



TECHNIUM
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

Vol. 18, 2021

**A new decade
for social changes**

www.techniumscience.com

ISSN 2668-7798



9 772668 779000

Third Space of Communication in Soekarno's Thought

Fidelis Aggiornamento Saintio

Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia
aggiorn@gmail.com

Anang Sujoko

Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia
anangsujoko@ub.ac.id

Wawan Sobari

Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia
wawansobari@ub.ac.id

Abstract. Viewed from the perspective of the third space of communication, colonialism is no longer a moment of the West's domination over the East. The boundary between superiority and inferiority is removed by exchanges of influences. In addition, the third space of communication can also be used as a means of fusing different cultures and values. However, when applied in certain contexts, there are opportunities to enrich the idea of a third space of communication. The enrichment of this idea can be found in the state speech made by President Soekarno on June 1, 1945. Apart from formulating the foundation of the Indonesian state, the speech also aimed to unite the diverse Indonesian peoples into one national identity. Through a hermeneutics analysis, it was found that there was no need to fuse or remove diversity to form a third space of communication

Keywords. third space of communication, colonialism, Soekarno, 1 June 1945 speech, national identity

Introduction

The third space of communication is a space where two or more cultures meet; this space encourages the marginalized to get a "stage". Meanings, values, and beliefs that were originally fixed were interpreted in a new way (Bhabha, 1994). The newness may include power and political structures, and belief values which in turn renew the authority and traditions of the past (Rutherford, 1990). In the third space, a culture can no longer be understood as something that stands alone, or is dualistic (binary) when faced with others (Bhabha, 1994). According to Bhabha, there will be a new relationship between self and other, first and third world, master and slave. In the third space, culture which is viewed as rigid seems to become a fragile syncretic.

In the context of post-colonialism, Bhabha (1994) saw this third space of communication as a meeting place for Western cultures and the cultures of the colonized (Eastern) societies. Bhabha did not see colonialism as a moment of dichotomy between cultures

(West-East, Islam-Christian). Whereas previously the colonizers "had the right" to stereotype Eastern nations because of their resources and academic abilities, Bhabha considered this as not always successful because there were always tensions between illusion difference and reality (Huddart, 2006). It is called illusion, because the hegemony practices are always based on a stereotypical mind-set which is false identification, arresting identity and denying play of difference (Bhabha, 1994). Via stereotyping, the Eastern wealth is forced into a limited Western perspective.

This stereotyping practice may eventually give birth to mimicry, in which the colonized imitates the colonizers. This is due to the colonialists' desire to reform and re-identify the colonized (Huddart, 2006). The colonizers camouflaged this narrative in such a way as if it were a civilizing moment (or, in the language of Soekarno: mission sacree – (Soekarno, n.d.). However, this mimicry failed to work because essentially the two cultures (the colonizer and the colonized) could not be likened. This practice continued because colonialism needed legitimacy to continue to colonize. In the end, beautiful dictions such as civilizing and educating were used as a cover.

However, in the third space of communication, those stereotypes and mimicry can be negated. According to Bhabha (1994), in the third space of communication, each culture may influence each other. It is not true that the West is more superior to have the right to civilize an inferior East. Therefore, the fundamental character of the third space is actually a productive space because it contains an exchange of influences. Instead of being seen as a dominating and dichotomous moment, the meeting of Western and Eastern cultures is seen as a contact zone that triggers translation between cultures (Raj, 2014).

Third space of communication is different from the principle of assimilation in acculturation. Assimilation is more like the process of individual adjustment to local culture (Jamal, Kizgin, Rana, Laroche, & Dwivedi, 2019). Whereas the character of the third space of communication is more towards an equalization of colonized and colonizer cultures (Ikas & Wagner, 2008). In third space communication, cultures are equalized. Because it is related to equality, the third space of communication can be used as a means to fight against Western hegemony over the East.

Thus the third space of communication can also be used by the inferior (subaltern) to fight against the hegemony of the colonizers or those who claim to be superior (Galvan-Alvarez, Laursen, & Ridda, 2020; Prabhu, 2007; Zhou & Pilcher, 2019). The concept of third space of communication attempts to change our thinking that colonialism is not merely a noisy command from the dominant authority to suppress minority voices. Through the third space of communication, third world culture is no longer considered an object that can be manipulated and controlled. Through this, the colonized people have the opportunity to fight for the previously oppressed values (Giles, Bonilla, & Speer, 2012).

