

Doctoral Thesis

Thesis Title

The Search for Indonesian Architecture through

World Exposition's Pavilions

(万博のパヴィリオンに表出されたインドネシア的な建築の探求)

Department of Architecture and Building Science

Graduate school of Engineering,

TOHOKU UNIVERSITY

HARRY KURNIAWAN

(ID No. B4TD9702)

CONTENT

Content	i
Figures	iii
Tables	vii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.1.1 International Exposition and Architecture	1
1.1.2 International Exposition and Nation’s Identity	2
1.2 Purpose and Question of Research	3
1.3 Study of Previous Research Studies	3
1.4 Methodology	5
1.5 Research Proses	6
2. Indonesian Participation in World Expositions	10
2.1 1931 Paris Colonial World Fair (PCWF)	11
2.1.1 Participation Background	12
2.1.2 Architect Selection	13
2.1.3 Design	16
2.2 1937 Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace Exposition (NPPPE)	23
2.3 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition (GGIE)	24
2.4 1964 New York World’s Fair (NYWF)	26
2.4.1 Participation Background	27
2.4.2 Architect Selection	29
2.4.3 Design	29
2.5. 1970 Osaka World exposition (OWE)	32
2.5.1 Participation Background	34
2.5.2 Architect Selection	35
2.5.3 Design	36
2.6 2010 Shanghai World Exposition (SWE)	45
2.7 2015 Milan World Exposition (MWE)	46
2.8. Epilogue	48
2.8.1 Ideas of Representation	48

2.8.2 The Meaning of Traditional Elements	54
2.8.3 The Meaning of Modern Expression	54
2.8.4 The Narration read through Precinct and its Relationship with the Main Pavilion	56
3. The Design of 1964 Pavilion	58
3.1 Nation Building Project as Context	58
3.1.1 International and Domestic situation in 1950-60s	58
3.1.2 Nation Building Project	59
3.2 Sukarno-Sudarsono Collaboration	64
3.2.1 Sudarsono	64
3.2.2 Sukarno	66
3.2.3 Sukarno-Sudarsono Collaboration	66
3.3 The Description of Indonesian Pavilion as Compared to NBP and TN	72
3.3.1 Elements of a Great Nation and Great World	72
3.3.2 Foreign Policy: Equality and Neutrality	80
3.3.3 The National Monument	82
3.3.4 Sukarno's Involvement	90
3.4 Epilogue	95
4. History of the architecture in Indonesia through pavilions	97
4.1 Discussion on Indonesian Architecture	97
4.2 The position of pavilion in the development of Indonesian Architecture	109
5 Conclusion	115
Bibliography	118
Attachment one	
Attachment two	
Attachment three	

FIGURES

Figure 1.1 1931 Maps of Netherlands Colonies	7
Figure 2.1 perspective plan of 1931 Paris Colonial World Fair.....	12
Figure 2.2 New about the opening of Netherlands Pavilion in PCWF	13
Figure 2.3 The winning design by W.J.G. Zweedijk as published in the newspaper	15
Figure 2.4 interior design from the chosen entry by W.J.G. Zweedijk	15
Figure 2.5 Masterplan of Pavilion complex and its surrounding	17
Figure 2.6 The final design after revised	18
Figure 2.7 Netherlands Pavilion after accomplished	19
Figure 2.8 Floor plan of the main pavilion	20
Figure 2.9 The interior of reception room	21
Figure 2.10 Replica of Mendut Temple that was built in the innercourt of Main Pavilion	22
Figure 2.11 1937 Pavilion photos and plan	23
Figure 2.12 Map of 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition	24
Figure 2.13 The Netherland Indies Pavilion	25
Figure 2.14 1939 Pavilion model	26
Figure 2.15 The Map of 1964-1965 New York Wolrd’s Fair	27
Figure 2.16 One of the illustrations of Indonesian Pavilion for NYWF	29
Figure 2.17 The Architecture of Indonesian Pavilion	30
Figure 2.18 Some cultural products exhibited in the first floor and accompanied by Indonesian women as information aides	32
Figure 2.19 Live performance of Indonesia’s culture in the Second floor of Pavilion as covered by Sunday News, August 16, 1964	32
Figure 2.20 The Map of 1970 Osaka World Exposition	33
Figure 2.21 A brochure on Indonesian Pavilion	35
Figure 2.22 Left: Sri Sultan HB IX gave speech at National day of Indonesia, August 21, 1970 ...	35
Figure 2.23 Robi Sularto (in the middle) stood in front of Indonesia Pavilion.....	36
Figure 2.24 The architecture model of Indonesian Pavilion that show the building and its landscape design	37
Figure 2.25 A Picture of Indonesian Pavilion and its location on Expo Map as informed in a Pamphlet about Indonesia	37
Figure 2.26 Floor Plan and Section of Pavilion	39

Figure 2.27 A situation during the performance in the stage. People could see the performance from Restaurant in ground and mezzanine floor, in the passage way, and from terrace	41
Figure 2.28 Detail Design of the exterior and landscape	42
Figure 2.29 Exhibition in Zone I	43
Figure 2.30 Visitors seed the demonstration on Zone II	43
Figure 2.31 Mask Exhibition in Zone III	44
Figure 2.32 Zone IV	44
Figure 2.33 2010 Pavilion photos	46
Figure 2.34 Exterior and interior photos of 2015 Pavilion	47
Figure 2.35 The Winning Design by Zweedjigk (above), New Pavilion built (below)	55
Figure 3.1 Events before and surrounding the participation of Indonesia in 1964 NYWF	59
Figure 3.2 Buildings and Obelisk in Nation-Building Project Series	63
Figure 3.3 Nation Building Project position and its relationship to 1964 NYWF	63
Figure 3.4 A House and Masjid (Mosque) designed by Sukarno	65
Figure 3.5 Guest House Istana	66
Figure 3.6 Masjid Baiturahman	67
Figure 3.7 <i>Tugu</i> or Obelisks that have been constructed before Tugu Nasional	68
Figure 3.8 <i>Tugu Nasional</i> and buildings around it	69
Figure 3.9 The Process to build Tugu Nasional	70
Figure 3.10 the Final Design of Tugu Nasional made by Sudarsono	70
Figure 3.11. <i>Soedarsono (right)—with Governor Soemarno and vice governor Henk Ngantung--accompanied President Sukarno to see the model of Tugu Nasional Project</i>	72
Figure 3.12 Traditional art and architecture that appeared during Indonesian participation in 1964 NYWF	77
Figure 3.13 A letter from Abel Sorensen—consulting architect—to NYWF Committee that told about the intention of Indonesian Government in their pavilion’s design	79
Figure 3.14 A letter that explain about ‘Slamatan’ (pre-opening dinner party) event	80
Figure 3.15 the architecture of Indonesian pavilion was labelled as ‘ultra-modern circular pavilion’ by media	80
Figure 3.16 The location of the Indonesian Pavilion during the 1964 NYWF	82
Figure 3.17 Indonesian Pavilion (marked with red arrow) among other international participant’s pavilions and Unisphere	82

Fig. 3.18. Location of Elements of <i>Tugu Nasional</i> (left) and Indonesian Pavilion (right) and buildings around	84
Figure 3.20 Section drawings of <i>Tugu Nasional</i> (left) and Indonesian Pavilion in 1964 NYWF (right)	87
Figure 3.21 Some changing on the tower design of Indonesian Pavilion and comparison with other obelisk in NBP	90
Figure 3.21 Sukarno gave his approval in the photo of model of Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat sculpture (left) and Sukarno gave speech during the inauguration on the Tugu (right)	92
Figure 3.22 Sukarno exemplified how the pose of statue of Tugu Selamat Datang should be during his visitation to the workshop in Yogyakarta (left); Tugu Selamat Datang when the construction was completed (right)	92
Figure 3.23 Sukarno's visitation for the groundbreaking of Tugu Nasional construction	93
Figure 3.24 Newspaper's news and letter that shows Sukarno involvement on building the Pavilion	94
Figure 3.25 Sukarno's painting with title 'Wanita (Woman)' (1958) which exhibited in Indonesian Pavilion	95
Figure 4.1 left: Gouvernements Bedrijven by J. Gerber (1920), and right: PTPN XI Office Surabaya by Cuypers	98
Figure 4.2 above: Bandoeng Technische Hoogeschool Building (1919), and below: Poh Sarang Church Complex (1936)	100
Figure 4.3 The change of façade of Sarinah Department Store, where the 1960s original design (left) covered with 'colourful' cladding and three layers of gable roof as the hat of its podium in 1990s (right)	102
Figure 4.4 TEMPO Magazine, October 16, 1982, with cover title 'the Market of Indonesian architect' as their main coverage issue (left) and profile of some architects, including Robi Sularto and his project (insert photo in the page) (right)	103
Figure 4.5 This Bank Office display the forced mixture between traditional architecture (pyramid roof) and modern style architecture	104
Figure 4.6 This caricature illustrated the problem faced by architect in their effort to create an Indonesian architecture	105
Figure 4.7 The architecture of recently Regent Offices in Indonesia which do not share identity of the context	106
Figure 4.8 Posters of seminars and symposiums on <i>nusantara</i> or traditional architecture	107

Figure 4.9 Diagram for relationship of discussion in Indonesian architecture events, architect figures, and Indonesian Pavilion in World Expos	109
Figure 4.10 NILLMIJ Office Building (left) and 'Kunstkring' (right)	110
Figure 4.11 Advertisement of a Contractor/Builder that shows the architecture of Pasar Gambir pavilions in early 1920s	112
Figure 4.12 The main gate of Pasar Gambir in 1936 (left) and 1937 (right) that both designed by Robert Deppe	113

TABLES

Table 1.1 List of Previous Researches	4
Table 1.2 Number of Participations in International Expositions	7
Table 1.3 Primary Research Data	8
Table 2.1 Permissible Use and Occupancy	31
Table 2.2 Content of Exhibition	31
Table 2.3 Information about Pavilions	50
Table 2.4 Characteristics of Pavilions	51
Table 3.1. Sukarno's Nation Building Projects	60
Table 3.2 Comparison between Sukarno's Vision and Soedarsono's Design Ideas on <i>Tugu Nasional</i>	71
Table 3.3 Comparison of nation-building projects and the Indonesian Pavilion in the 1964 NYWF	74
Table 3.4 Conclusion of comparison of <i>Tugu Nasional</i> and Indonesian Pavilion	85

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 International Exposition and Architecture

International expositions and architecture have shown a mutual relationship since the first international exposition held in London in 1851. Hitchcock, Jr (1936), Mattie (1998), and Jackson (2008), for example, explained how the exposition generated and provided a stage for architecture, and how architecture transformed the exposition into a visual and physical experience. Hitchcock (1936: 2) said that 'Expositions, like skyscrapers, dramatize architecture for the public. Hence, they have an influence upon architectural history far greater than their intrinsic importance. Their particular atmosphere of holiday and ballyhoo, their very transience, indeed, appeal to the imagination of a wide public which is otherwise rarely stirred by any ideas of architecture at all. Real innovations of structure or design seldom make their first appearance in expositions. But World's Fairs are sounding boards for ideas, both good and bad, which have already taken solid form under more obscure conditions.' Architectural Review (in Jackson, 2008: 41) also wrote that 'The architecture of successive international exhibitions is part of the history of modern architecture itself. They have been a laboratory for architectural experiment, a proving ground and a show-window in which ideas, structures, styles and personalities have first been presented to the world'. In the same perspective, Jackson (2008: 44) also said that 'The international expositions provided a grand stage for architectural advances and an important stimulus for engineering. The buildings, and indeed the design of the overall site, were crucial elements of these events. It was through architecture that the expositions were transformed from mere displays of things into a complete visual and physical experience that both informed and entertained.' This was proved by much architecture that were easily associated with the event they housed. The Crystal Palace at the Great Exhibition of 1851 was undoubtedly said as the most remarkable exhibit during the event (Jackson, 2008). Others that could be called as example are Eiffel Tower at 1889 Paris *Exposition Universelle*, Montreal Biosphere (United States Pavilion) and the Habitat for Montreal World Expo 1967, and the British Pavilion for Shanghai World Expo 2010.

