectuals about the true intention of Prince Soerjadinigrat with PKN. Noto Soeroto, for instance, had a doubt if the prince with “thousands of supporters” did not involve in politics.¹⁷⁹ The Dutch was also quite concerned with the growth of PKN. One editorial article of *Oetoesan Indonesia* reported about the editor of Dutch-language newspaper *Java Bode*, H.C. Zentgraaf who dislike the activities of the PKN because of the numerous numbers of its members. This article satirically said that, for the Dutch, any organization such as PKN was “...niet direct gevaarlijk maar kan toch gevaarlijk worden.”¹⁸⁰ *Oetoesan Indonesia* reminded PKN that it could not escape from the “real demand” as an “organization that live” (*organisasi hidup*), referring to the PKN potential if it became a political organization.¹⁸¹ But these opinions did not change the ideal of Prince Soerjadinigrat. In his speech at the Third PKN Congress, he spoke about the duty for the people of high standing to help the peasants. On his view of the peasants, Prince Soerjadinigrat said:

“The decline of the living quality of the population as well as the peasants creates difficulties in the country. On the other hand, the welfare of the population will bring about the welfare of the country. We have to feel the merit and suffering of the people altogether.

¹⁷⁸ *Oetoesan Indonesia* (13 January 1933).

¹⁷⁹ Noto Soeroto Diary (November 5, 1933), as cited from Djajadinigrat-Nieuwenhuis, ‘Noto Soeroto: His Ideas and the Late Colonial Intellectual Climate’: 65.

¹⁸⁰ *Oetoesan Indonesia* (20 July 1933).

¹⁸¹ *Oetoesan Indonesia* (20 July 1933).

We cannot choose only to feel their happiness, but then forget the bitter condition of the people at the same time.”¹⁸²

The Prince and PKN’s contribution to Indonesian nationalism was the fostering of the term Indonesia with ‘soft approach’ to the people of Yogyakarta. Prince Soerjadinigrat did not speak about the glory of the court of Yogyakarta or Javanese nationalism. His many speeches in the PKN congress and the editorial columns of *Kawoela* (the PKN monthly newspaper) mentioned ‘Indonesian’ or the ‘motherland solidarity’ where the Javanese was one part of it. As a Javanese prince with hundred thousands of followers in PKN, he did not promote Javanese nationalism but Indonesian solidarity nonetheless. PKN, for instance, agreed on the idea to have a “national culture”. One editorial article of *Kawoela* stated that,

“We agree on the idea of national culture [kebudayaan persatuan]. However, it should not mean the end of local culture. We need to create a national culture that can arrange the need of all Indonesian people. On the other hand, local cultures should exist side by side with national culture, because the establishment of national culture does not guarantee that it would be better than local culture...Our conclusion: local culture cannot be eliminated even though there is a national culture that pleases all Indonesian people!”¹⁸³

The significance of *Kawoela* to accept the idea of national culture was not only related to cultural sense, but it was about the concept of nationalism that showed the inclination to be absorbed in the idea of greater Indonesian nationalism. On the other hand, at this time the Dutch government still reluctant to use the term Indonesia. One government *Nota* in 1939 stated that the usage of the term Indonesian was a “political agitation” and it contained connotation that was “unacceptable” to the government.¹⁸⁴

Prince Soerjadinigrat and the *Kawoela* were not absent in the discourse of national independence during this period. One edition of *Kawoela* published an article (with pen name Rahardja) which described about freedom for all the people. It said,

¹⁸² *Oetoesan Indonesia* (31 July 1933).

¹⁸³ *Kawoela* (December 1938).

¹⁸⁴ Elson, *The Idea*: 92.

“Freedom [*mardika*] can bring happiness to both men and women. With freedom, women can attain higher level of knowledge. Men, on the other hand, will achieve high morale and manners. Both men and women will get benefit from the state of freedom. But Freedom needs to have its limit. We have to remember that we are the nation that created by Pangeran Kang Murbeng Dumadi [Almighty God] indifferent to any nation. We do, however, have our own morale. It is the line and border of freedom for Eastern Nation.”¹⁸⁵

By the term freedom (*mardika*), this article means freedom from colonial rule. But it cannot be said that it represented *Kawoela* or Prince Soerjadinigrat, as the author used a pen name to deliver its message. The appearance of this article in *Kawoela* showed that notion of independence is not absence in PKN. Outside the writing on the press and speeches, Prince Soerjadinigrat used symbolic gestures to display his affection toward the idea of Indonesia. He was frequently invited to attend meeting and congresses of other organizations in which he occasionally stood during the singing of *Indonesia Raya* (chosen as the nationalist anthem since 1928), the one that brought complaints by the Dutch. When asked by the Dutch authority about his standing gesture in *Indonesia Raya*, his explanation was simply that his Javanese courtesy taught him not to sit while others stood up.¹⁸⁶ Thus, in this period, Prince Soerjadinigrat paved the way for more democratic courts of Yogyakarta.

5.2. Reaffirming the royal identity, 1938 - 1942

The return of the royal family

At the start of the year 1939, General Phibun Songkhram began to assume the leadership as the third prime minister of Thailand. He came to power after another bloodless coup of Thailand led by himself succeeded in overthrowing Phraya Phahon from

¹⁸⁵ *Kawoela* (July 1938).

¹⁸⁶ O'Malley stated that Prince Soerjadinigrat was “facing a dilemma” whether he had to stand up during the singing of *Indonesia Raya*. But considering his speeches and the view of *Kawoela* toward Indonesia, I do not think that he was confused as O'Malley had suggested. Rather, Prince Soerjadinigrat used symbolic gesture that was common to the Javanese. When the complaints mounted from the Dutch, he decided to send his family member to represent him in the standing for *Indonesia Raya*. I quoted this data on Prince Soerjadinigrat standing during the singing of *Indonesia Raya* from: O'Malley, *Indonesia in the Great*: 320, 350.

the seat of prime minister. Phibun's political ideal was to change the identity of Thailand into his idea of official nationalism. Previously, many leaders of 1932 Revolution felt the need to include the royal family in the new government, resulting in several princes being appointed as Advisers. The plan to commemorate the 1932 revolution day (24 June) as an official celebration was rejected by Phraya Phahon's government on the ground that it would irritate the royal family and their supporters.¹⁸⁷ Under Phibun, his first plan was to create 24 June 1939 as "Thai National day". This means that the Thai government endorsed completely the 'struggle' of the revolution against the king and the royal family. Phibun was the one who commanded the government's army to strike the rebellion army of Prince Bowaradej. The creation of Thai National Day, therefore, connected to the glorification of his role in the 1932 revolution. On the day of 24 June 1939, the nation celebrated the revolution with military parade, community events, and so on. Official announcement was prepared by Director General of Fine Arts Department, Luang Wichit Wathakan to be distributed to all schools in Thailand. An excerpt of the text is as follow:

"Seven to eight years ago the country was in a precarious position. Our armed forces were weak, the economy was disintegrating and the people were in need. The wealth of the nation was being wasted and progress was dreadfully slow. The government ruled the people like a master rules a slave... Then on 24 June 1932 a group of military men and civilians joined forces and changed the administration of the country."¹⁸⁸

Here we see that the role of the military in the revolution was emphasized by Wichit Wathakan. It was different than the "Announcement of the People's Party 1932" which stressed on the participation of all the people of Thailand. The "Announcement" of 1932 originally said: "Therefore the people, government officials, soldiers, and citizens who know about these evil actions of the government, have joined together to establish the People's Party and have seized power from the king's government."¹⁸⁹ Moreover, Phibun government officially changed the country name of "Siam" to "Thailand" during the

¹⁸⁷ Barme, *Luang Wichit*: 139.