Aside of fighting the hegemony of colonialism, the third space of communication may also be used as a starting point to unite the groups of people with different backgrounds (Bhabha, 1994). This is because the third space of communication will automatically form when communicators with different backgrounds meet. They will then bring up a shared place to form an understanding (Widdowson, 2007). In this space, there will be re-interpretation of various values (Bhabha, 1995). Thus it can be said that there is no fixed meaning in the third space because every value and tradition is interpreted in a new way, to the point where its originality cannot be traced anymore.

From the perspective of post-colonialism, the writer sees that Indonesia has a moment that is almost similar to the development of a third space of communication. This is because Indonesia had experienced the domination of colonialism, but in the end it succeeded in gaining

independence through a struggle of values. This moment of struggle of values was crystallized in the speech of June 1, 1945. This speech was delivered by Soekarno at the BPUPKI session which was held starting on May 29, 1945. This session was held to bring in ideas from members regarding the foundation of the state.

Several national figures, such as Soekarno, Mohammad Yamin and Supomo began to convey their thoughts, and often their thoughts conflicted with one another (Latif, 2011). However, it is undeniable that every phase of the conceptualization of the foundation of the Indonesian state involved the participation of various elements and groups, even though in the end Soekarno's big role was inevitable because he had always been involved since the phase of conception, formulation and ratification of the foundation of the Indonesian state. Soekarno had been trailblazing ideas to form the basic philosophy of Pancasila since 1926, namely when he had made a synthesis between nationalism, Islamism and Marxism; and made efforts to conceptualize the ideas of socio-nationalism and socio-democracy. Therefore, the speech of June 1, 1945 was one of the important points in the synthesis effort.

At present, the speech of June 1, 1945 is commonly commemorated as the birthday of Pancasila, the foundation of the Indonesian state. However, based on the substance, this speech has a great significance because it contains the formulation of ideas used to find the national identity and personality. In the speech, there was an anamnesis moment to explore the wealth, soul, national spirit, personality, and character. These were lost during the colonial period because there was always an injection of value from the colonizers (Fennell, 2018; Rodriguez, 2018). This made "Indonesian people to become a small people, not confident, and always want to be guided" (Soekarno, 1964). "The people of color are indeed a wanting nation and the white people are the *adhi-adhining* (the elites) of the nation" (Soekarno, n.d.)

In line with the objective of the third space of communication, through his speech on June 1, 1945 Soekarno wanted to fight the hegemony of colonialism by bringing out the original values of the Indonesian people. The values that Soekarno fought for had been marginalized in the era of Dutch colonialism and were now raised to form a unifying foundation of the state, namely Pancasila. These values included godliness, humanity, unity, deliberative democracy, and social justice (Latif, 2011). In his speech on June 1, 1945 Soekarno mentioned that Indonesia was composed of many shared values and this needed to be formulated in one fundamental concept that absorbed all background elements (Latif, 2018).

In his speech on June 1, 1945, Soekarno did not mention the word "personality" or "identity" explicitly. However, these can implicitly be viewed in the terms *philosophischegrondslag* (philosophical basis) and *weltanschauung* (world view).

"*Philosophischegrondslag* of an independent Indonesia. *Philosophischegrondslag* is the foundation, philosophy, profound thoughts, the soul, the deepest desire to build upon it the building of the eternal and everlasting Independent Indonesia. [...] that we have to seek approval, seek informed consent. We say we are looking for *philosophischegrondslag* unity, looking for one '*Weltanschauung*' which we all agree upon. I say again agree! What Mr. Yamin agrees with, what Ki Bagoes agrees with, what Ki Hajar agrees with, what Mr. Sanoesi agrees with, what Mr. Abikoeno agrees with, what Mr. Lim Koen Hian agrees with, in short we are all looking for one mode" (Soekarno, 1964b, p. 18)

Through the use of this term, Soekarno actually wanted to invite all the meeting participants to look for one basic foundation that could be used as the personality and identity of the newly independent Indonesian nation. With this, Soekarno wanted to invite the Indonesian people to not to submit to the stereotypes given by the colonizers. These stereotypes are evident when we examine various labels, such as "inlander (native)" (Soekarno, n.d.; Weinstein, 2007), and lacking a civilized culture. This happened because the conditions of the

colonized Indonesian society did not comply with the colonial standards. Therefore, it is correct what Said stated (2010) that the West created certain assumptions and standards and the nations of the East (the colonized) were forced to comply with them.