1.1.2 International Exposition and Nation's Identity

International Exposition since its first event, has been put as important event to see and understand a nation's vision, situation, or progress. Year by year, the expositions organizer and participants tried to put their best performance on the event. Foreign countries saw exposition architecture—even in its simplest form—as a medium to introduce their nation. When foreign participants of the Exposition Universelle de 1878 were invited to build an entrance way to their exhibits on the central courtyard of the Palais de l'Industrie, they—as explained by Jackson, 2008: 72—replied by creating 'facades that served to announce the national and aesthetic characteristics of each country'. In a complete structure, this attitude could be exemplified by a series of foreign countries' buildings alongside the Seine River—part of the Rue de Nations zone of L'Exposition de Paris 1900—that projected their national characteristics. A nation's identity or characteristics—according to Kultermann (in Garn, et al, 2007: 26)—has appeared in more recent expositions through a 'more individual and formal image in which the identity of the country is visible.'

In Indonesian context, bringing the traditional architecture into new (contemporary) architecture all at once has already started since the beginning of Indonesian history. In the colonial era, where a massive invasion of outside architecture happened for the first time – in this case is European architecture – the Dutch architects began doing some adaptations. After that era, when the architecture projects had been handled by Indonesian architects, the searching on the identity of Indonesian architecture is always a struggle and can be seen from several themes on academic or professional discussions and building projects. Nowadays, the growth of regionalism idea in the international level of architecture and acknowledgement on local sensitive architecture projects has given good influences on Indonesian architecture which is so 'Indonesian'. Using the traditional element for contemporary architecture is also common in many countries. As explain before, this reinterpretation of traditional image makes people easy to identify the origin of certain contemporary architecture. Japanese Pavilion for Venice Biennale, as explained by Igarashi (in Diener and Gabriele Basilico [ed.], 2012), as an example, is a design called "the imperial crown style" of a modern building with a traditional Japanese tiled roof. This design was becoming a popular trend at the time, reflecting rising nationalism. But at the same time, refusal on traditional or vernacular architecture is another side of contemporary architectural design because of its non-modern image, which also happens around the world as Turan (1990) said: "For some, this interest has been no more than an expression of dislike or even hatred of vernacular architecture and a denial or ignoring of it totally if not a condemnation because it lacks 'artistic qualities' and 'conceptual integrity'." Therefore, the appearance of Indonesian Pavilion for representing this rich country is essential to be designed carefully.

1.2 Purpose and Question of Research

This statement is relevant to see and understand the involvement of Indonesia and also the construction of its Pavilion in an International Exposition. As a single building, the Indonesia pavilion in international exposition could be seen as an effort to collect all the richness of Indonesia in a small physical form. In addition, Netherland as a Indonesian authorities in a certain period, it will be interesting too to understand how the foreigner see and transform Indonesia in the pavilion. While as a series of participations, those pavilions can give the information about the current situation in Indonesia and world during the events. Therefore, this research purpose to reveal those facts and find the meaning behind it.

1. What was the idea behind the Pavilions?
2. How Indonesia was represented in a pavilion?
 - a. How the pavilion was designed (design method)?
 - b. How was the relationship between Indonesian Architecture (Classic and Traditional) with the pavilion architecture?
3. What kind of change is happened between one pavilion to others?
4. How is the relationship between The Pavilion and the History of Architecture's Development in Indonesia?

1.3 Study of Previous Research Studies

Several previous research studies of pavilions for international expositions can be found. Some of them focus on the issue of the identity or representation technique used in the architecture of pavilions, such as by Morton (1998). Meanwhile, the study of Indonesian architecture for international expositions is still very limited. Publications on the topic to date have come from Bloembergen (2002), Tjahyawulan (2011), and Lukito (2016). Bloembergen, an architecture historian, explained the Dutch participation in world exhibitions and the meaning of representations as a quest for their reflection. Tjahyawulan (2011) described how visual elements in several Indonesian/Netherlands-Indies' exhibitions created 'Indonesia'. Meanwhile, Lukito (2016) compared the pavilion for the 1931 Paris Colonial World Fair (PCWF) with Pasar Gambir and Taman Mini Indonesia Indah Theme Park to investigate the construction of culture at that time. Those previous studies share a basic similarity with this research through the issue of the representation brought by Indonesian participation in international exhibitions. They also shared some of the research objects, such as the pavilion for the 1931 PCWF discussed by Bloembergen (2002) and Lukito (2016), and the pavilion for the 1964 New York World's Fair (NYWF) discussed by Tjahyawulan (2011). However, this study compares all the pavilions which were completely designed from scratch by Indonesian/Netherlands-Indies itself and

focuses on how architectural elements work in this official representation of Indonesia in the international community.

Table 1.1 List of Previous Researches

	Title	Author, Year	Purpose	Range of Content
1	<i>Menuju Arsitektur Indonesia</i> (Towards the Architecture of Indonesia) (book)	Eko Budiharjo, 1983	'Collection of ideas and thoughts on architecture in Indonesia from architect and architect & non-architect experts' (P. vii)	Issues about architecture in Indonesia around 1980s
2	<i>Jati Diri Arsitektur Indonesia</i> (the Identity of Indonesian Architecture) (book)	Eko Budiharjo, 1989	'Collection of ideas and thoughts on identity in architecture, including in Indonesian context, from architects, academicians, humanists, and artists' (P. v)	Issues around the search of identity in Indonesian architecture
3	A Study of Indonesian Architectural History (unpublished dissertation)	Iwan Sudradjat, 1991	'Investigate the historical development of Indonesian architectural history and to illustrate how its various traditions took root and developed' (P. ii)	How Dutch academic practices—including archaeology, anthropology, urban sociology, town planning and architecture—in the former Indies constructed Indonesian architectural history
4	Behind the Postcolonial: Architecture, Urban Space, and Political	Abidin Kusno, 2000	'develop a perspective from which to view the emergence and development of the socio-cultural crisis in the postcolonial	From Netherlands-Indies to New Order Regime (1968 – 1998)

Cultures in Indonesia (book)		world, and the ways this crisis both shapes and is shaped by the practices of architecture and urban design' (P. x)	
---------------------------------	--	---	--

1.4 Methodology

Content analysis is used as methodology in this research. This methodology, according to Krippendorff (2004: 18), 'is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use. As a *technique*, content analysis involves specialized procedures. It is learnable and divorceable from the personal authority of the researcher. As a research technique, content analysis provides new insights, increases a researcher's understanding of phenomena, or informs practical actions.' Content analysis requires three conditions, which is objectivity, systematic approach, and generalization (Muhadjir (2000) in Kurniawan (2009). For the analyst, Krippendorff (1991) explains that, this methodology also requires them to do several things, such as:

- a. analysis data should be clear on which contents are analyzed, how the data is determined, and from which population data is drawn,
- b. context that relates to the analyzed data should be explicated,
- c. goals or targets should be clearly stated,
- d. determine the construction of context to draw inferences,
- e. have or construct an operational theory about the link between the data and context,
- f. specify the type of evidence needed to assess the validity of result

The data needed for this content analysis research, based on Kostof's (1985: 3-7) explanation, will consist of pictorial evidence and literary evidence. The pictorial evidence will be in form of pictures or images. It is important to give clear information about physical form of an object, and, as Kostof (1985:3) said, 'buildings are often born of images and live on in images'. On studying the architecture of pavilion, the pictorial evidence will be used to find the implementation of idea and references into architecture form, and it becomes important data to make comparison between pavilions. The main pictorial evidences for this research are consist of:

- a. The map and picture of International Expositions
- b. The pavilion drawings, such as site plan, plans, elevations, sections and details
- c. Photos of exterior and interior of Indonesian pavilion

The literary evidence –according to Kostof (1985)—gives good description about an object. On this research, the literary evidence is essential to reveal the idea, situation and context behind a realization of pavilion. Some main literary evidences which will be used are:

- a. The Indonesian pavilion design concept
- b. The Indonesian pavilion information, such as architect, contractor, material, structure, and etc.
- c. The explanation on Indonesia participation in International Exposition
- d. The history of Indonesian Architecture

1.5 Research Process

The research process started by broaden the scope of context from independent Indonesia's to Netherlands-Indies' Participations. This action was taken for some reasons, such as the continuous search for identity in both Indonesia and Netherlands-Indies periods; similar geographical area shared as seen on 1931 map of Netherlands indies which is similar to recent Indonesia (see figure 1.1); and the transition of architectural knowledge from Dutch educator to Indonesian. The second step was an identification of participations in international exposition. It Could be said that Indonesia is a regular participant in world expositions since Colonial Era till date. Third, reviewed and filtered all participation during those periods to find the same level of research object; and find proper objects to answer the research questions. All participation during those periods are reviewed (see attachment 1 and table 1.2) and filtered by two considerations, which are own built national pavilions, and pavilions designed by local architects. The 'own-built pavilion' consideration was used because it provides maximum room for creativity to achieve the purpose of architecture—which, according to Norberg-Schulz (1963), is to give order to certain aspects of our environment, such as physical control, functional frame, social milieu, and cultural symbolization. Then, considering local architects—born and/or working in the Netherlands-Indies/Indonesia at that period—design is important, with the assumption that they have sufficient knowledge of Indonesian society and cultures to use them as their design reference. This will reveal the context of the represented Indonesian image in Indonesian architectural history during the relevant periods. Seven appearances passed the filtering process and were taken as research objects: the 1931 PCWF, 1937 Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace Exposition (NPPPE), 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition (GGIE), 1964 NYWF, 1970 Osaka World Expo (OWE), 2010 Shanghai World Expo (SWE), and 2015 Milan World Expo (MWE).