¹⁸⁸ Barme, *Luang Wichit*: 140 – 141.

¹⁸⁹ "Announcement of The People's Party No. 1 (1932)": 71.

national day of 1939.¹⁹⁰ In his version of official nationalism, Phibun launched “hyper-nationalism” of Thailand. He enforced a general convention to all Thai people to follow the same Thai language, the same dress (Western attire), and the same daily habit (i.e. eating, drinking, sport) in the so-called ‘*Rathaniyom*’ (state convention).¹⁹¹ Thai economic policies also followed Phibun’s direction of nationalism with the campaign of “Thai Economy for the Thai people”.¹⁹² With hyper-nationalism, he asked all Thai people – including the Chinese, the Malay - to become ‘fully Thai’.

During Phibun period, the royal family virtually did not take part in the formulation of hyper-nationalism. Several ‘democratic princes’ played some role as Advisers, including Prince Wan who became an important Adviser to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. But their influence was limited in Thai politics at that time, with many other princes chose to stay put from political life. The royal family made a ‘come back’ to Thai politics when Japanese invasion to Southeast Asia came nearer in 1941. One prominent figure of the royal family to take the lead at that moment was M.R Seni Pramoj. He was the Thailand Minister Plenipotentiary to the United States during 1940 – 1945. He disliked the measures implemented by Phibun government with its hyper-nationalism, especially those related to persecuting the Chinese in Thailand.¹⁹³ In Washington, he found the momentum to oppose Phibun. In the first place, Seni agreed with Phibun to declared Neutrality in the World War II. In November 1941, Seni spoke about Thailand’s pledge for independence, stating if Japan attack Thailand, “Japan will go through Thailand over our dead bodies.”¹⁹⁴ When Japan attacked US military base in Pearl Harbor on 7 December 1942, Seni Pramoj issued a declaration inaugurating the Free Thai (or the *Seri Thai*) Movement from Washington DC without his government consent.¹⁹⁵ Seni Pramoj’s measures in Washington focused on

¹⁹⁰ Barme, *Luang Wichit*: 147.

¹⁹¹ Incidentally, Phibun Songkhram introduced fascist ideas into Thailand’s nationalism. This would not have been done by King Prajadhipok in 1932. For hyper-nationalism of Thailand, see: Barme, *Luang Wichit*: 144 – 170.

¹⁹² Under Phibun, the “Thai people” referred to Thai farmers, workers, and consumers. In: Akira Suehiro, *Capital Accumulation in Thailand, 1855 – 1985* (Chiang Mai, Silkworm Books: 1996): 130.

¹⁹³ M.R. Seni Pramoj, ‘Political Memoirs: Mom Rajawongse Seni Pramoj’, in Jayanta Kumar Ray, *Portraits of Thai Politics* (Calcutta, Orient Longman: 1972): 149.

¹⁹⁴ *Washington Post* (28 November 1941).

¹⁹⁵ M.R. Seni Pramoj, *Political Memoirs: Mom Rajawongse Seni Pramoj*: 150.

war propaganda against the Japanese in Thailand. In 12 December, he broadcasted a speech in BBC, All India Radio, and Singapore Radio to urge all Thai to “fight” for the independence.¹⁹⁶ He also wrote an article in Washington Post to response a critics that Thailand will soon “wave the white flag” to Japan. He stated,

“The Thai will to resist was strong, I can assure you, as evidenced by our struggle of centuries to maintain our independence... As to the reported alliance between conquered Thailand and the conquering Japanese, I am convinced equally that history will reveal the melancholy farce which the Japanese are enacting before the world in this regard... I myself cannot trust any news from Thailand of so fantastically unbelievable a nature. For this reason, I am continuing in this country to bend my every energy, as the appointed official representative of the Thai people, toward the eventual defeat of Japan and the triumphant of the democracies, among which I am proud to count my native land.”¹⁹⁷

From Washington, Seni sent telegrams and letters to his friends and royal family members abroad requesting support in the Free Thai Movement. Seni also sent telegram to King Ananda Mahidol (Rama VIII) who was studying in Switzerland to declare his will to “struggle for the freedom of our country”.¹⁹⁸ He then asked Thai students in the United States to enlist in the military for the Free Thai movement, which resulted in many students joined Free Thai Movement.¹⁹⁹ The Thai in America seemed to cooperate well with Free-Thai Movement. Therefore, when Phibun declared war to England and the United States on 25 January 1942, Free Thai Movement already being formed abroad.

In England, the situation was not all that positive but turned to be in favour of Seni Pramoj and the Free Thai Movement. King Prajadhipok had just passed away in May 1941. Prince Chula Chakrabongse, the son of prominent Prince Chakrabongse, declined invitation to join Free Thai Movement due to personal choice and illness.²⁰⁰ Other royal

¹⁹⁶ E. Bruce Reynolds, *Thailand's Secret War: OSS, SOE, and the Free Thai Underground during World War II* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 2010): 14.

¹⁹⁷ *Washington Post* (19 December 1941).

¹⁹⁸ Reynolds, *Thailand's*: 14.

¹⁹⁹ Sorasak Ngamcachonkulid, *The New History of the Seri Thai Movement* (Bangkok, Institute of Asian Studies Chulalongkorn University: 2010): 151.

²⁰⁰ H.R.H. Prince Chula Chakrabongse, *The Twain Have Met or An Eastern Prince Met West* (London, G.T. Foulis & Co. Ltd: 1956): 238.

family members in England sympathetically joined Free Thai Movement, including Queen Rambhai Barni (the widow of the late King Chulalongkorn), Prince Chakrabandhu, and Prince Suphasawat.²⁰¹ Although very small in number, they were still quite influential in the eyes of Thai people. They were the ones to organize the resistance from England against the Phibun government and Japan. In 1942, Prince Suphasawat organized Special Operation Executive (SOE) based in England. He commanded the supports of Thai students in England who called the prince with the code name “Major Arun”.²⁰² When the war progressed in 1943, it was Prince Suphasawat who made a deal with Pridi Banomyong, the leader of Free Thai Movement in Thailand. His appeal to Pridi was to ask for “general amnesty of all political prisoners” which means the return of the royal family in Thai political life. Pridi, in need of the support of the royal family to oppose Phibun, agreed with Prince Suphasawat.²⁰³ But at that moment it was still unclear who would win the war, whether it was the Allies and the Free Thai Movement or the Japanese with Phibun government. Nevertheless, the Thai royal family had made a comeback in Thai politics. The decision of MR. Seni Pramoj and Prince Suphasawat to reject the Japanese ‘occupation’ from abroad was important to determine the view of the Allies toward Thailand as ‘partly’ in support of the Allies, rather than to recognize her fully as an enemy in 1942. This decisive moment in Thai history helped to win the trust of the royal family to the people of Thailand. The return of royal family to Thai politics had the implication that the position of the monarchy became stronger in Thailand. The country reaffirmed the identity of the nation created by King Vajiravudh, that was the unity between the nation (*chat*), Buddhism (*satsana*), and the king (*phramahakesat*).