Apart from being used to fight hegemony, this speech was aimed at building a common space for communication. Soekarno realized that the national identity and personality could not be the result of his own subjective thinking. A unified understanding was needed from those who represented various values and cultural backgrounds. For this reason, in his speech on June 1, 1945 Soekarno did not practice a monological, one-way, and canonical pattern of communication. His mode of communication was not just looking for a compromise but also for a mutual agreement.

“... that we have to seek approval, seek informed consent. We say we are looking for *philosophischegrondslag* unity, looking for one ‘Weltanschauung’ which we all agree upon. I say again agree! What Mr. Yamin agrees with, what Ki Bagoes agrees with, what Ki Hajar agrees with, what Mr. Sanoesi agrees with, what Mr. Abikoesno agrees with, what Mr. Lim Koen Hian agrees with, in short we are all looking for one mode. Mr. Yamin, this is not a compromise, but we all are looking for one thing we all can agree on” (Soekarno, 1964b, p. 17).

In the end, it is revealed that Soekarno had his own way of building a third space of communication structure. Soekarno's way is a little different from Bhabha. This is because the diversity of nations and the historicity of each culture in Indonesia were not eliminated, but were used as a basis for unity. The third space of communication was indeed coined by Bhabha in 1994. However, this does not rule out that the characteristics of this third space of communication were used by Soekarno in 1945. There are several reasons why the writer uses the concept of the third space of communication as a framework in reviewing the speech of June 1, 1945.

First, this concept proceeded from post-colonialism (Cook & Wei, 2009). Thus the birth of this concept and the situation in Indonesia have similar backgrounds, which is the colonialization by the West. Second, a trait of the third space of communication is resistance to the colonial hegemony (Rutherford, 1990) and becomes a sign of the formation of new values accepted by all elements (Bhabha, 1994). Third, the third space of communication provides an opportunity for the marginalized to get the main stage (Bhabha, 1995). This suited the condition of Indonesia during the colonial period because at that time there were values that were marginalized (Mahfud, 2020).

The second and third points may become the entry points for the Indonesian people to find their identity and personality. This may answer the problem of identity crisis once experienced by colonized nations (Sherry & St-Pierre, 2000) and the superiority-inferiority dichotomy practiced by the colonizers (Said, 2010). This effort can ultimately lead Eastern nations to move out of the hegemony of values.

This hegemony of values that led to mimicry occurred in Indonesia. The Indonesian people were manipulated to conform to imperialist interests (Soekarno, n.d.). Such representation only makes East nations (including Indonesia) to exist not on behalf of themselves, but on behalf of the West. The real East was never touched and would be uprooted from its original cultural context (Bhabha, 1990).

Bhabha's focus on the colonizer-colonized relations and the characteristics of the third space of communication is in line with the purpose of this study, namely to find out how Soekarno explored the identity and personality of the Indonesian nation in his speech on June 1, 1945. The reason behind the choosing of this topic was because this speech marked the struggle about nationality, namely about how to be and the reasons for being (*raison d'etre*) of a nation.

In other words, how the third space of communication may inform Soekarno's formulation of the personality/identity of the Indonesian nation.

Method

Implicitly, the development pattern of third space of communication can be seen in Soekarno's statement in his speech on June 1, 1945, which mentioned Indonesia's original values, namely godliness, consensus democracy, economic democracy, internationalism, and mutual cooperation. These values are not the values inherited from the colonizers. These values will not be able to be analyzed if only the speech on June 1, 1945 alone is examined. Further study is needed through analysis on the writings, thoughts, and life contexts surrounding Soekarno. In order to find these, this study used Gadamer's hermeneutic circle.

Gadamer's circle of hermeneutics does not view the June 1, 1945 speech as a mere composition of letters, words and paragraphs. Hermeneutics believes that in words and languages there can be found claims about the "way of being" (Gadamer, 2004). This can happen because the text is considered as a house of being. What is written in a text is not just letters and words poured in written form. Text is not an inanimate object; it is an expression that describes the innermost side of its originator. Therefore, to understand a text comprehensively, it is also necessary to understand the thoughts of its originator. In other words, to get the deepest meaning of the June 1, 1945 speech, the writer should also analyze Soekarno's figure as a being in order to understand the intricacies of his thinking.