Figure 1.1 1931 Maps of Netherlands Colonies (source: La Federation Francaise des Ancien Coloniaux (ed.), 1931)

Table 1.2 Number of Participations in International Expositions

Expo List ¹	Netherlands-Indies (1850 – 1944)			Indonesian Government (1945- 2015)			Total
	P	NP	ND	P	NP	ND ²	
BIE	23	2	1	12	16	10	64
Others	35	31	19	1	1	0	87
Total	58	33	20	13	17	10	151

Legend: P= Participated; NP = Not participated; ND = No data

1 This BIE list, excluding Horticultural Exhibitions and the Triennale di Milano, can be seen on the BIE Official website (<http://www.bie-paris.org/site/en/expo-timeline>, last accessed November 16, 2017). Meanwhile, other expos were collected from the Expo Museum website (<http://www.expomuseum.com>, last accessed November 16, 2017), University of Maryland Architecture Library's World's Fair Overview:1851-1970 (<http://web.archive.org/web/20120822150600/http://www.lib.umd.edu/artarch/exhibition/>, last accessed November 16, 2017), Jackson (2008: 122-125), and other sources.

2 Expos in 'no data' list are specialized expos from the period 1949 to 1965 (seven expos) and Plovdiv Expositions (three expos).

The process of data collection was done by visited several libraries and institutions in several countries, such as New York Public Library in New York, U.S, National Library of Indonesia and National Archives in Jakarta, Indonesia, and Osaka 70 Memorial Park and Tokyo University Library in Japan. Digital archives, articles, photos and pictures are also collected from online access such as KITLV Digital Image Library and Delpher. For 2010 and 2015 World Exposition, interviewed with the architects could be done. Here is some primary data used in this study.

Table 1.3 Primary Research Data

Expo	Source	References	LE	PE
1931 PCWF	a. Osaka University Library (loaned-2016)	• Bloembergen, 2006	V	V
	b. Avery Library, Columbia University (visited-2016)	• Exposition Coloniale internationale de Paris, 1931	V	V
	c. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1146912 (accessed on October 1, 2015)	• Savarese, 2001	V	V
	d. KITLV Digital Image Library (accessed since November 2015)	• Images	X	V
	e. www.delpher.nl (accessed since November 2015)	• De ingenieur 1931 and Voorwaarts 1930-1931	V	V
1937 NPPPE	a. Tohoku University Library (visited-2015)	• Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace Exposition, 1938	X	V
	b. https://ci.nii.ac.jp/els/contents110004732111.pdf?id=ART0007475452 (accessed October 11, 2015)	• Nakata, 1997	V	X
	c. National Library of Indonesia (visited-2015)	• D' Orient, 1937 and Actueel Wereldnieuws, 1937	V	V
	d. www.delpher.nl (accessed since November 2015)	• De Indische Courant, 1937	V	V
1939 GGIE	a. National Library of Indonesia (visited-2015)	• The Netherlands Indies, 1939, • D' Orient, 1938 Magazines	V V	V V
	b. Tohoku University Library (visited-2015)	• Shanken, 2014	V	X
	c. www.delpher.nl (accessed since November 2015)	• De Indische Courant, 1938	V	V

1964 NYWF	a. New York Public Library (visited-2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation, 1963 • Collections of images, photos, documents, articles 	V	V
	b. http://kepuustakaan-presiden.pnri.go.id/ (accessed July 4, 2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sukarno, 1960 	V	X
1970 OWE	a. National Library of Australia (interlibrary loaned-2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atmadi, T. [ed.], 1970 	V	V
	b. Osaka 70 Memorial Park (visited-2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commemorative Association for the Japan World Exposition, 1972 • Collections of design drawing, photos, articles 	V	V
2010 SWE	a. Budi Lim Architect (visited and interviewed-2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design drawing, photos, explanation 	V	V
	b. Gramedia Book Store (visited-2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pangestu, 2011 	V	V
2015 MWE	a. Dani Hermawan (Architect of the Pavilion) (interviewed-2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design drawing, photos, explanation • Pareanom, 2016 	V	V
Legend: LE = Literary Evidence; PE = Pictorial Evidence				

CHAPTER TWO

PARTICIPATION OF INDONESIA IN WORLD EXPOSITION

Indonesia's participation in international expositions has been started since it was named as Netherlands-Indies or Dutch East Indies (Netherlands colony) until the most recent 2015 Milan World Exposition. Indonesia was also seen International Exposition as moment to put the country on the world map. 1964 New York World's Fair, which is held 19 years after Indonesian independence, marked Indonesian active involvement in this International event. But as a representation of similar geographic and social-cultural region, the involvement of Indonesia in International Exposition could be traced back to 1900 Paris Colonial Exposition, as part of Netherlands exhibition. The fully existence of Netherlands-Indies/Indonesia in international exhibition event was marked by the grandeur Netherlands-Indies Pavilion for 1931 Paris Colonial World Fair. It was around ten years since Ethic Policy was implemented in Netherlands' Colonized Areas and continued to happen for the next 20 years till the end of Netherlands power and occupation in Indonesia. Years before 1931 Exposition, Netherlands-Indies was already appeared in international exposition as part of Netherlands' exhibition. It has been appeared as small display in Netherland zone, own exhibition area inside Netherland zone, and even exhibited as 1:1 replica of Netherlands-Indies indigenous architectures and/or a village--including the native people and daily life--as seen in L'Exposition de Paris 1900, 1883 Amsterdam World Expo, and 1889 Paris World's Fair. Even though it does not participate regularly or in the same conditions (sometime built own building, but at other time it used provided module building or joint in a single exhibition zone), but on each its appearance, Indonesian/Netherlands-Indies pavilion always become one of favorite destination for visitors. One of the reasons for this is the richness and uniqueness culture that Indonesian has.

The nation participation in international exposition keeps continue after the end of colonization era at 1945 and officially become an Independent country named Indonesia. There is specific reason for each participation, but in general—Pangestu (2011: 42) said that—this 'wide-reaching event has consistently been perceived by Indonesia as the perfect opportunity to promote its Tourism, Trade, and Investment (TTI).' Along many participations, it is found that only in seven events Netherlands-Indies/Indonesia appeared with its own pavilion. Those are during 1931 Paris

Colonial World Fair (PCWF), 1937 Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace Exposition (NPPPE), 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition (GGIE), 1964-1965 New York World Fair (NYWF), 1970 Osaka World Expo (OWE), 2010 Shanghai World Expo (SWE), and 2015 Milan World Expo (MWE). These seven pavilions were taken as research object by considering the purpose of architecture, which according to Norberg-Schulz (1963), to give order to certain aspects of our environment, such as physical control, functional frame, social milieu, and cultural symbolization. It is mean that Indonesian pavilions can be seen not only as a building, but also a bearer of message and representation of Indonesia. Other consideration is related to the chance to create architecture from the scratch that provide opportunity to maximize all architectural elements ('mass', 'space', and 'surface') to achieve those purpose, especially to send the complete narration or story of its appearance meaning. Therefore, the purpose of the study is to understand the meaning of architectural image of Indonesian pavilions, and concept and method used to create those images.

2.1 1931 Paris Colonial World Fair (PCWF)

1931 Paris Colonial World Fair (PCWF) or *Exposition colonial internationale*, as it was named, put the colonial and colonies countries as the main subject. Several colonial countries display their colonies in a grand scale, including Netherlands with Netherlands-Indies as the spotlight. It was held from 6 May until 6 November 1931 in the Bois de Vincennes, Paris. France, Denmark, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, the United States, and the Netherlands built their own national colonial pavilions during the time. The PCWF—as said by Bloombergen (2006: 271)—was essentially 'a part of a national educational drive to instill an imperialist mentality into French visitors, especially the young,' by the French Government. It was noted that over 33 million people visited this PCWF.




Figure 2.1 perspective plan of 1931 Paris Colonial World Fair

(source: <https://i.pinimg.com/236x/b5/64/04/b564040685a92242d030f019f1e366ad--birds-eye-view-map-art.jpg>, accessed May 16, 2016)

2.1.1 Participation Background

The Dutch government received an official invitation in April 1927. And soon after it, the Dutch government made meetings and preparations needed. The decision to participate in PCWF was influenced by the general situation in the colonies and the mother countries in the late 1920s. The world, as it was also the case for Netherlands and its colonies, during that period was vociferous by the calls for independence. Governor- general Van Limburg Stirum, on his November promises (1918) also made promise to give the Indonesians more administrative powers through *Volksraad* (Bloombergen, 2006). This develop ethical policy that ensure indigenous people to develop and participate in their own affairs including politic, economy, and education.

Netherlands government, through the ministry of colonies, was in general loath to promote the colonies through propaganda to inform the public about the country's overseas possessions and what they had done in the interest of their people as the anticipation for that strained relations between the Netherlands and the Dutch East Indies, and between the Dutch colonial administration and the nationalist Indonesian emancipatory movements (Bloombergen, 2006 and Demaison, 1931). The participation in 1931 PCWF displayed similar intention as they (Netherland government) want to show their achievement in terms of culture, industry and trade, and also in social terms and the instruction for the greater good of the natives. The participation for PCWF was registered with

name 'Pays-Bas'-a France word for Netherlands, but it is the first spot to display of Netherlands-Indies' identity in an international exposition.




Figure 2.2 New about the opening of Netherlands Pavilion in PCWF (source: De Graafschap-bode/ August 21, 1931)

2.1.2 Architect Selection

The process to select the architect who will design the pavilion was another important story in the appearance of Netherlands-Indies in this event. It was the long process that guided by the choice of grand concept of the Netherland and Netherlands-Indies appearance in this event. The grand concept of the design of 1931 pavilion, as also appeared in the intention of participation, was influenced by the atmosphere of colonial politics in Netherlands-Indies in 1920s. Bloombergen (2006: 270) wrote that 'it is tempting to see in this worldly temple, this amalgam of Western and Indonesian architectural styles, an image of the unity of the Netherlands and the Dutch East Indies, bound together by association (of diverse architectural styles) and assimilation (combined into new of architecture).' The idea to build a single building which designed in European style but with Indonesian motifs was proposed by Professor J.C. van Eerde, director of the Ethnography Department of the Colonial Institute in preparatory committee meeting on 15 September 1927 (Bloombergen, 2006).

After the grand concept was set, the Netherlands government start the discussion on the architect selection. At the beginning, government wanted to have the architect from the motherland—Netherlands—for the pavilion design. However, responding the proposed concept, considering the big portion of participation money provided by Netherlands-Indies, and the logic on how 'local' architect is the best in understanding local expression, many 'leading' figures and institutions in Netherlands-Indies had a great desire to take that rule, asked for a truly Netherlands-Indies pavilion at the exhibition, and a chance for 'the New Building movement' in Netherlands-Indies to present itself this time. This desire was something that they had been started to do sixteen years

before for 1915 Panama Pacific International Exposition, San Francisco. One of the ‘leaders’ is P.A.J. Moojen—one of Netherlands-Indies well-known architect, who played an important role in the participation of Netherlands-Indies in PWCF, especially in terms of how Netherlands-Indies took charge and the physical appearance (architecture and exhibition) and ‘had been working on the best way to present the Dutch East Indies’ in previous 1915 Panama-Pacific Exposition in San Francisco. For this 1931 exposition, P.A.J. Moojen already involved himself in the preparation of Netherlands-Indies participation since very early time, when he met Jacob Koningsberger, the colonial minister on March 1927 and got a letter of introduction to accompany his visit to Paris to enquire into the purpose and nature of the exhibition, and then actively built up a network to ensure the Netherlands-Indies presence at the exhibition and take charge of organizing and structuring the exhibition (Bloombergen, 2006).