The consolidation of Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX

²⁰¹ Reynolds, *Thailand's*: 24.

²⁰² Reynolds, *Thailand's*: 151.

²⁰³ In Thailand, the royal family did not initiate to organize themselves into resistance against Japanese or Phibun. They were constantly being watched by spies of Phibun government. With the assurance of Pridi and Prince Suphasawat, several members of royal family who resided in Thailand joined Free-Thai Movement. One of the Free Thai Movement members in Thailand was Prince Dhani Nivat the late Thai Minister of Public Instruction. See: Ngamcachonkulkid, *The New*: 154.

At the end of the 1930s, Yogyakarta experienced a political succession for the throne of Kasultanan court. The political succession of this period is important due to the war that came close to Java. A strong leader was needed for Yogyakarta.²⁰⁴ In the light of the changing political situation in the coming years, decisions from a capable sultan were needed. Especially when it comes to the views toward “Indonesian nationalism”, “pro-Dutch”, and “Indonesian independence”. From the beginning, Sultan Hamengku Buwono VIII did not appoint a crown prince. Therefore, the choice to appoint G.R.M Dorodjatun as his successor was made shortly before Sultan Hamengku Buwono VIII passed away in October 1939. G.R.M. Dorodjatun was one of the few princes from Kasultanan who received western education since his early childhood.²⁰⁵ His education pattern followed the line of education for the ‘high princes of Java’. He went to *Fröbel* (Dutch kindergarten), *ELS B* and *Neutrale Europese Lagere School* in Yogyakarta for his early education. After that, he went to *Hogere Burgerlijke School* (HBS) in Semarang and Bandung. During the time of his education, Dorodjatun did not live in the palace. His father sent him to live with several Dutch families to familiarize himself with the custom of the Dutch as well as to teach him “discipline” and “simplicity”.²⁰⁶ At one point, his father sent Dorodjatun to HBS-B in Haarlem, the Netherlands where he completed his secondary school in 1934. After that, Dorodjatun continued his study of Indology at Leiden University.

During this important phase in his life, Dorodjatun did not involve in politics. He did not make a contact with the PI nor with Indonesian nationalists in the Netherlands that might raise suspicion from the Dutch authority. He sometimes met Indonesians from *Roekoen Peladjar Indonesia* (Indonesian Students Solidarity –ROEPI), a non-political organization where his brothers, Tinggarto and Raisoelngaskari became its members.²⁰⁷ Instead of Indonesian politics, he was active as a member of *Leidsche Studenten Corps* (the

²⁰⁴ Pakualam court already experienced political succession in 1937 and enthroned Paku Alam VIII as the ruler of Pakualam principality in Yogyakarta.

²⁰⁵ Four sons of Sultan Hamengkubuwono VIII who received high educations to the Netherlands were G.R.M Dorodjatun (Sultan Hamengkubuwono IX), G.R.M. Tinggarto (Prince Prabuningrat), G.R.M. Raisoelngaskari (Prince Bintoro), and G.R.M. Ila’oel Kirami. In: Poeze, *Di Negeri*: 288.

²⁰⁶ Atmakusumah, ed. *Tahta untuk Rakyat: Celah-Celah Kehidupan Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX* (Jakarta, Gramedia: 1982): 28.

²⁰⁷ These Indonesian students were Maruto, Priyono, Maria Ulfah, and Soeripno. See: Atmakusumah, ed. *Tahta untuk Rakyat*: 32; and Poeze, *Di Negeri*: 288.

student militia) and *Sociëteit Minerva* in Leiden.²⁰⁸ Among many of his Dutch friends were Princess Juliana who studied in Leiden at the same time as Prince Dorodjatun. He was also active in Debating Club of Professor Schrieke, whom he said to be one of his favourite teachers.²⁰⁹ As a high prince from Yogyakarta, he probably knew that his movement was observed by the Dutch authority. Involvement in politics could mean a ‘dead letter’ for his promising career in the *kraton*. For once, he went to see a meeting of NSB from his own “curiosity”. In next day, he was called to the Ministry of the Colony.²¹⁰ But his time in the Netherlands was shortened because of the escalation of World War II in Europe. In 1939, before he could finish his bachelor *scriptie*, Sultan Hamengku Buwono VIII called him home and he boarded the last ship from Europe heading for Java. Arriving in Batavia in the same year, Prince Dorodjatun was greeted by his father and several family members. The next moment before the courtesy meeting with Governor-General Tjarda van Starckenborgh Stachouwer (in office 1936 – 1942) in Batavia, Sultan Hamengku Buwono VIII gave him *Keris Kanjeng Kyai Joko Piturun*, the *pusaka ageng* of Kasultanan Yogyakarta. It was a symbol that he was chosen as the Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX.

Critical decisions of Prince Dorodjatun before he became sultan were to make political consolidation within the royal family and to strengthen the monarchy’s position in Colonial Indonesia. Earlier in the history of Java, the problem of the courts of Java was due to the lack of unity within the princes. The double allegiance of *patih* between the court of Yogyakarta and the Dutch government made the situation more difficult to the unity of the court because the *patih* would usually defend the Dutch position. When Prince Dorodjatun was appointed by the Dutch to lead a small group of high princes in ensuring a smooth transition of power, he used this opportunity to gather all the princes for a meeting of succession. At that moment, he asked the princes if there was anyone who wanted to be

²⁰⁸ The *Leidsche Studenten Corps* merged into *Sociëteit Minerva* in 1972. For information on Dorodjatun’s membership in student organization at Leiden, see: Poeze, *Di Negeri*: 288; Dorodjatun also served as a board member in several student organizations such as *Sociëteit Minerva* (as a commissioner) and a chairman of *Verenigde Faculteiten* (association of students from different faculties) at Leiden University. In: Atmakusumah, ed. *Tahta*: 30.

²⁰⁹ Atmakusumah, ed. *Tahta*: 31.