Regarding the hegemony of identity, the writer saw that hermeneutics could eliminate one form of Western hegemony, namely the academic hegemony (cf. Said, 2010). In the context of post-colonialism, the nuances of academic imperialism are considered to be more often carried out by Western researchers who feel they have the power to survey indigenous participants (Jandt & Tanno, 2001). However, using the hermeneutic method on the June 1, 1945 speech, the writer tried to find the typical Soekarno way to unite the Indonesian peoples and to offer an identity that is completely different from the West-given identity. To obtain a comprehensive understanding of this, a thorough reading of Soekarno's works was required as well as an understanding of each context behind the writing of the work.

The data source used was the transcript of the speech text of June 1, 1945 which was contained in the book *Tjampkan Pantjasila* (Keep Pancasila in Mind) (1964b). However, because this is a hermeneutic study, this data was also be complemented by Soekarno's writings spread in several books, such as *Di Bawah Bendera Revolusi* (Under the Flag of Revolution) (1964) and *Indonesia Menggugat* (Indonesia Protesting) (n.d.).

In accordance with Gadamer's hermeneutical steps, the text of the June 1, 1945 speech would be analyzed in parts and whole. The elements of the text (parts) cannot be understood without understanding the culture and background of the originator of the text (whole) (Palmer, 1969). This means that the meaning of a text could only be understood when the interpreter also understands the context of the times and the culture that gave birth to the text (Jensen, 2018).

Since hermeneutics involves interpretation, this study also includes presumptions on the part of the writer (interpreter's horizon). According to Gadamer (2004) this presumption is a sign that the interpreter / researcher wants to contextualize the text-context in current socio-historical conditions. Presumptions are productive understanding and are not a barrier in achieving a comprehensive understanding.

A prerequisite for achieving a comprehensive understanding is a fusion of horizons. Here the interpreter / researcher is obliged to integrate the meaning he finds into the text. This is a form of historically effected consciousness that makes the interpreter / researcher aware of

the historical continuity of a meaning (Mueller-Vollmer, 1987; Winartono, Antoni, & Sujoko, 2019)

Results

1. Focus on the Authenticity of Indonesian People

As an application of the third space of communication, in his speech on June 1, 1945, Soekarno did not even offer values from outside the nation to become the foundation for the establishment of the Indonesian state. Soekarno believed that the authentic values of the Indonesian people were worthy of being the foundation of the state. Liberalist and socialist ideologies were rarely mentioned. Even though personally Soekarno was awed by the practices of liberal democracy (Soekarno, 1964), and Marxism which he used as a method of thinking to attack the practices of colonialism.

Instead of taking an external ideology to define national identity, Soekarno made his own synthesis. He reflected on the history of the nation and explored these values himself. “*Philosophischegrondslag* is the foundation, philosophy, deepest thoughts, the soul, the deepest desire on which is built the building of an Independent Indonesia which is eternal and everlasting” (Soekarno, 1964b, p. 33).

What Soekarno had reflected on was summarized in the 5 principles mentioned in his speech on June 1, 1945, namely nationality, internationalism, unity, consensus democracy, and justice. Soekarno admitted that these principle had been thought of for a long time. “For decades my chest has been raging with those principles.” (Soekarno, 1964b, p. 32). He claimed that the five values were rooted in a unique identity of the Indonesian people, namely mutual cooperation.

According to Latif (2011), the speech of 1 June 1945, as well as the findings that Soekarno produced, was a creative synthesis of the Declaration of American Independence (from capitalism) and the Communist Manifesto (from communism). However, the writer believes that this speech is not just a synthesis of the two big ideologies. On the other hand, Soekarno also dared to include authentic values which were the result of his struggles in his youth, such as godliness, consensus democracy, and economic democracy.

The formulation of these principles indicates that there is a forming of a second third space of communication. In his speech on June 1, 1945, Soekarno dared to mention the values that had been marginalized during colonialism (Mahfud, 2020), such as godliness, economic democracy, and consensus. This is in line with the characteristics of the third space of communication, that the production of value was not formulated based on the will of the (colonialist) authority (Rutherford, 1990).