Finally, it was approved that the architect will be chosen through competitions process which was opened for architects who lived or worked in Netherlands-Indies only. The whole process started with order given by The Dutch executive committee in March 1929 to Moojen, in consultation with the Nederlandsch-Indische Architectenkring (NIAK, the society representing local architects in the Dutch East Indies) to nominate six competitors. The first six competitors were Wolff Schoemaker of Bandung, Maclaine Pont of Modjokerto, J.F.L. Blankenberg of Weltevreden, C. Citroen of Surabaya, B.J.K. Cramer of Rotterdam and F.J.L. Ghijsels of Overveen. These competitors seemed chosen by Moojen without consulting the NIAK or the East Indies Committee in Batavia, therefore this process was protested by both body (the NIAK and the East Indies Committee) and requested to be replied through an open competition (Bloombergen, 2006). After this first ‘controversial’ process, the second nomination process came from an open announcement submission get six designs nomination. A group of experts consisted of G.C. Bremer—Head of government architects in The Hague, Ir. H. von Essen—former architect of Batavia, and Ir. J.F. Hoytema—Head of the Civil Service Department of Batavia was appointed by Moojen as reviewer committee. This committee chose—with a few recommended changes—the design “B.A.L.I.”—as seen in figure 2.3—which came from the architect W.J.G. Zweedijk of Surabaya (Algemeen Handelsblad, 1930). Zweedijk was invited to come to Netherlands and developed the winning design in collaboration and guidance from Moojen during 1930.



INTERNATIONALE KOLONIALE TENTOONSTELLING
PARIJS 1931. — Het toekomstige Nederlandsche Pavil-
joen, ontworpen door den architect W. J. G. Zweedijk te
Soerabaya. De oppervlakte zal ongeveer 5500 M2. bedragen

Figure 2.3 The winning design by W.J.G. Zweedijk as published in the newspaper (source: Voorwaarts sociaal-democratisch dagblad/ January 30, 1930)




Figure 2.4 interior design from the chosen entry by W.J.G. Zweedijk (source: Algemeen Handelsblad/ January 21, 1930)

2.1.3 Design

2.1.3.1 Site Plan

Netherlands got a chance to make a huge and impressive appearance during the PWCF. They can make the acquisition of a new piece of land after England, that planned to use that lot, canceled their participation in the PWCF. The total of the final site was covering 32,000 m² in the north of Lake Daumesnil. In general, the site was divided into two parts. The part near to lake was recognized as an open natural ground and used to create a layout of '*kampung*' (indigenous village) through the reconstruction of several original indigenous houses of Netherlands-Indies (see number 5 in figure 2.5) which was sent from the Netherlands Indies. Batak's Toba house, Batak's Karo house, Minangkabau *adat* house and rice storehouse, and Javanese Pendopo stood on the ground as example. Inside this *adat* houses, the Hague Society Boeatan set up a showroom for Indies' arts and crafts. While in the opposite of the *adat* house, a Sumatran-style Indonesian restaurant was run by the Hague company Warong Djawa where the Indies' culinary will be offered. (Bloombergen, 2006; Bataviaasch Nieuwsblad, 1931.1.28)

The other part of the site was filled by a compound of buildings and courts that bound together by a total of 170 meters length—Balinese walls with several gates to access the inner court. It was generally inspired by the style of indigenous Java and Bali architectures. The whole complex of the pavilion itself was built on the idea of Alun-Alun (Javanese city square), where the main pavilion was on the left and other small pavilions was around this 60x100-meter square. There are two small pavilions and a small Balinese temple with shrines and a bell tower that accompanied the main pavilion. The first small pavilion that stood parallelly to the main pavilion was a house for private companies, such as the "Bataafsche", "Koloneale" petroleum companies, and Droste Cacao. The second one was a building in the sense of an enclosed Javanese Pendopo for dance and music performance—two elements that importantly considered by the Executive Committee to be performed in this event. Moojen and the Executive Committee brought in 100 members of dancers and musicians from Bali to stay and perform for about three months (Algemeen Handelsblad, 1930).



Figure 2.5 Masterplan of Pavilion complex and its surrounding (source: Savarese, etc, 1931)

A.5.1.1 The Design of Main Pavilions

The design concept of the pavilion—as has been described in previous sub-chapter—was the mixture of exotic Indigenous art and architecture and western styles and technology in art and architecture. The architect (Moojen and Zweedijk) took all the detail of the native style as inspiration and then gave, as Moojen says as quoted by Exposition orldat orldational de Paris (1931), to the whole building “a modern expression”. This approach successfully made the pavilion seen as ‘something new by remaining archaic’ (Exposition orldat orldational de Paris, 1931); as ‘a fairytale so rich, colourful and flawless that it will never fade from our minds.’ (Nieuwsblad van het Noorden [July 31, 1931] in Bloombergen, 2006: 269); as ‘an idyllic dream edifice representing the unity of the Netherlands and the Netherlands-Indies’ (Bloombergen, 2006: 271).



Figure 2.6 The final design after revised

(source: ---,1931, ' La Paris En 1931, Exposition Coloniale 1931, Guide Officiel')

The main pavilion is the biggest building of this Pay-Bas Pavilion. It has 110 meters length and easily identified by its two 50 meters height Balinese Meru (temple tower) arose on each ends of innovative version of Minangkabau architecture roof. At the same time, the main pavilion was the best sample of the implementation of the design concept. Many changes were made on the winning design made by Zweedijk (see figure 2.3) to be successfully transformed the concept into the final design that done by Moojen and Zweedijk (see figure 2.6). Compare to the competition winning design, the architecture of final version—as explained in detail in De Kol. Tentoonstelling 1931 Te Parijs (in Bataviaasch Nieuwsblad, 1931.1.28)—was ‘pulled more heavily from the ground, so devolve at the front of the 2 meters above the ground floor. A tall pedestal with a heavy profiling hall has high facades. The middle part of the front façade becomes 30 meters high, while the two towers will rise to 50 meters. The two protruding facades of the side wings were made more rigid. The high-pitched middle gate prevailing on the original design completely fades; Instead, a new mid-façade was designed of lower but also more elegant shape. The reception hall is made bigger and bigger than it was originally designed. Was this room initially 450 square meters. Large, now it will have an area of 870 square meters. Get up to 12 meters with a ceiling height. Both Preanger and Bali major dioramas were moved from the side walls of the reception hall to the ends of the side wings, making the perspective

operation much stronger. The Mendoet Temple has been moved from the left side wing to the center of the pavilion, where the temple is now at the end of a quiet, shaded courtyard. The system of subdivision applied in the original design in small exhibitions has been waived. There has now been as much as possible for the formation of spacious halls. For roofing, more than half a million ironwood syrups from Borneo are involved. This roofing is now ready for a large part. On the newly designed facade of the north side of the building, the motif of the mesdjid tower roofs was applied, as occurring on Java frequently.'

The first change that can be seen influence the whole image is the change of the proportion of the pavilion. Architects took several actions such as raised the ground floor two meters above the ground and more rigid side wing protruding façade that successfully brought the beautiful proportions of the pavilion that reflected the strength of the Netherlands Empire. The meaning of the pavilion was also escalated, for example, through the change of the Meru' steps number from nine to—the maximum number allowed in tradition—eleven. This made the status of the Dutch pavilion as revered temple (Bloombergen, 2006).



Figure 2.7 Netherlands Pavilion after accomplished
(source: Le Livre D'or, De L'exposition Coloniale Internationale De Paris, 1931)

The implementation of the concept was experienced by visitor as soon as they pass through the grand main entrance—a copy of Balinese temple archway—and enter the grand reception room. The reception room was an 870 square meter floor area, over 12 meters ceiling height, decorated with artistic motifs in Javanese teak and Balinese woven patterns, and based on the *bangsal kentjono* (gold reception hall) of the kraton of Yogyakarta. On the upper part of walls on this room, visitor could find two large wall paintings (4 x 8 meters) on canvases made by the painters Hendrik Paulides and the painters Charles Sayers under the guidance and instructions of Moojen. Paulides drew an idea of Dutch civilization in Netherlands-Indies through the illustration of the arrival of Comelis Houtman at the Court of the Sultan of Banten in 1597; the development of the cityscape of Batavia in the course of two centuries; and the traffic and agriculture, industry and trade today. Meanwhile, Sayers, for the other painting hung on other side of the hall, gave an impression of the native life through the illustration of the episode of an ancient Javanese praise; religion, art, customs and habits; and Houses and population types. At the two end walls of the reception hall, two decorative wall maps by H. Wolbert illustrated the Indies archipelago and its location vis-à-vis Asia and Europe. (Bloomberger, 2006; Bataviaasch Nieuwsblad, 1931.1.28).



Figure 2.9 The interior of reception room (source: Media KIT)

The next rooms found after the reception room was three divisions—which are economic division, political division, and cultural division—and separate division that displayed the submissions from Suriname and Curacao. The economic division was on the left wing of the reception room. This division displayed the Netherlands Indies' climate, natural resources, domestic and international transportation and trade, and others. The right wing contains the political division where the colonial history and the accomplishment of administration, education, security and defense was exhibited and celebrated. Two major dioramas in curve form were attached on the end of each wing. It had length of 20 meters, height of 8 meters, and 7,5 meters depth and showed plantation in Bali and the Preanger was designed by the painter J.L. Eland which was selected among other submission. Meanwhile, the cultural division was lied behind the reception room in form of 60-metre long artery that contains two courtyards. One of the courtyards displayed the replica of famous Mendut temple which included the reproduction of three statues of Buddha and two Bodhisattvas (see figure 2.10). This replica of sacred indigenous architecture was made by the sculptor Willem Rudolf van Leeuwen following the instruction and intention of Moojen to bring in the “tranquil serenity” of the Islander religion and architecture into the visitor mind. (Bloomberger, 2006; Bataviaasch Nieuwsblad, 1931.1.28; Algemeen Handelsblad, 1930.1.21).