²¹⁰ Atmakusumah, ed. *Tahta*: 31.

the next Sultan.²¹¹ The result was that he got assurances that all princes agreed to him as the next Sultan. His next move was to ensure that a political contract with the Dutch would give him certain advantage as the ruler of Yogyakarta. As his successors before him, political contract was usually made between each sultan and the Dutch government.²¹² For Prince Dorodjatun, his ‘opponent’ at that time was Governor of Yogyakarta Dr. Lucien Adam. With his knowledge in Dutch and Western Science, Prince Dorodjatun was able to deliver fine arguments and analyzed all the points offered by Governor Adam, as compare to earlier rulers who had less language skills and knowledge to do so.²¹³ The discussion took about five months because Dorodjatun insisted on the following points: the elimination of *patih* position, the need to have an Advisory Council to the court with democratic principle (free speech) and the need to have Yogyakarta army legion under Sultan’s command.²¹⁴ Lucien Adam opposition to these demands made the political agreement was difficult to achieve. Hence, as Dorodjatun explained in his biography, during this deadlock, supernatural occurrence came to him and told him to “just sign the contract”.²¹⁵ He followed the decision and therefore concluded the contract in favor of the Dutch demand. In 18 March 1940, Prince Dorodjatun was enthroned as Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX in Yogyakarta. His speech during the enthronement ceremony underlined his identity as a Javanese above his western education. He also stated that he would prefer ‘tradition’ in his reign as long as it did not obstruct progress. He stated:

²¹¹ Dorodjatun in fact continued the Old Mataram tradition to ask the princes directly in a meeting of succession, whether they have any objection of one prince’s candidacy to the throne. For Dorodjatun’s meeting of succession, see: Atmakusumah, ed. *Tahta*: 40.

²¹² Political contract was the foundation of laws, government, and judicial in the principalities. In this regards, it can also be called ‘constitution’ for the monarchy under colonial rule. See: Soedarisman Poerwokoesoemo, *Kasultanan Yogyakarta: Suatu Tinjauan tentang Kontrak Politik (1877 – 1940)*, (Yogyakarta, Gadjah Mada University Press: 1985): 3.

²¹³ Poerwokoesoemo, *Kasultanan Yogyakarta*: 68.

²¹⁴ All the points here are described by Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX in his memoir. See: Atmakusumah, ed. *Tahta*: 43; Monfries tried to match these points with the report by Governor Adam upon the matter and found contradicting statements. Monfries therefore made his own speculation but concluded with a statement that it was a “minor historical mystery”, see: Monfries, *A Prince in a Republic*: 73 – 78.

²¹⁵ Sultan believed that a spirit of Sultan Agung came to him during the condition of “half sleep and half awake” (famous in Javanese cultural tradition) and said, “*Tole, tekene wae, Landa bakal lunga saka bumi kene*” (My boy, just signed it, for the Dutch will leave this country anyway) in: Atmakusumah, ed. *Tahta*: 44.

“Dat de taak die op mij rust, moeilijk en zwaar is, daar ben ik mij tenvolle van bewust, vooral waar het hier gaat de Westerse en de Oosterse geest tot elkaar te brengen, deze beide tot een harmonische samenwerking te doen overgaan zonder de laatste haar karakter doen verliezen. Al heb ik een uitgesproken Westerse opvoeding gehad, toch ben en blijf ik in de allereerste plaats Javaan. Zo zal de adat, zo deze niet remmend werkt op de ontwikkeling, een voorname plaats blijven innemen in de traditierijke Keraton. Moge ik eindigen met de belofte dat ik de belangen van Land en Volk zal behartigen naar mijn beste weten en kunnen.”²¹⁶

Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX did not speak about ‘Indonesia’ during the years 1939 - 1942. He was committed to the task to improve the welfare of his subjects in Yogyakarta, as well as to improve the relation between “East and West” during this period.

Starting from the beginning of his reign, Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX was determined to maintain a good relationship with the people of Yogyakarta. He also wanted the people to stay close with the *kraton*, for instance to let them know the progress of bureaucracy reform of his government. In this regard, Yogyakarta already had PKN with hundred thousands of members to distribute the news and important messages from the *kraton*. Furthermore, he incorporated PKN under his influence by appointing Prince Soerjadiningrat as part of his court circle. The Sultan introduced *Hoedyana – Wara* monthly magazine with editorial members such as Prince Soerjadiningrat, Prince Puruboyo, Prince Tedjokusumo and Prince Prabuningrat.²¹⁷ Prince Soerjadiningrat, having served in PKN for about ten years, was indeed an asset for the sultan. Later during the Japanese occupation, Sultan Hamengkubuwono appointed him as *Panitya Jaga Waluya* (committee of Public Safety) of the court.²¹⁸ Beside the intensification of public press, Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX made direct appeal to the public. He made it a routine for him and his entourages to conduct an inspection to the villages to meet the people and

²¹⁶ Atmakusumah, ed. *Tahta*: 53.

²¹⁷ P.J.Suwarno, *Hamengku Buwono IX dan Sistem Birokrasi Pemerintahan Yogyakarta, 1942 – 1974: Sebuah Tinjauan Historis* (Yogyakarta, Kanisius: 1994): 91.

²¹⁸ Suwarno, *Hamengku Buwono* 107.

local chiefs.²¹⁹ He also made a good contact with prominent organizations in his principality such as *Taman Siswa* school.²²⁰

The efforts of the Sultan to consolidate all elements in Yogyakarta proved to be useful when the Japanese penetrated Southeast Asia. In 7 December 1941, the Japanese attack of Pearl Harbor started World War II in the Pacific. The people of Yogyakarta was also nervous about what would happen to them. Several days after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX made a speech in a radio to calm the people. He said,

“My people, I have been anxious if the Indies would soon experience war... Now there has not been any war here, but will it still be like this tomorrow or the next days? No one will know the answer. But there are people who become stressful with this uncertainty... My People, in order to deal with this situation, it is necessary to help each other. It is our duty to think about others. You should prioritize whatever become your duty for the benefit of others... And put your trust to the court officers who will defend you in time of trouble. I will help you too, and if its needs be, I will help you personally... Three things that you should do during this difficult time: firstly, give your love to others; secondly, have peace [tentram]; thirdly, be trustful to others... My people, let us divide the task together: You fulfill your duty, and I will fulfill mine.”²²¹

Due to the earlier effort by the Sultan to reach his people, the people put their trust in the Courts of Yogyakarta during the time of trouble. This situation was soon demonstrated by the people's loyalty to the sultan. When the Japanese troops arrived in Yogyakarta on 5 March 1942, the Sultan could control his people by asking them not to seize this opportunity for personal benefit. The people also obeyed the Sultan when he decided to be part of the Yogyakarta *Ko* (sultan) under the Japanese occupation.²²² Therefore, in the period from 1939 to 1942, Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX succeeded in consolidating all

²¹⁹ Suwarno, *Hamengku Buwono*: 90.

²²⁰ Suwarno, *Hamengku Buwono*: 103.

²²¹ “Sabda Dalem Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX” (12 December 1941), *Archive of Keraton Kasultanan Yogyakarta*, Yogyakarta.