The study of hermeneutics proves that the godliness principle is the result of Soekarno's personal reflection since he was young. Godliness values had been internalized in him since he was a child. Soekarno's grandmother gave him inspiration about Javanese mysticism, and through his father Soekarno studied theosophy and Islam. Meanwhile, Soekarno studied Hinduism and Buddhism from his mother (Adams, 1965). Even though he embraced Islam, he was open to dialogue with other religions. He learned about Christian teachings from Father Van Lith. This wealth of ideas about God gave Soekarno a distinctive synthesis when it came to defining who the Indonesian people were. He saw that Indonesia was a godly nation. Since pre-Hindu times, Indonesia lived in a world of worship. The Indonesian people believed and trusted that there was a Transcendent Being who reigned their life (Soekarno, 1964b, p. 87).

The godliness that Soekarno offered was also a “cultured” godliness. This means that everyone has the right to embrace a religion according to their respective beliefs, and must respect the religions of others (Soekarno 1964b, p. 18). When he reflected on godliness,

Soekarno realized that Indonesian culture had grown in and been influenced by various religions, ranging from animism, Hinduism and Buddhism, Islam, and finally Christianity (pp. 92-93). On this basis, he did not insist on Islam as the main religion, even though the majority of Indonesians adhered to Islam.

Regarding consensus, Soekarno considered that this was the original soul of the Indonesian people (Soekarno, 1964, p. 467). This value was also chosen because it corresponded to the spirit of the Asian community. Soekarno knew that the biggest obstacle to Indonesian independence was the value-influences of capitalism-imperialism which had been translated into the praxis of colonialism. In the end, this practice had led to economic, social and cultural oppression.

The oppression in the realm of culture killed the personality and identity of the Indonesian nation. Whereas according to Soekarno (1964b, p. 457), the soul of Indonesia was a populist one which had found its expressions in *adat* (customs), consensus meetings and consensus democracy. The proposing of this idea directly reveals that Indonesian identity is “human beings who love to seek agreement”, prioritizing order and harmony (Dahm & van der Kroef, 1969). This is a far cry from colonialist tendencies to always practice / communicate ideas monologically and authoritatively (cf. Said, 2010, p. 23). By proposing the principle of consensus as the fundamental principle of the state, Soekarno actually wanted to prove that Indonesia had its own way of being and this way of being could not be controlled by any other party.

Regarding economic democracy, Soekarno was initially interested in the idea of Western democracy, because it contained the value of equality. This equality was fought for in the parliament, as an arena for contesting ideas. Soekarno was once impressed by this value because in the Soekarno era there was a disparity between the Indonesian people who became laborers in their own country and the colonialists who were their masters (Soekarno, 1964).

Soekarno considered the idea of equality to be a means to boost up the dignity of the then colonized Indonesian nation. However, in the end he did not use the idea of Western democracy purely, because outside the parliament the equality would be lost. People who are in the lower classes will continue to carry out their professions and become servants of the upper class.

These ideas of godliness, consensus democracy, and economic democracy have important implications in the third space of communication. Indonesia is indeed composed of various religions, interests and social classes. However, that diversity is accommodated in the same vessel. Soekarno's efforts to embrace and provide a place for each of these differences could not be separated from his life background. During his life, Soekarno had absorbed many different values.

“To that I added gleanings of Karl Marxism and Thomas Jeffersonism. I learned economics from Sun Yat-sen, benevolence from Gandhi. I was able to synthesize modern scientific schooling with ancient animistic culture and to translate the end product into living, breathing messages of hope geared to the understanding of a peasant. What came out has been called — in plain terms—Soekarnoism.” (Adams, 1965, p. 71)

At first glance, there were several values borrowed from outside Indonesia, but Soekarno always contextualized these values with the actual conditions in Indonesia. This can be seen in Soekarno's action when he formulated the idea of Marhaenism. Instead of using the term proletariat to describe the conditions of the Indonesian people who became laborers in their own country, he used the term *Marhaen*. He did the same thing when he “revised” Western democracy into an economic democracy to suit Indonesia's conditions. Regarding this,

Soekarno had admitted that he was able to synthesize modern sciences with ancient animistic cultures and then compose them to suit the context of the society (Adams, 1965, p. 76).