Figure 2.10 Replica of Mendut Temple that was built in the innercourt of Main Pavilion (source: Media KIT)

2.2 1937 Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace Exposition (NPPPE)

After the end of World War I, Japan saw the concentration of politic, economic, military, industry, and education of the world are in the Pacific countries (Nakata, 1997). Hence, a friendship among Pacific countries became responsibility of each country and was important to keep and promote peace of the world. Japan saw itself as one of the main players to do the mission and brought it as one of the purposes of the 1937 Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace Exposition (NPPPE). The other purpose of NPPPE was to develop the culture and industry of twenty-nine participant countries. Another reason to hold this international exposition was also to celebrate the development of Nagoya city as one of the center of industry and trading. 1937 NPPPE was held in total 78 days from March 15 to May 31, 1937. It took place on 496.857 square meters lot on the harbor area of Minami-ku, Nagoya City and cost 3.000.000 yen for the operational. 4.808.164 people visited the exposition, which daily average visitor is 61.643 people.




Figure 2.11 1937 Pavilion photos and plan (source: D' Orient, No.21/ May 22, 1937)

Netherlands-Indies was invited and decided to build a pavilion designed by Robert Deppe, the architect for pavilions at Batavia's 1936 Pasar Gambir Annual Fair. Deppe made a rectangular building with two elements, inspired from indigenous houses of worship, were attached on each end. A building inspired from historic Javanese temple was attached on the left. While on the right, a replica of Balinese Kori Gate was pushed into the building. The pavilion was constructed of wood and masonry with dark brown *sirap* roofs and sand color (beige) performed with gold, white red and black

decorations of façade surfaces. The monumental doors were followed the example of Balinese temple, and ornamented with strong colors of black, red and gold.

2.3 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition (GGIE)

Twenty-four years after the success of the 1915 Panama Pacific International Exposition, San Francisco held their second exposition which was named 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition (GGIE). Initiated at early 1933, 1939 GGIE purpose was to increase trade and celebrate the opening of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and the Golden Gate Bridge. The fair’s theme, “The Pageant of the Pacific” featured countries on the Pacific Rim, including them who involved in the escalation of war in the Pacific region.




Figure 2.12 Map of 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition (source: ---, 1938, World’s Fair Highlights 1939 On San Francisco Bay, Golden Gate International Exposition)

Netherlands-Indies, which is written as ‘Netherlands East Indies’ in Closing Report San Francisco Bay Exposition book, was one of 26 participated foreign governments—such as Argentine Republic, Australia, Denmark, Japan, France, Italy, Portugal, and Netherlands—including several other colonial countries—such as British Columbia, French Indo China, and Johore—in 1939 year. While in the second-year-run (1940), in the same numbers, some countries such as Argentine Republic, Australia, Republic of Chile, Johore, and Guatamala were out; and others were in such as Belgium,

British India, Hungary, Turkey, and Switzerland. The reasons for the changes, as said in the closing report, was because of war conditions during the time. The important reason for Netherlands-Indies participation was to remind visitors of their (Netherlands) long presence in the Netherlands-Indies (Shanken, 2014). At the end of October 1937, *De Indische courant* (October 22, 1937) informed that final decision to participate will be made around one week (end of October or Early November). For the second time, Robert Deppe was chosen to design the pavilion.



Figure 2.13 The Netherland Indies Pavilion (source: The Netherlands Indies, 1939)

The pavilion was a rectangular building covering 7100 square feet, 120 feet long and 60 feet wide. It was marked by its 50 feet height tower which is modeled on the Hindu *Penataran* Temple near Blitar-East Java and arose strongly above the podium that decorated with intricate bas-relief copied from Borobudur temple. The roof of gallery hall was reminiscent of the shape of *baleh-desa* roof covered with black *sirap*. The wall carried copy of bas-relief panels from the wall of temples and the *Bali* architecture's color which was grayish green of the weathered *paras* stone on an underground of terracotta and partial plaster work. The main and side entrance were under the tower and brought to the atrium. The door of the main entrance was in Balinese character—colored with gold. Above the

atrium, in the tower room, a light shaft 7.40 meters height offered the opportunity to see four 9 x 2.70meters murals with symbolic representations—of the commerce, industry, art, and planting—which is created by an Indies’ painter Mr. Ch. Sayers.




Figure 2.14 1939 Pavilion model (source: D’Orient No 30/ July 23, 1938)

2.4 1964 New York World’s Fair (NYWF)

New York World’s Fair (NYWF) in 1964-1965 at first was registered as one of world exposition on BIE’s event until it was crossed out for breaking some BIE’s rules. First offense was related to the operation time for a World’s exposition that only for one six-month season. However, New York insisted to run it for two six-month seasons. Secondly, New York planned to withdraw rental fees for the site and it broke the BIE regulations that prohibited that action. NYWF committee insisted with their plan and as the consequence BIE gave sanction to 1964-1965 NYWF. The sanction did not only exclude the NYWF from the list of World Expo event, but BIE also asked its member to not participate. Lot of regular participant countries cancelled their participation, and Uni Soviet decided not to participate. It was—as expressed by Matte (1998: 218)—‘leaving a world exhibition without much of the world.’ It left the doubt in the beginning but as a fair is a fair, excitement was still gave ‘a wonderful experience’ as it is told by Bill Cotter, a writer—together with Bill Young—of ‘the 1964-1965 New York World’s Fair’ photos collection book who was 12 years old during visiting the NYWF.

The idea of New York world fair was to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the city’s founding. The Fair was located at 630 acres Flushing Meadows, the same site as 1939-1940 New York World’s Fair. Even the plan and infrastructure were preserved, only the pavilions were positioned differently within thematic bands. 1964 fair built the Unisphere, sponsored by U.S. Steel, as their great symbol and stood on the same foundations as 1939 NYWF symbol: the Perisphere. This is a twelve-story stainless steel framework in form of the Earth with the continents in relief designed by Peter Muller-Munk Associates. This fair was fulfilled by a lot of monumental pavilion such as watchtowers

of New York State Complex, designed by Philip Johnson and Richard Foster; and the IBM Pavilion designed by Eero Saarinen. It was run in two seasons, April 22-October 18, 1964, and April 21-October 17, 1965.



Figure 2.15 The Map of 1964-1965 New York world's Fair (source:

https://live.staticflickr.com/7504/15089945393_1d7c44b413_b.jpg, accessed February 12, 2016)

2.4.1 Participation Background

Indonesian participation in the 1964 NYWF was immense for several reasons. It was a two-floor building with 30,730 square feet that stood on a 40,000-square-foot lot. It took around \$2.5 million for the construction of the pavilion and \$6.5 million for the whole participations. Indonesia was noted as the 14th country that announced its participation and the first country that signed the contract. It was the first participation of Indonesia after being independent of colonialization and it was prepared during the worst economic period. The motif of participation was to promote the

country; to further the aims of world peace, develop better international understanding, and promote harmonious international relations—as explained by Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono (HB) IX, the commissioner general for the pavilion of Indonesia, during the groundbreaking ceremony; and to build nation pride and international recognition—as said by Sukarno (in ‘Sukarno Advice to Girls at Fair: ‘Don’t Wiggle’ article by N.Y. Times, January 24, 1965) in suggesting Indonesia to participate in the fair again in 1965 so the world would know all about Indonesia. The pavilion—as explained by Major Saudin Sagiman, the head of public relations of The Indonesian New York World’s Fair Committee, in *Harian Merdeka* (1964)—was framed with ‘to build the world anew’ as the theme. All this narration could be read—as quoted from Ho, 1963—as a reflection of “Indonesia’s desire for creating a synthesis between Western and Eastern ideologies, in addition to [establishing] a new basis for world peace and international relations, based on the ‘Five Principles,’ or Pancasila (belief in God, humanity, nationality, democracy, and social justice), and would further give an impression of what Indonesia regards as its active and independent foreign policy.” The Indonesian pavilion could also be understood through some of the next statements. First, Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX —Commissioner General for the Pavilion of Indonesia—during his speech on groundbreaking ceremony of Indonesia Pavilion (in *New York World’s Fair 1964-1965 Corporation* (1963a: 4))—said that it was a reflection of “way of life; rich and dynamic culture; huge natural resources and the possibilities of exploiting them; contributions to world trade; and last but not least, efforts to attract foreign tourists.” Second, it—as explained by President Sukarno in his welcome speech for returned NYWF delegates (in Sukarno, 1964)—“was a showcase and a proof that Indonesia was not a backward country...on the verge of collapse, in a ‘complete chaos’ as argued by Neo-Colonialism, Colonialism and Imperialism Countries.” Third, it was one of the foremost instruments to declare and proclaim the Indonesian revolution (*Harian Merdeka* (1964); *The Information Division of the Indonesian NYWF Committee* (1964)).




Figure 2.16 One of the illustrations of Indonesian Pavilion for NYWF (source: <https://i.pinimg.com/originals/56/a2/8f/56a28fd9e580ff435bae158b82bc4d2b.jpg>, accessed February 12, 2016)

2.4.2 Architect Selection

This grand pavilion was entrusted directly by Sukarno to R.M. Soedarsono who was the palace architect and had experiences to interpret Sukarno's assignments under the nation-building projects category, such as the *Tugu Nasional* (National Obelisk). Sukarno was either assigned Abel Sorensen, an American architect who built the first modern hotel in Indonesia, Hotel Indonesia, as consulting architect, and Max O. Urbahn, as local partner.

2.4.3 Design

The pavilion was described by Hamilton Wright Organization (1964) as an 'ultra-modern' pavilion. This 'ultra-modern' image could be read through its architecture as described by the appearance of:

- a. The 86-foot high *Candi Bentar*—which is a monumental structure in Balinese architecture that functioned as gateway—as the gate to the site.

- b. A “Meru” structure—a wooden pagoda-like structure found in a Balinese temple—and a lotus-filled pond between the gate and the building to create Indonesia’s “watery country” image and atmosphere.
- c. A two-floor main structure with a circular form.
- d. A roof shaped like an umbrella.
- e. The beams of the radial frame of the roof converge at the axis and then spread out again the form of a 61-foot high five-petal flower. From within the flower, five shafts of colored light point skyward.
- f. Ornamented with traditional elements and motifs.




Figure 2.17 The Architecture of Indonesian Pavilion (source: Time-Life Books [ed.], 1964)

The design process lasted from September of 1961 (site selection) to the end of 1962 with the groundbreaking phase done on the 18th of January 1963. Then, its opening was preceded by “*Slamatan*” (pre-opening dinner party) in the evening of 19th April 1964. This building was occupied by four themed (political, cultural, trade, and tourism) exhibitions, demonstration of handicrafts, a souvenir shop, and a restaurant with oriental dancers and a native orchestra. All efforts received much appreciation from the media and visitors. It hit newspaper headlines several times and became—as reported by Caro (1965)—‘one of the fair’s most popular during the 1964 season’. It—as reported by Charles Poletti’s letter to Mr. S. Haditirto, 1964.9.4 (in archive of New York World’s Fair 1964-1965 Corporation

Collection at New York Public Library)—surpassed the number of visitors to pavilions representing South and Southeast Asia and the Far East, and several other foreign pavilions.