²²² “Oendang-Oendang Papatih Dalem (Koti Samutyokan) Jogjakarta” (3 August 1942), *Archive of Keraton Kasultanan Yogyakarta*, Yogyakarta.

elements of Yogyakarta under his influence. It was the key for Yogyakarta to go through the period of the Japanese occupation, and to ensure the unity of Yogyakarta in the period afterwards.

5.3. Overview

In the period 1930 – 1942, the ‘new identity’ penetrated further into Thailand and Yogyakarta in two different ways. The revolution of 1932 changed the situation radically which ended the rule as absolute monarch. Whereas in Yogyakarta, Indonesian identity penetrated in a gradual process. But in both Thailand and Yogyakarta at this period, this chapter has shown that the progress of the acceptance of a new identity especially in 1930 - 1939 was equally important. Similar to Thailand that still retained the king and the royal family as part of its national identity, Yogyakarta preserved its Javanese identity along with the support to Indonesian nationalism. PKN was an example of the Javanese persistence to preserve their Javanese identity while accepting the idea of Indonesia. In Thailand, the revolution that accused the king for the problems in the country still viewed the king and the royal family in high regards. At least for Thailand, this situation persisted until 1938 when the Phibun government took power as the third Prime Minister of Thailand. Under Phibun, Thailand was directed into hyper-nationalism which glorified the Revolution of 1932 and the people. The period of Japanese occupation gave the chance for the royal family to unite against Phibun. With the help of Pridi, the royal family made a comeback to Thailand that would determine the character of Thailand as a nation. In a milder way, Yogyakarta also experienced a critical period in the years 1939 – 1942. Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX succeeded to consolidate the princes and the people of Yogyakarta under his influence, including Prince Soerjadinigrat and the PKN. He strengthened the trust of the people to the court of Yogyakarta and thus reaffirmed the identity of the royalty to the people of Yogyakarta.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

This thesis discusses the relationship between the royalty and nationalism in the two traditional courts of Southeast Asia, the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta. It poses one main question, “How did the royal courts of Yogyakarta and Thailand reconcile the idea of nation with egalitarian idea during 1908 - 1945?” There are three sub-questions to support the main question: “What was the origin and foundation of nationalism in Thailand and colonial Indonesia?”, “Why did it change in the period of 1908 – 1945?” and “How did the royal family react to the challenges of nationalism?”

From their establishments, the court of Thailand and Yogyakarta shared several similarities and differences. They were both emerged in the 18th century after a series of internal conflicts and ‘outsider’ intervention. The royal house of Thailand – the Chakri, and

the two royal houses of Yogyakarta – the Kasultanan and Pakualaman - were products of interaction between the local elites of that time. The presence of the Dutch in the political affairs of Yogyakarta made the situation different in the two courts. In the first half of the 19th century, this difference was sharpened even further by the increasing influence of the Dutch in the court of Yogyakarta. From this moment on, Yogyakarta was fully a subordinate to the Dutch Colonial government. They retained a semi-sovereign status to govern the principality of Yogyakarta. The court of Thailand, on the other hand, is a sovereign court. In the 19th century, the court of Thailand increased its control of mainland Southeast Asia, from Laos to the Malayan Peninsula.

Nationalism is related to the identity of a nation. It can hardly arise without the consciousness of the people to form a nation based on common identity. In Thailand and Yogyakarta, the ruler and the people shared common identity based on cultural tradition at first. Royal rituals were performed by the royalty to keep the people under its influence. Sacred objects were controlled to legitimize the kingship and authority of the royalty. This study shows that intensification of royal rituals was not only visible in the court that lost its political influence such as Yogyakarta. It was also present in the court of Thailand that became one political center in the mainland. The court of Yogyakarta used the royal tradition to show the idea of ‘cultural persistence’, while the court of Bangkok used royal tradition to spread the hegemony of the court to outer territory. Royal tradition, therefore, contributed to the creation of a common ‘Thai identity’ and ‘Javanese identity’. These identities were the foundation of nationalism in Thailand and Yogyakarta.

In regards to the origin of nationalism, this thesis argues that there is a relationship between the establishment of the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta to the birth of nationalism from the royalty. The origin of nationalism from the court of Thailand can be attributed to the struggle against the Burmese invader in the 18th century. From then on, the matter about sovereignty of Thailand was part of Thai nationalism. In Yogyakarta, the origin of nationalism is attributed to the courts’ subjugation to Dutch colonialism, which fostered an anti-colonial sentiment. The royal house of Kasultanan and Pakualaman glorified the moment when their predecessor the court of Mataram was still independent

from the Dutch. The prophecy of Joyoboyo tells about the spirit of anti-colonialism of the Javanese since the period of 19th century.

At the end of the 19th century, the common identity between the ruler and the people was expanded further into the idea of common welfare. From this moment onwards, ordinary people in Thailand and colonial Indonesia had more chance to participate in the government and in modernization projects of the country. The emergence of Western powers such as England and France at the Thai border became the drive of Thailand's modernization. The royalty of Thailand gradually realized the importance of modern education and the need to provide education to the people to support modernization. They merged the traditional Buddhist monasteries into the educational system supervised by the government. With this policy, the people religion of Buddhism was strengthened into a national identity of Thailand. In Yogyakarta, on the other hand, the shift of political influence between the court of Yogyakarta to the Dutch colonial government made Kasultanan and Pakualaman royal houses only became passive participants in the creation of state policy. Ethical Policy from the Dutch had a different perspective of modernization. From its basic foundation, Ethical Policy was formulated by the Dutch and not by Indonesians. It was aimed to support the Dutch colonial state. The educated elites among the indigenous were expected to support the Dutch with 'modern' character, such as secular one. Traditional Islamic education from *pesantren* did not become part of the Ethical Policy as Buddhist monastery in modernization policy of Thailand. This measure affected the character of 20th-century educated elites from Yogyakarta. Following the character of modern education from the Dutch, the Yogyakarta elites were secular, modern, and intellectual Javanese. They embraced the west but at the same time did not neglect Javanese culture, the source of their pride and identity.