This was finally re-emphasized at the end of the speech on June 1, 1945:

“For decades my chest has been raging with those principles. But don't forget, we live in times of war, brothers. It is during this time of war that we found the Indonesian state, - in the thunders of war! In fact, I thank Allah Subhanahu wata'ala, that we have founded the Indonesian state not in the light of the full moon, but under the sledgehammer of war and in the flames of war. The emergence of an Independent Indonesia, an Indonesia that has been invigorated, an Indonesia that is free, which was forged in the flames of war, and such an Independent Indonesia is a strong Indonesian state, not an Indonesian state which will gradually become mush. That's why I give thanks to Allah SWT.” (Soekarno, 1964b, p. 6)

2. Diversity as the Basis for Unity

The main characteristic of the third space of communication is to unite different values and ultimately produce a new value (Rutherford, 1990). Each different value influences each other, and is interpreted anew (Bhabha, 1994). Through his speech on June 1, 1945, Soekarno invited the Indonesian people to have a common agreement. This can be achieved by negotiating meaning, and by reformulating it in different terms (Widdowson, 2007).

Efforts to unite the diverse peoples had been brought up several times by Soekarno. In the principle of nationalism, for example, the unity Soekarno wanted was the one based on nationalism, not on ethnic unity. The same thing is found in his discussion about the third principle, namely unity. Soekarno emphasized the importance of unity which had to stand above group interests. “The Indonesian state is not a country for one person, not a country for one group, even the rich. But we established an ‘all for all’, ‘one for all’, ‘all for one’ state” (Soekarno, 1964b, p. 25).

The idea of unity submitted in the June 1, 1945 speech did not just appear from nothing. Textually, the idea of unity had been around since 1926, when Soekarno wrote articles on Nationalism, Islamism and Marxism. The articles were an attempt to build national unity (Latif, 2018) and as a means of proving that the three characteristics were not in conflict with one another.

What Soekarno started in 1926 continued to his speech on June 1, 1945. This was marked by the mention of the principle of mutual cooperation. This character of unity was again emphasized in the term *gotong royong* (mutual cooperation). *Gotong royong* is not only a symbol of identity, but also a symbol of unity because *gotong royong* “is a dynamic ideology, more dynamic than ‘kinship’. Kinship is a static ideology, but mutual cooperation describes one effort, one charity, one work, which is called by the honorable member Soekardjo as one *karyo* (effort), one *gawe* (work).” (Soekarno, 1964b, p. 32)

Soekarno's great desire to unite all the different elements had made him a person who was “drunk on unity” and “drunk on peace” (Soekarno, 1964, p. 204). This is inseparable from the fact that Soekarno had always wanted to work for unity, somehow. He began by looking for similarities between different values (p. 2), making the colonizers a common enemy (p. 49), and using the discourse of poverty so that the people would launch a radical revolution (p. 136).

This great desire cannot be separated from Soekarno's childhood. Since childhood, he had seen colonial practices that were merely discriminatory politics. Indonesian society was segregated based on ethnicity and background.

“One of Soekarno's miracles is that he united his people. The color of our skin may differ, the shape of our noses and foreheads may differ: Irians are black, Sumatrans brown, Javanese are short, inhabitants of the Moluccas are taller, people from Lampung have their own

features, those from Pasundan have their own features, but no more are we islanders and strangers. Today we are Indonesians and we are one. Our country's motto is Bhirmeka Tunggal Ika—'Unity in Diversity'" Adams, 1965, p. 20)

Diversity has become indispensable in the Indonesian nation. Unifying that diversity is a tough task, given the politics of discrimination already prevailing in Indonesia. However, the attempt to build national unity is a conception that transcends emotions and thoughts (Hargens, 2019). Not all society members can meet eye-to-eye to form an agreement. Moreover, one ethnicity and culture will always have a strong sense of unity among themselves. The sense of internal unity is always stronger and more binding than the sense of unity with other ethnicities or cultures.

To achieve a unity of accord, Soekarno rejected the protraction of the policy of discrimination by the colonial government. He also kept himself from leaning too much towards the majority ethnic, culture and religion to unite Indonesia (Hargens, 2019). Soekarno did not impose a unity of various cultures. He allowed diversity to remain the identity of Indonesia because the reality of pluralism is a process towards an awareness which presupposes the willingness of each person to imagine himself/herself as an identity called "the nation" (Anderson, 2006).

This effort was perceived in the speech on June 1, 1945, which touched (both implicitly and explicitly) almost all elements of pluralism. Religion (Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism), ethnic background (Minang, Java, Yogya) and political currents (socialism and capitalism) without any tendency to divide. This is summarized by mentioning the principle of mutual cooperation which is synonymous with kinship, endeavor and collective struggle. The value of mutual cooperation in itself was not the result of Soekarno's subjective feelings. *Gotong-royong* had already existed without Soekarno making the speech, and had been attached to its bearers, namely the Indonesian people.