Table 2.1 Permissible Use and Occupancy

Story (include cellar and basement)	Live load (pounds per square foot)	Number of persons to be accommodated	use
First	100	320	Exhibit area
Mezzanine	60	75	Staff facilities
Second	100	475	Entertainment & Dining

(source: Occupancy Certificate, NYWF 1964-1965 Corporation Archive – New York Public Library)

2.4.3.1 Interior and Exhibition

Inside the building was exhibited varied artefact on Indonesia’s natures, cultures and histories. The exhibition was dominating the first floor, while second floor focus on displaying live performance of culture. The content of exhibition is listed in Table 2.2. The exhibition was displayed in a circular path following the form of the building.

Table 2.2 Content of Exhibition

No	First Floor	Second Floor
1	Demonstration of the creation of wood carving, batik – the wax process of dyeing exquisite multi-colored pattern on cloth-, stone sculptures and silversmiths.	The famed Indonesian dancers from Bali, Java, and Sumatra
2	Huge map of Indonesia	Varied foods of Indonesia
3	The major export products of Indonesia	The exotic music of gamelans and other native orchestras
4	Education	
5	Agriculture	
6	A display and demonstration of the unique, fascinating puppets or <i>wayang</i>	

(source: Hamilton Wright Organization, 1964)



Figure 2.18 Some cultural products exhibited in the first floor and accompanied by Indonesian women as information aides (source: NYUF 1964-1965 Corporation Archive – Collection of New York Public Library)



Figure 2.19 Live performance of Indonesia's culture in the Second floor of Pavilion as covered by Sunday News, August 16, 1964 (source: NYWF 1964-1965 Corporation Archive – New York Public Library)

2.5. 1970 Osaka World exposition (OWE)

BIE awarded Osaka a universal exhibition in 1965. It was the first world's fair hosted in Asia. With high enthusiasm, Japan prepared the exhibition to triumph. The world's fair was running for six months from March 15 to September 13, 1970. Organize by Japan Association for the 1970 World

2.5.1 Participation Background

Participation in 1970 Osaka World Exposition (OWE) was quite surprising for several reasons. First, it was only six years from the previous participation in 1964 New York World's Fair. Second, the invitation came—in 1967—when the transition period for nation life was started—also in 1967—through the change of presidency from Sukarno to Suharto. Mr. Alibasah Samhudi—friend of Robi Sularto during study in ITB, National Monument Competition in 1960, CONEFO Project in 1963-1965, and also accompanied Robi Sularto for several weeks in Osaka during developing the design for OWE—said, during an interview in 2018, that at first Indonesia was not planning to participate in the expo because of this transition event and because a lot of money needed to make those participations. It was estimated in the beginning that Indonesia's participation would cost US\$ 1,475,330. (Antara, 1963) However, the Japanese government supported by giving free rent building lot—according to Mr. Alibasah—and architect-constructor team to develop and realize the design.

All this challenge made Indonesia brought a high value on every aspect of its appearance. The motif of participation was explained by The Secretary General of the National Committee for Expo '70, Brig. Gen. Slamet Danusudirdjo—as quoted from Atmadi in JAPENPA [ed.], 1971: 217-218—in four points:

- a. Indonesia—as an Asian nation—considered it morally obliged to participate in the first world exposition ever held in Asia.
- b. Japan is one of Indonesia's staunchest friends among Asian nations, so it was proper that Indonesia helped in ensuring the success of Expo '70 in Japan.
- c. Indonesia wanted to introduce itself, particularly its aspiration to build an orderly, peaceful and prosperous world, in the Expo '70 where peoples from around the world came and gathered.
- d. The Expo theme conformed with 'the Indonesian people as embodied in its nation's philosophy of Pancasila.'

Meanwhile, the objectives of participation were to promote tourism; stimulate trade; and encourage the flow of foreign capital investment into the country. The participation of Indonesia in 1970 World Exposition in Osaka was decided based on Presidential Decree No. 291/1968 of 7 October 1968. This Presidential Decree besides declaring the participation also pointed several things, such as:

- a. The appointment of the Chairman of the National Development Planning Board (BAPPENAS) to arrange and coordinate the preparation for the participation
- b. With the lead of BAPPENAS, this participation would also be assisted by the Departments, Government Institutes, and Private Agencies.
- c. Indonesian Embassy in Tokyo was charged to render assistance in making preparations and implementation of the participation.

d. The fund needed would be borne by the Government with support of the public.



Figure 2.21 A brochure on Indonesian Pavilion (source: Osaka Expo 70 Memorial Park Collection)



Figure 2.22 Sri Sultan HB IX gave speech at National day of Indonesia, August 21, 1970 (left) , An information aide stood in front of the pavilion (right) (source: Commemorative Association for the Japan World Exposition, 1971 (left), JAPENPA [ed.], 1971 (right))

2.5.2 Architect Selection

There is limited time to make preparation on the design, therefore the selection for architect and design was made through a competition. There are two version about who is the participant and where the competition was held, but both could be related. The first version based on an interview

with Mr. Alibasah Samhudi said that the selection was held for the young architects or architect student of ITB who work—as internship—at the development of CONEFO (Conference of the New Emerging Forces) project. The second version from Dikdik Sayahdikumullah’s research report (2016) explain that limited competition was held on a small architectural firm, PT. Gubah Laras in Jakarta. The similarity of both versions is that the principal architect of CONEFO project and PT. Gubah Laras are the same person—Ir. Sujudi Wiryoatmodjo. Mr. Alibasah not quite sure who is the judges, however he thought that the judges were architect Ir. Sujudi Wiryoatmodjo and architect Han Awal. From this process, Robi Sularto and his design was chosen. In designing the pavilion, Robi Sularto was possessed as architect that helped by a team of Japanese people that ruled as co-architect. In his articles *‘Arsitektur Itu Dilahirkan, Bukan Dibuat (Architecture was born, not made)’* (in Salain, 2001: 8), Robi Sularto wrote that there are 12 to 19 people—from architect to cost estimator—in that Japanese team.



Figure 2.23 Robi Sularto (in the middle) stood in front of Indonesia Pavilion (source: Robi Sularto’s Family Collection)

2.5.3 Design

2.5.3.1 Concept

The Indonesian pavilion was differed to futuristic structures or inflatable buildings that dominate the Expo. Indonesian pavilion chose to display the spiritual and cultural achievement of the Indonesian Man by the peaceful and warm atmosphere, a firm tranquility in the human-scaled spaces, and the deep psychological human experience while going around (Atmadi [ed.], 1970[?]). This quality was built through the concept that based on the cultural tradition and heritage.




Figure 2.24 The architecture model of Indonesian Pavilion that show the building and its landscape design (source: Robi Sularto’s family Collection)



Figure 2.25 A Picture of Indonesian Pavilion and its location on Expo Map as informed in a Pamphlet about Indonesia (source: Osaka Expo 70 Memorial Park Collection)

There is—at least—two explanation about the concept of the design. The first concept—as recorded in the 1972 report book by ‘Commemorative Association for the Japan World Exposition— associated the pavilion to the stupa of Borobudur temple and rice field with terraced irrigation in Java as its inspiration. The second concept—as Noguchi (1971) wrote in his paper based on interview with the architect Robi Sularto—was worked out from the principles of universal space and quake-proof construction of “Pendopo”, The complex of buildings and squares used by the Javanese princes as their palaces. This second concept was the original planning and said—by Noguchi (1971: 41-42)—to be ‘not fully realized, with the exception of the space framed roof covered with transparent acrylic

resin plates, mainly because of halved budget' and the dynamic plan with the floors of split level with centered in a central space. In its final form, both concepts were seemed fused.

The pavilion was a compound of six pyramid-type buildings—transformed from the stupa of Borobudur temple—that housed four zones, plus zones for restaurant, gift, and shops encircled the central dance stage—where live performances are held every day during the Expo. A horizontal terrace roof covered and bound together these pyramid-shaped stupas, reminiscent of the exhibit theme of “Unity in Diversity.” How the buildings stood on terraced ground that seen to float in the pool from which water flowed slowly down its slopes was a clear representation of *dangau*—small temporary hut in the middle of paddy field—and a paddy field of Indonesia. The concept was successfully felt by visitor as delivered by Press such as:

- a. “(Indonesia) showed how people could create good feeling to each other by colour, texture and design of the spaces in which they met. The feeling of welcome stemmed from the personality of the hostesses and the exotic costumes of the dancers, as well as the building, its sculptures, painting and exhibits of hand-made and lovely handicrafts”. (Atmadi in JAPENPA [ed.], 1971, p.213)
- b. “A firm tranquility in the human-scaled spaces (of the Indonesian Pavilion), made the ordinary visitors feel at home, whereas in the huge pavilion we ca feel that the ‘power that be’ were charge of everything including our own life”. (Atmadi [ed.], 1970[?]: 3)

The quality of the design of Indonesian Pavilion was also recognized by Expo committee through its position as one of the 10 nominators for architectural award—that won by Czechoslovakia Pavilion (Salain, 2001).




Figure 2.26 Floor Plan and Section of Pavilion (source: Osaka Expo 70 Memorial Park Collection)

2.5.3.2 Characteristic

The Pavilion was a 2.222 sq. meters floor area cut pyramid shape with 7.5 meters tall. Lot. No. 4130 where the pavilion was stood was located at the west of the Symbol area, near the artificial lake. It has 2.852 sq. meter area that sloping towards the artificial lake. There are several ideas and features of the pavilion that reconstructed the dynamic life of Indonesian people, culture, and landscape.

1. The first feature was created to respond the context of site. The architect rotated the axis of the pavilion 45-degree angle from the lot axis, then made multi-level terraces with flowing water and multi-level floor inside the pavilion (see cross section picture in figure 2.25).
2. The exterior of the building was created by arrangement of wall built of steel frames and covered with exposed wooden tiles. It was walls but at the same time built the sense of the existence of roofs. This wall closed the whole pavilion except in some small parts of the wall where vertical transparent slits were made, and this brought the spectator's curiosity as they could only see small part of the interior.
3. The "Space Structure"—horizontal terrace roof was composed of a waved roof deck and acrylate boards to bring sunlight into the interior space.
4. The nation's state emblem GARUDA became one of eye-catching element in the entrance area. It chose as the symbol of the Indonesian Pavilion. In an article 'Symbol of The Indonesian Pavilion', the reason for this choice are because its close affinity to the national coat-of-arms, related to the Pavilion's theme: Unity in Diversity, Diversity in Unity, symbolized, through its outspread wings, that there can be no development for man without progress and the use of technology and science—which was tied in with the theme of EXPO'70: "Progress and Harmony for Mankind".
5. The Stage as uniting space is the most important Zone inside the pavilion. It was situated almost in the centre of the Pavilion; protected by the space structures; and the place for tradition dance, music, and other performances. It was also the element to enlivened—by colourful seats—the whole space that dominance with the grey color of the floor and the walls.
6. The circulation gave the visitor choices to go as they—from the entrance-hall—can proceed either to the exhibition zones or to the restaurant, or to the stage area. However, the circular pattern of circulation inside the pavilion—from zone to zone—also allows visitors to always be tied to the stage as the most important zone.
7. The colour of the building and interior was consisted of the colour of the materials and the calm colours with some contrast colour to invite and welcome visitors' awareness. The choice of colours could be described—based on a paper with no title in Osaka Expo Memorial Park Collection—as below:
 - The colour of exterior façade was from exposed wood panel colour
 - The passage-way floor is grey.
 - The floor of the Zone I is reddish – violet, therefore when the visitor was standing in the entrance-hall and walking along the passage-way to the hall, they would be aware of a warm stretch from this Zone I.