In the early 20th century, the character of the monarchy gave way to different kind of nationalism in Thailand and Yogyakarta. In the state of absolute monarchy such as in Thailand, nationalism emerged from 'above'. The official nationalism of King Vajiravudh was a product of the king who controlled all aspects of Thailand. King Vajiravudh's nationalism was the 'modern' attempt for the state to influence the people of Thailand in support of the king, religion, and nation. He showed the splendor of Thai sovereignty to

foreign guests as well as Thai public in the court ‘spectacles’ during his enthronement ceremony. He also organized the state-sponsored organizations to enhance his official nationalism into practice. In the colonized state of Yogyakarta, nationalism emerged from ‘below’. The subordinate position of the Sultan of Yogyakarta and the Pakualam to the Dutch made them unable to promote nationalism which related to the foundation of the courts of Yogyakarta. The courts could only promote ‘cultural nationalism’ in the form of Javanese nationalism. ‘Political essence’ of nationalism from Yogyakarta, on the other hand, derived from its educated elites. Instead of nationalism from the sultan or the Pakualam, it was R.M. Soewardi Soeryaningrat who delivered the voice of nationalism to the Dutch Colonial Government and wider public. His educational background as a student of STOVIA in particular connected him to the network of young nationalists at that time, different than many other members of royal family from Yogyakarta. In his article, “*Als Ik Een Nederlander Was..*”, Soewardi’s nationalism was anti-colonial in character. It followed the earlier form of nationalism from Yogyakarta as the subjugated kingdom of the Dutch. Soewardi’s vision of national identity was not only limited to Yogyakarta, but also the unity of the entire territory of colonial Indonesia. From the nationalism by Soewardi and King Vajiravudh, Yogyakarta and Thailand found their basis of nationalism. Their ideas of nationalism became the ground for the development of nationalism in the period of 1908 – 1942. In Thailand, the idea of constitutional monarchy emerged to oppose absolute monarchy. In Yogyakarta, the idea of the unity of the entire territory of colonial Indonesia – the Indonesian nationalism - gained acceptance by the royal family from Kasultanan and pakualaman.

This thesis demonstrates that nationalism from ‘below’ changed the state imposition of nationalism, whether in the absolute monarchy of Thailand or the Dutch-influenced state of Yogyakarta during the period of 1908 – 1942. The pattern started from the emergence of educated elites in Thailand and colonial Indonesia. These elites were educated in the cities such as Bangkok or Batavia, and also abroad such as England or the Netherlands. Educational experience was essential to link the network of educated elites to their ideas of nationalism. Thailand provides a clear and unique case in this matter. Since the elites of Thailand were educated in several countries, the students there created their

own 'cliques' and characters that related to the political change in Thailand. The clique of Pridi Banomyong and Thai students in France was the drive of 1932 Revolution in Thailand. It succeeded in overthrowing the absolute monarchy and created the new Thailand with a new identity based on equality. From the Netherlands, the members of *Perhimpunan Indonesia* (PI) became the promoters of Indonesian nationalism from abroad. When they returned to the colony, they continued their activities to promote Indonesian nationalism. Different than in Thailand, the vision of one identity in colonial Indonesia was not accepted until at least the late 1920s. The collaboration between the ex-PI – the Netherlands graduates and youth organizations in colonial Indonesia succeeded in formulating the Youth Pledge (*Sumpah Pemuda*) in 1928. From this point onward, the identity of Indonesia was accepted gradually into Yogyakarta.

In the court of Thailand and Yogyakarta, nationalism was part of the state project and vision to unite the court and the people with one common identity. But in the period of 1908 – 1942, another type of nationalism that emerged in this period, the 'people's nationalism', came forward and challenge nationalism from the court. From the people's nationalism, the courts were asked to change their identity that related to politics as well as cultural. People's nationalism even forced the court of Thailand to replace the absolute monarchy into constitutional monarchy in the 1932 revolution. The consequence of the 1932 Revolution was the removal of the King Prajadiphok and Thai royal family from politics. With the resource that they had, the royal family tried to come back to control the central politics again soon afterwards. But the combination of the civil and military elements of the People's Party was able to resist the reactionaries. In Yogyakarta, people's nationalism influenced the courts of Yogyakarta in gradual development. The courts of Yogyakarta began to accept the idea of Indonesian nationalism from the period of 1930s. *Taman Siswa* and PKN became the promoters of Indonesian nationalism from Yogyakarta. The two organizations emerged from the basic needs of the people to have better education and receive information from the authority. The initiator of Taman Siswa and PKN were members of the royal family from Pakualaman and Kasultanan, Soewardi Soryaningrat and Prince Soerjadinigrat. They were supported by the court of Yogyakarta from various means. Therefore, it can be said that the court of Yogyakarta reacted positively to

Indonesian nationalism starting from the 1930s. In terms of culture, the core of Javanese nationalism, PKN support toward national identity of Indonesia in the late 1930s tells us that Indonesian nationalism already influenced the court of Yogyakarta in a considerable degree.

From here, people's nationalism might look to be in dominant position in Thailand and Yogyakarta. But in the period of 1939 – 1942, the people's nationalism was contested again by the royalty. The Japanese occupation under Phibun government made the royal family of Thailand consolidated their power to make a comeback in Thai politics, led by M.R. Seni Pramoj and the Free Thai Movement. In Yogyakarta, Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX consolidated all elements of his court in this period, including Prince Soerjadinigrat and the PKN. Under his rule, Yogyakarta reaffirmed its Javanese identity and left Indonesian nationalism 'untouched'. In Thailand, the comeback of the royal family to Thai politics also reaffirmed the royalty as one identity of Thailand.

This comparative study shows that the egalitarian idea was a dominant political force in the period of 1908 – 1942. It forced the courts of Thailand and Yogyakarta to change into more democratic, more egalitarian, government. The absolute monarchy of Thailand was changed by the people's revolution of 1932. From then on, it became a constitutional monarchy and placed the king only as a symbol. In Yogyakarta, the court adapted itself into Indonesian identity and appealed more to the people. The slogan 'the royal family for the people' from PKN as early as 1932 was a realization that the royal court's existence is to serve the people. Further development of the royalty during Japanese occupation and the early years after the war is also important for comparative explanation. But we have to leave it now for another study.

Bibliography

Archives

“Sabda Dalem Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX” (12 December 1941). *Archive of Keraton Kasultanan Yogyakarta*. Yogyakarta.

“Oendang-Oendang Papatih Dalem (Koti Samutyokan) Jogjakarta” (3 August 1942). *Archive of Keraton Kasultanan Yogyakarta*. Yogyakarta.

Newspaper articles

Bangkok Daily Mail (1 July 1929).

Bangkok Daily Mail (23 July 1929).

De Express (19 July 1913).

De Express (28 July 1913).

Kawoela (December 1938).

Kawoela (July 1938).

Oetoesan Indonesia (13 January 1933).

Oetoesan Indonesia (20 July 1933).

Oetoesan Indonesia (31 July 1933).

Oetoesan Indonesia (31 July 1934).

The Manchester Guardian (1 December 1911).

The New York Times (3 December 1911).

The Siam Observer (1 October 1919).

Washington Post (4 February 1912).

Washington Post (28 November 1941).

Washington Post (19 December 1941).

Source Publication

Asvabahu (King Vajiravudh), *A Siam Miscellany: A Reprint of Articles Written by "Asvabahu" to the "Siam Observer" and Appearing in its Columns during The Period of August 5, to December 31, 1912* (Bangkok, Siam Observer Printing Office).

Snouck Hurgronje, C. *Nederland en De Islam* (Leiden, Brill: 1915).

Jaarlijksch Verslag der School Tot Opleiding van Inlandse Artsen te Weltevreden Over den Cursus 1904 – 1905 (Batavia, Landsdrukkerij: 1906).