Soekarno's speech on June 1, 1945 contained the authentic values of a nation which were ultimately directed towards unity. He succeeded in building a shared communication space that could become a bridge for differences in values, backgrounds and cultures, as well as directing these to the discovery of shared values.

Discussion

The speech of 1 June 1945 delivered by Soekarno contained the authentic values of a nation which were ultimately directed towards unity. He succeeded in building a shared communication space that could become a bridge for differences in values, backgrounds and cultures, as well as directing these to the discovery of shared values.

Soekarno's efforts to accommodate the differences in a third space of communication are different from Homi K. Bhabha's version of third space of communication. It is true that Soekarno's efforts were directed towards Indonesian independence. In his efforts, there was an attempt to break away from the colonial hegemony, including to escape from stereotypical labels and a tendency towards value mimicry. But at the end of the road Soekarno chose to make a room for diversity of values.

In the effort to develop a shared space, diversity is maintained, but the society also gets a new national identity, namely mutual cooperation. This is slightly different from Bhabha's third space of communication which dissolves diversity (Bhabha, 1994). According to Bhabha, unity can be achieved, but by blurring (or even removing) the fixedness of the original culture.

The blurring of fixedness. This can lead to dangers, namely forgetting history (negligence of history) and a tendency to fall into the narrative of ethnic fanaticism (Raj, 2014). However, this is not seen in the values Soekarno offered in the 1 June 1945 speech. In that

speech, Soekarno offered unifying values and a “new” identity as a nation, but he did not immediately erase the original identity of each group or ethnicity. Facts containing diversity were still alluded to, such as when he alluded to something that was regional in nature, such as Yogyakarta, Minang, and Sunda. But in the end it was directed towards a space of unity.

“Forgive me brothers, I am taking the Minangkabau example, among the peoples in Indonesia, the one with the most “*desir d’entre ensemble*”, is the Minangkabau people, the number of which is approximately 2.5 billion. These people feel that they are one family. But Minangkabau is not one unity, but only one small part of a unit! The inhabitants of Yogya also feel “*le desir d’etre ensemble*”, but Yogyakarta is only a small part of a unit. In West Java the Pasundan people feel “*le desir d’etre ensemble*”, but Sundanese are also only a small part of a unit.” (Soekarno 1964b, p. 3)

While trying to form a unity, Soekarno did not attempt to equalize. This means that the existing differences were not simply made uniform. This effort was apparently also motivated by the context of Soekarno's life. “Politically, Soekarno is a nationalist. Religiously, Bung Karno was a religious. Ideologically, Bung Karno was a socialist: ‘I have 3 heads’” (Adams, 1965). This is what is sometimes not understood by those who do not know Soekarno.

Since childhood, Soekarno had been in contact with many cultures, values and beliefs. From his family background, Soekarno seemed to have been a meeting place for various values, cultures and religions; because “Soekarno's grandmother inspired him about Javanese mysticism, and through his father Soekarno studied theosophy and Islam. Meanwhile, Soekarno studied Hinduism and Buddhism from his mother” (Adams, 1965). Therefore, it is not surprising that the proposed efforts towards unity were more syncretic in nature (Van der Kroef & Dahm, 1969) and permissive.

Conclusion

The hermeneutical analysis of the June 1, 1945 speech proves that Soekarno had an approach that was almost similar to Homi K. Bhabha's effort to build a third space of communication, especially to fight stereotypical practices and prevent mimicry. But on the other hand, there are differences that stand out when it comes to uniting Indonesia. For this reason, Soekarno did not eliminate the originality of any existing culture. This cannot be separated from the characteristics of Soekarno's thinking which tended to be syncretic. Soekarno also proved that the various values possessed by this nation cannot be used as an excuse for separation, because the Indonesian nation has one personality, namely mutual cooperation. *Gotong royong* as the national personality will not erase the fundamental values that shaped it. In mutual cooperation, every element of the nation is invited to build a wider image of unity as a nation.