- 'Entering Zone II, the sensation was brought to normal through the medium-grey colour, and attention is begged for the demonstrations being held in this zone.'
- The floor of Zone III (the zone of the past history of Indonesia) is deep-green so the visitor could evoke the exotic characters of the 'ketjak' dance of Bali, the array of masks and display of *kain* (textile) that exhibited in this zone.
- The Zone IV which presenting: Indonesia today used cadmium-orange colour to enhance brightness.
- The colour of the mezzanine floor and stairs to the mezzanine was leafgreen/lemon yellow, except for the mezzanine for the restaurant which has greyish-blue colour. 'This latter is intended to show-off the soft beige-coloured chairs.'
- The floor of the restaurant below was leafgreen/lemon yellow and the chairs in this site are ochre-coloured.



Figure 2.27 A situation during the performance in the stage. People could see the performance from Restaurant in ground and mezzanine floor, in the passage way, and from terrace. (source: Osaka Expo 70 Memorial Park Collection)



Figure 2.28 Detail Design of the exterior and landscape (source: Osaka Expo 70 Memorial Park Collection)

2.5.3.3 Exhibition

The main theme of the exhibition, as explained by Atmadi (in JAPENPA [ed.], 1971: 214), was ‘the diversity of the peoples who make up modern Indonesia, and their unity as they move towards greater industrialization.’ The exhibition was displayed inside the pavilion as below:

1. Zone I (general information) shows:
 - a) An ethnographic map of Indonesia
 - b) A map of Indonesia as compared with that of Japan
 - c) Puppets showing regional dresses
 - d) Stalactite photographs, showing features of Indonesia




Figure 2.29 Exhibition in Zone I (left: Osaka Expo 70 Memorial Park Collection; right: Atmadi, 1970)

2. Zone II (demonstrations) demonstrates the making of the following arts and crafts:
 - a) Batik
 - b) Woodcarvings
 - c) *Wayang kulit* (leather puppets)
 - d) *Wayang golek* and *topeng* (wooden puppets and masks)
 - e) Balinese arts and crafts
 - f) Silverworks



Figure 2.30 Visitors see the demonstration on Zone II (Osaka Expo 70 Memorial Park Collection)

3. Zone III (masks, weaving and Gems) displayed a collection of about 50 masks from primitive to contemporary Javanese and Balinese masks.



Figure 2.31 Mask Exhibition in Zone III (Osaka Expo 70 Memorial Park Collection)

4. Zone IV (Indonesia Today) exhibit the condition of Indonesia during the Expo period.



Figure 2.32 Zone IV (Osaka Expo 70 Memorial Park Collection)

5. Other facilities:
 - a) The VIP Room
 - b) The stage and art performances.
 - c) The Restaurant & Indonesian Cuisine on the ground floor and the mezzanine.
 - d) Three Pavilion Shop sold distinctive Indonesian products.

Those exhibitions were shown in relatively traditional technique where the object was displayed and the visitors observing. This solution was chosen because the Indonesia Pavilion looked to extend to their visitors a peaceful presentation and presented the high-lights on the performing arts.

2.6 2010 Shanghai World Exposition (SWE)

2010 SWE took the theme 'Better City, Better Life' and invited participants to present a model of urban living concept that breathes harmony with its sustainable natural and human development environments. Indonesia was presented in 4 stories building with 2,400sqm building size that stood on 4,000 square meters lot. As respond to the expo theme, Indonesia brought 'Indonesia's Biodiverse City' as pavilion theme to highlights the trove of wisdom Indonesia in designing prosperous multi-cultural urban habitats of tomorrow based on sustainable graceful living with Nature (Pangestu [ed.] 2011). The architect, Budi Lim Architects, proposed 'the stilted house' as the design idea, something that they found as one commonality or universal feature along the different traditional houses across the archipelago (Pangestu [ed.] 2011). It was also their answer for the option on a specific/single out one traditional architecture which they thought will not represent Indonesia's vast range of diversity and for a contemporary, ultra-modern look option which completely veer away from traditional styles (Pangestu [ed.] 2011).

This 'stilted house' made as open structure with open plan, 20-meter high atrium-like entrance and a 600-meter ramp that flowed continuously between indoor and outdoor spaces. Bamboo was chosen as the main material where it was used as structure, floor material, wall, ceiling material, and decoration. The extensive use of bamboo shared the indigenous wisdom of taking the most appropriate from Nature without stripping the land senselessly, and the craftsmanship quality that Indonesian people is mastered (Pangestu [ed.] 2011).



Figure 2.33 2010 Pavilion photos (source: <https://cdn-u1-gnfi.imgix.net/post/large-what-do-you-know-about-pavillion-indonesia-in-shan-c1e0650c4abc056614f6644585fc7f50.jpg>, http://1.bp.blogspot.com/_MJScgGMYSvl/TNUV0E_R0dl/AAAAAAAAAyg/8j4zmbwc-XQ/s1600/02.jpg accessed on July 8, 2016)

2.7 2015 Milan World Exposition (MWE)

The last 2015 MWE which held from May 1 to October 31, 2015 was participated by 145 countries world organizations and private sectors. For Indonesia, it was the first exposition where the participation was initiated—and at the beginning it was fully done—by private group with—then got—support from government. The government at early preparation time for participation decided to not participate on this event for financial efficiency reason and also approaching the end of their reign. With this situation, Indonesian, finally, could built its own pavilion successfully in a 1,100 square-meter

lot, located at the East entrance of the exhibition site. A team of architect consist of Miranti Gumayana, Rubi Roesli, and Dani Hermawan got responsibility to design the pavilion.



Figure 2.34 Exterior and interior photos of 2015 Pavilion (source: Courtesy of Pavilion Indonesia Architect Team (above), Pareanom, 2016 (below))

The participation purpose to bring and talk about Indonesia today, which is modern with strong Indonesian characteristic, brought their decision to not display a specific Indonesian custom house for the architecture of the pavilion. They believed that specific custom house could not represent the diversity of Indonesia as said by Rubi Roesli—one of the architects (Pareanom, 2016). The expo theme ‘Feeding the Planet, Energy for Life’ was understood by the architect on three

keywords—food, technology, energy—and translated with Maritime and Agrarian as the concept of pavilion’s architecture. The physical form inspired by the Bubu and Lumbung, a harmonious blend of marine and agriculture and was a modern interpretation of the local values and wisdom of the people of Indonesia. Bubu, a traditional tool used to catch fish, made in the shape of woven bamboo or rattan, was displayed in the form of a curved woven rattan panel in layers around the upper outside wall, while the lumbung was manifested in the overall construction of the pavilion.’ This agriculture aspect also, originally, implemented on the landscape in front of the pavilion where rice will be planted (Pareanom, 2016). To strengthen interpretation of locality, the pavilion also constructed as semi-opened pavilion as could be found in many traditional buildings in Indonesia. This structure got maximize use of natural light and air circulation. The final presentation could be seen in form of building which covered by panels of waved synthetic rattan.

2.8. Epilogue

2.8.1 Ideas of Representation

The first discussion was carried out between architectural image, expo, and pavilion theme, and the objective of participation was to present ideas of national representation. The 1931, 1937, and 1939 pavilions represented a positive image of both the Netherlands as the motherland and the Netherlands-Indies as a colony on the world colonization map. As Dutch pursued the objective, they tried to revive the grandeur of both cultures and achieve representation of a ‘wealthy’ nation by taking the grand European-style building proportions mixed with monumental traditional elements. The result is grand buildings fully decorated on a monumental scale and with numbers of traditional elements (see Figures 1, 2, and 3). It—as quoted from Taylor (2003: 239)—was a perfect illustration of how the ‘Dutch thought of the colony as “our Indies,” inhabited by a huge variety of peoples fused into one as “Natives.”’ Meanwhile, Indonesian participation after independence shared Indonesian richness as a solution for world problems (see Table 2.3, column 4). The 1964 pavilion sent a message about Indonesia’s position and ideas about world peace—the issue marked by the freedom of several countries and the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Cold War—as shown in the pavilion’s theme. The message is presented through the site selection, pavilion form and style, and ‘five-petal flower’ roof crown. President Sukarno came and himself chose the neutral site, which was located at an equal distance from the U.S and U.S.S.R. sites. The circular form was made for the same statement of neutrality, and the ultra-modern style was Sukarno’s expression of freedom from colonial influence and the fresh and bright face of the new-Indonesia. This was concluded from Sukarno’s speech (1960: 290) which said ‘Build the world anew. Break now with the past, for the day is at its dawning. Break now with the past, so that we can justify ourselves with the future.’ It is also concluded by many scholars, as explained

by Silver (2008: 100), that this modernist, international architectural motif, were an exercise in raising national prestige to blot out the lingering images of the colonial past. The roof crown symbolized *Pancasila*, the Five Principles on which the Republic of Indonesia was founded and lives with, proposed by Sukarno as an alternative ideology for a peaceful world. The 1970 pavilion—as explained by Prof. Sadali, who was responsible for the pavilion’s interior and exhibitions, in Atmadi [ed.] (1970: 3)—stood as a big, calm, mysterious building known for its peaceful atmosphere to emphasize the spiritual and cultural achievements of Indonesian people, rather than the material, scientific, and technological fields. This was the Indonesian proposal for the problem of human development. The 2010 pavilion’s theme promoted Indonesia’s wisdom, nature, biodiversity, and multicultural urban habitat as a proposal for creating a livable city. It was presented in the image of an open stilted bamboo pavilion with no walls and no doors. The theme for the 2015 MWE was a semi-open pavilion with rattan weaving inspired by *Bubu* and *Lumbung*, both symbols of indigenous culture to maintain food sustainability for a communal life. Once again, Indonesia shared its wisdom as problem-solving.