Banomyong, Pridi. *Pridi by Pridi: Selected Writings on Life, Politics and Economy* (Chiang Mai, Silkworm Books: 2000).

Batson, Benjamin. A. ed. *Siam's Political Future: Documents from the End of the Absolute Monarchy* (Ithaca, Cornell Data Paper: 1974).

Kartini, R.A. *Letters of a Javanese Princess* (New York, Norton: 1964).

Kerapatan Besar-Indonesia Moeda Jang ke-I (29 Desember 1930 – 2 Januari 1931) di Surakarta (1931).

Soembangsih: Gedenkboek Boedi-Oetomo, 20 Mei 1908 – 20 Mei 1918 (Amsterdam, Tijdschrift Nederlandsch Indie Oud&Nieuw: 1918).

Soeryaningrat, R.M. Soewardi. *Vlugschrift No. 1: Als Ik Eens Nederlander Was...* (Bandung, Inlandsch Comite tot Herdenking van Neêrlands Honderdjarige Vrijheid: 1913).

'Treaty Between Great Britain and Siam', *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 3, No. 4, Supplement: Official Documents (October 1909): 297 – 304.

Vajiranana, Prince. *The Buddhist Attitude towards National Defence and Administration* (no place of publication: 1916).

Books and articles

Abeyasekare, Susan. 'Partai Indonesia Raja, 1936 – 1942: A Study in Cooperative Nationalism', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 3, 2 (1972): 262 – 276.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, Verso: 1983).

Atmakusumah, ed. *Tahta untuk Rakyat: Celah-Celah Kehidupan Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX* (Jakarta, Gramedia: 1982).

Baker, Chris and Pasuk Phongpaichit, *A History of Thailand* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 2014).

Barme, Scot. *Luang Wichit Wathakan and the Creation of Thai Identity* (Singapore, ISEAS: 1993).

Batson, Benjamin A. *The End of the Absolute Monarchy in Siam* (Singapore, Oxford University Press: 1984).

_____. 'Review: Thawatt Mokarapong, *History of the Thai Revolution: A Study in Political Behaviour* (Chalermnit, Bangkok: 1972)', *Journal of the Siam Society*, 61, 2 (July 1973): 186 – 196.

- Benda, Harry J. 'The Pattern of Administrative Reforms in the Closing Years of Dutch Rule in Indonesia', *Journal of Asian Studies*, 25 (1966): 589 – 605.
- Blofeld, John. *King Maha Mongkut of Siam* (Bangkok, Siam Society: 1987).
- Bumbongkarn, Suchit and Prudhisana Jumbala, eds. *Monarchy and Constitutional Rule in Democratizing Thailand* (Bangkok, Institute of Thai Studies Chulalongkorn University: 2012).
- Bunnag, Tej. *The Provincial Administration of Siam, 1892 – 1915: The Ministry of the Interior under Prince Damrong Rajanubhab* (Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press: 1977).
- Chakrabongse, H.R.H. Prince Chula. *The Twain Have Met or An Eastern Prince Met West* (London, G.T. Foulis & Co. Ltd: 1956).
- Coedes, George. *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia* (Honolulu, East-West Center: 1968).
- Colenbrander, H.T. and J.E. Stokvis. *Leven en Arbeid van Mr. C.Th. van Deventer, Vol. 2* (Amsterdam, P.N. Van Kampen en Zoon: 1916).
- Day, Clive. *The Policy and Administration of the Dutch in Java* (Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press: 1972)
- Dewantara, Bambang Sokawati. *Raja Mogok, R.M. Soerjopranoto: Sebuah Kenangan* (Jakarta, Hasta Mitra: 1983).
- _____. *Nyi Hajar Dewantara Dalam Kisah dan Data* (Jakarta, Gunung Agung: 1979).
- Dhofier, Zamakhsyari. *Tradisi Pesantren: Studi Pandangan Hidup Kyai dan Visinya Mengenai Masa Depan Indonesia* (Jakarta, LP3ES: 2011).
- Djajadiningrat-Nieuwenhuis, Madelon. 'Noto Soeroto: His Ideas and the Late Colonial Intellectual Climate', *Indonesia*, 55 (April 1993): 41 – 72.
- Elson, Robert. *The Idea of Indonesia; A History* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 2008).
- Geertz, Clifford. *Religion of Java* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press: 1976).
- Greene, Stephen Lyon Wakeman. *Absolute Dreams: Thai Government under Rama VI, 1910 – 1925* (Bangkok, White Lotus: 1999).

- Grenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press: 1992).
- Heine-Geldern, Robert. *Conceptions of State and Kingship in Southeast Asia* (Ithaca, Cornell Data Paper Number 18: 1956).
- Hell, Stefan. *Siam and The League of Nations: Modernisation, Sovereignty and Multilateral Diplomacy, 1920 – 1940* (Bangkok, River Books: 2010).
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789 – 1848* (London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson: 1962).
- Ishii, Yoneo. *Sangha, State, and Society: Thai Buddhism in History* (Honolulu, The University of Hawaii Press: 1986).
- Ismail, Ibnu Qoyim. *Kiai Penghulu Jawa: Peranannya di Masa Kolonia* (Jakarta, Gema Insani Press: 1997).
- Jumsai, Sumet. 'Prince Prisdang and The Proposal for The First Siamese Constitution, 1885', *Journal of the Siam Society*, 92 (2004).
- Kasetsiri, Charnvit. *Studies in Thai and Southeast Asian History* (Bangkok, The Foundation for The Promotion of Social Science and Humanities Textbooks Projects: 2015).
- Keyes, Charles F. *Thailand: Buddhist Kingdom as Modern Nation-State* (Colorado, Westview Press: 1987).
- _____. 'Buddhism and National Integration in Thailand', *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 30, 3 (May, 1971): 551 – 567.
- Kroeskamp, H. *Early Schoolmasters in a Developing Country: A History of Experiments in School Education in 19th century Indonesia* (Assen, Van Gorcum & Comp.: 1974).
- Lange, Matthew. *Comparative-Historical Methods: An Introduction* (London, SAGE Publications Ltd.: 2013).
- Landon, Kenneth Perry. *The Chinese in Thailand* (New York, Russel&Russel: 1973).
- Larson, George D. *Prelude to Revolution: Palaces and Politics in Surakarta, 1912 – 1942* (Leiden, KITLV: 1987).
- Le May, Reginald. *An Asian Arcady* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1936).