References

- [1] Adams, C. (1965). *Sukarno; an Authobiography as Told to Cindy Adams*. Hong Kong: Toppan Printing.
- [2] Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvgs0c0q.10>
- [3] Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture* (H. Bhabha, Ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- [4] Bhabha, H. (1995, February). *Black Male*. *Artforum*, 86–87, 110. Retrieved from <https://www.artforum.com/print/199502>
- [5] Cook, V., & Wei, L. (2009). *Contemporary Applied Linguistic; Language Teaching and Learning* (V. Cook & L. Wei, Eds.). New York: Continuum.
- [6] Dahm, B., & van der Kroef, J. (1969). *Soekarno: the Ideologue*. *Pacific Affairs*, 42(1),

- 55–57. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/3350794>
- [7] Fennell, C. (2018). Beyond the trace. *Postcolonial Studies*, 21(4), 520–524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2018.1542581>
- [8] Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.
- [9] Galvan-Alvarez, E., Laursen, O. B., & Ridda, M. (2020). Decolonising the state: subversion, mimicry and criminality. *Postcolonial Studies*, 23(2), 161–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2020.1752356>
- [10] Giles, H., Bonilla, D., & Speer, R. B. (2012). Acculturating intergroup vitalities, accommodation and contact. In *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203805640>
- [11] Hargens, B. (2019, November 6). Merawat Ingatan. *Kompas*, p. 6.
- [12] Huddart, D. (2006). Homi K. Bhabha. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-476-05386-2_3
- [13] Jamal, A., Kizgin, H., Rana, N. P., Laroche, M., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2019). Impact of acculturation, online participation and involvement on voting intentions. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(3), 510–519. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.04.001>
- [14] Jandt, F. E., & Tanno, D. V. (2001). Decoding Domination, Encoding Self-Determination: Intercultural Communication Research Processes. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 12(3), 119–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/106461701753210411>
- [15] Jensen, K. B. (2018). The Double Hermeneutics of Communication Research. *Javnost - The Public*, 25(1–2), 177–183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2018.1418968>
- [16] Latif, Y. (2011). *Negara Paripurna*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- [17] Latif, Y. (2018). Religiosity, Nationality, and Sociality of Pancasila: Toward Pancasila through Soekarno's Way. *Studia Islamika*, 25(2), 207–246. <https://doi.org/10.15408/sdi.v25i2.7502>
- [18] Mahfud, M. D. (2020, January 1). Tidak Ada Islamofobia di Indonesia. *Kompas*, p. 6.
- [19] Mueller-Vollmer, K. (Ed.). (1987). *The Hermeneutics Reader* (Vol. 38). <https://doi.org/10.2307/590701>
- [20] Palmer, R. E. (1969). Hermeneutics; Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483347660.n326>
- [21] Prabhu, A. (2007). Introduction: Hybridity in Contemporary Postcolonial Theory. *Hybridity: Limits, Transformations, Prospects*, 086, 1–18.
- [22] Raj, P. P. E. (2014). Postcolonial Literature, Hybridity and Culture. *International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies (IJHSSS)*, 1(2), 125–128. Retrieved from <http://www.ijhsss.com>
- [23] Rodriguez, A. (2018). A case against colonialism. *Postcolonial Studies*, 21(2), 254–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2018.1474705>
- [24] Rutherford, J. (Ed.). (1990). *Identity; Community, Culture, Difference*. <https://doi.org/10.16309/j.cnki.issn.1007-1776.2003.03.004>
- [25] Said, E. (2010). *Orientalisme; Menggugat Hegemoni Barat dan Mendudukkan Timur sebagai SUBjek*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [26] Sherry, S., & St-Pierre, P. (Eds.). (2000). *Changing The Terms; Translating in the Postcolonial Era*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- [27] Soekarno. (n.d.). *Indonesia Menggugat*. Jakarta: Departemen Penerangan RI.
- [28] Soekarno. (1964). *Di Bawah Bendera Revolusi*. Jakarta: Departemen Penerangan RI.
- [29] Weinstein, F. B. (2007). *Indonesian Foreign Policy and the Dilemma of Dependence from Sukarno and to Soeharto*. Singapore: Equinox.
- [30] Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [31] Winartono, W., Antoni, A., & Sujoko, A. (2019). *Membumikan Ilmu Komunikasi di*

Indonesia (Pembacaan Hermeneutik Gadamerian atas Tulisan-Tulisan M. Alwi Dahlan).
Mediakom, 2(2), 100. <https://doi.org/10.32528/mdk.v2i2.1922>

[32] Zhou, V. X., & Pilcher, N. (2019). Tapping the thirdness in the intercultural space of dialogue. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 19(1), 23–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2018.1545025>