- Locher-Scholten, Elsbeth. *Ethiek in Fragmenten: Vijf Studies over Koloniaal Denken en Doen van Nederlanders in de Indonesische Archipel, 1877 – 1942* (Utrecht, HES Publisher: 1981).
- Loftus, A.J. *The Kingdom of Siam: Its Progress and Prospects* (Huntingdon, 1891).
- Lombard, Denys. *Nusa Jawa: Silang Budaya: Kajian Sejarah Terpadu Bagian 3: Warisan Kerajaan-Kerajaan Konsentris* (Jakarta, Gramedia: 1996).
- McVey, Ruth T. 'Taman Siswa and the Indonesian National Awakening', *Indonesia*, 4 (October 1967): 128 – 149.
- Miert, Hans van. *Dengan Semangat Berkobar: Nasionalisme dan Gerakan Pemuda di Indonesia, 1918 – 1930* (Jakarta, Hasta Mitra: 2003).
- Moertono, Soemarsaid. *State and Statecraft in Old Java: A Study of the Later Mataram Period, 16th to 19th Century* (Ithaca, Cornell Modern Indonesia Project: 1981).
- Mohammad, Ghamal Satya. 'Widjojo Koesoemo Between Tradition and Science: 1830 – 1939' (Bachelor thesis, Leiden University: 2014).
- Monfries, John. *A Prince in a Republic: The Life of Sultan Hamengkubuwono IX of Yogyakarta* (Singapore, ISEAS: 2015).
- Mulder, Niels. *Java – Thailand: A Comparative Perspective* (Yogyakarta, Gadjah Mada University Press: 1983).
- Multatuli. *Max Havelaar* (Amsterdam, Van Oorschot: 1949).
- Nagazumi, Akira. *The Dawn of Indonesian Nationalism: The Early Years of Boedi Oetomo, 1908 – 1918* (Tokyo, Institute of Developing Economies: 1972).
- Ngamcachonkulkid, Sorasak. *The New History of the Seri Thai Movement* (Bangkok, Institute of Asian Studies Chulalongkorn University: 2010).
- Niel, Robert van. *The Emergence of the Modern Indonesian Elite* (The Hague, Van Hoeve: 1960).
- O'Malley, William Joseph. *Indonesia in the Great Depression: A Study of East Sumatra and Jogjakarta in the 1930's* (unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, Cornell University: 1977).

- _____. 'The Pakempalan Kawulo Ngajogjakarta: An Official Report on the Jogjakarta People's Party of the 1930s', *Indonesia*, 26 (1 October 1978): 111 – 158.
- Panitia Buku Peringatan Taman Siswa 30 Tahun. *Dari Kebangunan Nasional sampai Proklamasi Kemerdekaan: Kenang-Kenangan Ki Hadjar Dewantara* (Jakarta, Pustaka Penerbit Endang: 1952).
- Poerwokoesoemo, Soedarisman. *Kasultanan Yogyakarta: Suatu Tinjauan tentang Kontrak Politik (1877 – 1940)*, (Yogyakarta, Gadjah Mada University Press: 1985).
- Poeze, Harry A. *Di Negeri Penjajah: Orang Indonesia di Negeri Belanda, 1600 – 1950* (Jakarta, KPG: 2014).
- Ras, J.J. *Masyarakat dan Kesusastraan di Jawa* (Jakarta, Pustaka Obor: 2014).
- Ray, Jayanta Kumar. *Portraits of Thai Politics* (Calcutta, Orient Longman: 1972)
- Reynolds, E. Bruce. *Thailand's Secret War: OSS, SOE, and the Free Thai Underground during World War II* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 2010).
- Ricklefs, M.C. *Polarising Javanese Society: Islamic and Other Visions, c. 1830 – 1930* (Leiden, KITLV: 2007).
- _____. *A History of Modern Indonesia Since c. 1300* (Hongkong, Macmillan: 1993).
- _____. *Yogyakarta under Sultan Mangkubumi, 1749 – 1792: A History of the Division of Java* (London, Oxford University Press: 1974).
- Ricks, Jacob I. 'National Identity and The Geo-Soul: Spiritually Mapping Siam', *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 8, 1 (2008): 120 – 141.
- Roff, William R. 'Indonesian and Malay Students in Cairo in the 1920's', *Indonesia*, 9 (April, 1970): 73 – 87.
- Sartraproong, Karnnikar. *A True Hero: King Chulalongkorn of Siam's Visit to Singapore and Java in 1871* (Bangkok, Tana Press and Graphic: 2004).
- Scherer, Savitri Prastiti. *Harmony and Dissonance: Early Nationalist Thought in Java* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press).
- Schmutzers, Eduard J.M. *Dutch Colonial Policy and The Search for Identity in Indonesia, 1920 – 1931* (Leiden, Brill: 1977).

- Siam Society. *The Siam Society Fiftieth Anniversary Commemorative Publication – Selected Articles from the Siam Society Journal*. (Bangkok, Siam Society: 1954).
- Siraishi, Takashi. *An Age in Motion: Popular Radicalism in Java, 1912 – 1926* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press: 1990).
- Soeratman, Darsiti. *Kehidupan Dunia Keraton Surakarta, 1830 – 1939* (Yogyakarta, Taman Siswa: 1989).
- Stetson, Richard Saw. *Siam's Diplomacy of Independence, 1855 – 1909, in the Context of Anglo – French Interest* (Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, New York University: 1969).
- Suehiro, Akira. *Capital Accumulation in Thailand, 1855 – 1985* (Chiang Mai, Silkworm Books: 1996).
- Sutherland, Heather. *The Making of a Bureaucratic Elite: The Colonial Transformation of the Javanese Priyayi* (Singapore, Heinemann Educational Books: 1979).
- Suwarno, P.J. *Hamengku Buwono IX dan Sistem Birokrasi Pemerintahan Yogyakarta, 1942 – 1974: Sebuah Tinjauan Historis* (Yogyakarta, Kanisius: 1994).
- Syamananda, Rong. *A History of Thailand* (Bangkok, Chulalongkorn University Press: 1993).
- Surjomihardjo, Abdurrachman. *Kota Yogyakarta Tempo Doeloe: Sejarah Sosial 1880 – 1930* (Depok, Komunitas Bambu: 1998).
- Tsuchiya, Kenji. 'The Taman Siswa Movement – Its Early Eight Years and Javanese Background', *Journal of Southeast Asia Studies*, 6, 2 (September 1975): 164 – 177.
- Vella, Walter Francis. *Chaiyo! King Vajiravudh and the Development of Thai Nationalism* (Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press: 1978).
- Vredenbregt, J. 'The Haddj. Some of its Features and Functions in Indonesia', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 118, 1 (1962).
- W.D (real name unknown), 'Brief History of Siam, with a Detail of the Leading Events in Its Annals', *The Chinese Repository*, XX, 7 (July 1851): 345 – 363.
- Wales, H.G. Quaritch. *Siamese State Ceremonies: Their History and Function with Supplementary Notes* (Richmond, Curzon Press: 1992).
- Wetzler, Peter Michael. *Hirohito and War: Imperial Tradition and Military Decision Making in Prewar Japan* (Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press: 1998).

Wilson, David A. *Politics in Thailand* (Cornell, Cornell University Press: 1962).

Wiselius, J.A.B. 'Djaja Baja: Zijn Leven en Profetieen', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Laan-, en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, 19, 1 (1872): 172 – 217.

Wyatt, David K. *The Politics of Reform in Thailand: Education in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn* (New Haven, Yale University Press: 1969).