Table 2.3 Information about Pavilions

Expo Name	Expo/Fair Theme	Pavilion Theme	Objective	Architectural Image
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(6)
1931 PCWF	Colonization	-	Introducing Netherlands-Indies as the biggest Dutch colony and a display of purpose and progress of Western civilization in the colonies	Collection of traditional architectures
1937 NPPIE	Peace on Pan-Pacific Area	-	-	
1939 GGIE	Pageant of The Pacific	-	Reminder of the Netherlands' long presence in the Netherlands-Indies	
1964 NYWF	Peace Through Understanding	To Build the World a New	Sending an Indonesian vision and solution for world peace	Modern circular building in Balinese yard
1970 OWE	Human Progress into Harmony	Unity in Diversity	Introducing Indonesia and its aspiration to build an orderly, peaceful, and prosperous world	Six cut pyramids floating on the water
2010 SWE	Better City, Better Life	Biodiverse City	Highlighting the Indonesian wisdom in designing prosperous multicultural urban habitats based on sustainable graceful living with nature	Open Stilted Bamboo House
2015 MWE	Feeding the Planet, Energy for Life	Stage of The World	Taking Indonesian wisdom on maritime activities and agriculture	Semi-open construction covered by rattan panels

Table 2.4 Characteristics of Pavilions

No	Pavilion	1931 PCWF	1937 NPPPE	1939 GGIE	1964 NYWF	1970 OWE	2010 SWE	2015 MWE
A. CONTEXT								
A.1. Precinct								
1	Form	<i>Alun-alun</i> with traditional houses	X	X	Lotus-filled pond with a <i>meru</i> tower	rice field with terraced irrigation	trees & bamboo garden	Small green grass & plants
2	Reference	Java	X	X	Bali	Java	All regions	All regions
A.2. Site Border								
1	Form	Solid Clay Brick Fence	X	X	White beam – clay brick column	X	Bamboo poles & greenery	X
2	Reference	Bali	X	X	Modern form of Balinese gate	X	All regions	X
A.3. Site Gate		<i>Candi Bentar</i>	X	X	<i>Candi Bentar</i>	X	X	X
A.4. Main Pavilion Plot		Front corner	Whole site	Whole site	Center	Whole site	Whole site	Whole site
A.5. Approach to Main Pavilion		Directly from street	Directly from street	Directly from street	Through gate and precinct	Through precinct	Through precinct	Through small precinct

B. MAIN PAVILION								
B.1. Basic Description								
1	Program	Exhibition space	Exhibition space	Exhibition space	Exhibition, restaurant, stage	Exhibition, restaurant, gift shop, stage	Exhibition, restaurant, Stage	Exhibition, restaurant,
2	Floor	One	One	One	Two	One + mezzanine	Four	One
3	Floor Plan	B shape (two inner courts)	C shape	L shape	circle	Intersected boxes with hole	Rectangle	intersected ovals
4	Structure	Wood	Wood	Wood	Steel	Steel	Steel	Steel
B.2. Pavilion Form								
1	Form	Box	Box	Box	Crowned cylinder	Cut pyramids	Open box	Semi-open structure
2	Space	Big hall	Hall	Hall and atrium	Big halls	Atriums	Atrium, rooms corridor	Small hall
3	Reference	European building	European building	European building	Symbol of neutrality	Stupa of Borobudur Java	Stilted house in all regions	Traditional fishing & food storage in all regions
B.3. Pavilion Elements								
B.3.1. Main Entrance								
1	Form	<i>Kori Gate</i>	<i>Kori Gate</i>	Decorated door	Opening	Opening	Atrium	Opening

2	Location	Center of front facade	One side of building's	Under the tower	Center of front facade	Center of pavilion	First-floor open space	Center of front facade
3	Reference	Bali	Bali	Bali	Not specific	Not specific	Stilted House	Not specific
B.3.2. Wall								
1	Form	Bas-relief, clay brick & ornament	Bas-relief	Bas-relief & Paras stone	Glass	<i>Lauan</i> plywood sheet single	Bamboo	Bamboo woven panels
2	Reference	Java & Bali	Java & Bali	Borobudur-Java & Bali	Modern Architecture	Kalimantan & Sumatra	All regions	All regions
B.3.3. Roof (R.)								
1	Form	Storied roof	Hip roof	Hip roof	Umbrella- fluted roof	Horizontal roof	Horizontal roof	Horizontal roof
2	Reference	Minangkabau	Java/Bali	Bali	All regions	Modern	Modern	Modern
B.3.4. Roof Cover								
1	Form	<i>sirap</i>	<i>sirap</i>	<i>sirap</i>	Sandwich type deck	Woven roof deck & acrylate boards	Aluminum sandwich panel	Flat roof covered with turf
2	Reference	Kalimantan	Kalimantan	Kalimantan	Modern material	Modern	Modern	Modern
Special Feature								
1	Form	Two Meru towers	Replica of Temple	Replica of Temple	Five-petal flower roof crown	Traditional style sculptures	Bamboo for all elements	Rattan panel as facade
2	Location	On corners of roof	On corner of pavilion	On top of podium' roof	On top of the roof	Precinct	All places	Surrounding the facade
3	Reference	Bali	Java	Java	Symbol of Pancasila	Bali	All regions	All regions

2.8.2 The Meaning of Traditional Elements

All pavilions used traditional elements as constructing elements. This was strongly visualized at all seven events, except for the 1964 pavilion, which was dominated by a modern architectural style (see Table 4). This part will discuss the meaning of the traditional elements displayed on the main pavilion. As explained before, the 1931, 1937, and 1939 pavilions used elements from many regions, such as Sumatra, Java, Bali, and Borneo, with Java and Bali elements dominating. This attitude was influenced by the point of view of Dutch scholars of Indonesia's traditional elements that regarded art influenced by Hindu civilization, especially on Bali, as purer and undefiled by Islam, above the others. Daniel Veth, as an example, divided and classified arts and architecture by ethnic groups into three categories which are authentic but "primitive" living cultural expressions made by indigenous or "natural" people, art influenced by the worthy ancient Hindu civilization, and work produced under the influence of Islam (Bloombergen, 2002). This point of view influenced the architects working in the Netherlands-Indies to regard traditional architecture as inferior to Western civilization. In the 1920s, some architects, such as Thomas Karsten and Maclaine Pont, began the idea of taking traditional elements, which would provoke the first discussion of Indonesian architecture, as important references in developing a proper and good architecture for the Netherlands-Indies. Therefore, the dominance of elements from Java and Bali during Netherlands-Indies participations is reasonable. Meanwhile, others selected elements from outside Java and Bali, choosing them from high or sacred rank/value origin, such as the *Rumah Gadang* roof from Minangkabau and the durable *sirap* wood from Borneo/Kalimantan, putting these in the same class as elements from Java-Bali. Traditional elements in pavilions after independence appeared in different manners. The 1964 pavilion had two features taken from traditional elements, which were the umbrella roof and five-petal flower roof crown. The 1970 pavilion brought the idea of the Borobudur stupa as a form, and then covered it with wooden tiles for the whole wall. This created a big, calm, mysterious building which was difficult to associate with its original form. Massive use of woven bamboo/rattan and a semi-open structure represented traditional elements of Indonesia were used in the 2010 and 2015 pavilions. The origin of the elements used in these four pavilions was wider, because they can be found in almost all Indonesian cultures.

2.8.3 The Meaning of Modern Expression

In the 1931 pavilion, Moojen clearly declared modern expression to be one of the objectives of architectural creation. The first and most important step to ensure this was taken by the basic image of the form in European proportion. In doing so, Zweedjigk and Moojen revised the building proportions from the winning design by Zweedjigk to be grander and preserved these grand

proportions—while reducing the number of traditional elements—in the new pavilion built after the first (original) pavilion was destroyed by fire (see Figure 2.34). With this strong modern base, traditional elements were brought in and put on it. This strategy was repeated in 1937 and 1939. The 1964 pavilion used a similar approach in the beginning, when modern expression took over the whole form of the pavilion. Modern expression was used as a method to transform the tradition, as seen by how the umbrella roof appeared in its simplest shape, a roof crown supported by a modern structure, and traditional details were decorated in limited colors. This use of modern expression—as belived by Sorensen (as quoted from Silver, 2008: 101)—was explained as a reflection of ‘Indonesia’s desire to show its ‘progressive aims and cultural art forms’. It was also a continuation of vision by Indonesian government that made modern architecture as Indonesia’s identity during 1957—65 period. The 1970, 2010, and 2015 pavilions continued the effort started in 1964 by completely using modern expression to change the traditional forms into a new modern interpretation. As seen in their final appearance, the form of those three pavilions differed from their origin.




Figure 2.35 The Winning Design by Zweedjigk (above), New Pavilion built (below) (source: Voorwaarts, No. 2918/ January 30, 1930 (above); Voorwaarts, No. 3388/ August 5, 1931 (below))

2.8.4 The Narration read through Precinct and its Relationship with the Main Pavilion

Stories of Indonesia can be narrated through the relationship between the precinct and the main pavilion. Five of the seven pavilions were built completely in combination with the main pavilion and precinct. Two pavilions that did not have precinct are those of 1937 and 1939. The 1931 pavilion's precinct was created as a repetition of dominant traditional Balinese elements which appeared on the main pavilion. This creation was constructed as two structures, which functioned as a second pavilion and dance theater, and a Balinese gate and fence that tied all the structures together as one compound. In a larger precinct, this compound was seen standing behind a big park in which some traditional houses were scattered. This was another repetition of collecting the traditional elements achieved by the main pavilion's architectural image. In this case, the relationship between the precinct and the main pavilion was to re-emphasize the idea of representation.

The 1964 pavilion was named as the pavilion of past and present (Hamilton Wright Organization, 1964). One of its forms is was exhibited in the precinct that appeared in traditional image and its main pavilion was in ultra-modern. The explanation of the architecture—as could be read in New York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation, 1936 (b) and Hamilton Wright Organization, 1964—clearly said that the traditional image took the visitor into an Indonesian atmosphere and to the modern pavilion. This narrated the relation of the precinct and the pavilion to show the progress of development in Indonesia and the harmonious life of the new modern Indonesia in its traditional setting. Therefore, the relationship between the precinct and the main pavilion in 1964 created a complete narration of Indonesian participation. The traditional precinct of the 1970 pavilion was different from the one used in 1964 because it could not be directly associated with its original inspiration. However, this traditional precinct worked closely—and would have no or different meaning when standing alone—with the main element, where both shared a similar abstract quality. It was displayed as terraced ground with a pool from which water flowed slowly down the slopes, representing an Indonesian paddy field. The pool below and around the pavilion created an image of a floating building. This image could be associated with many traditional structures standing on rice fields across Indonesia and used by farmers to rest in. While precinct and pavilion had an abstract quality, the responsibility to visually inform spectators of Indonesian identity was given to the traditional sculptures installed on the precinct, such as the well-known Garuda statue in Balinese style. Consequently, the relationship between precinct and pavilion in 1970 was also intended to create a complete narration. A similar intention to use precinct to complete the narration can be found in the 2010 and 2015 pavilions. In 2010, the architects used local craftsmanship skills to work with bamboo as a floor material, and for the amphitheater's benches, stage, and fence. Then they installed palm trees and tropical fruit trees

in the small gardens. This gave a replica of the actual context of an original stilted house to the pavilion. In the 2015 Pavilion, a small green precinct—which in its design was planned to be filled with a small rice field—was added around the building to complete the narration of food and energy sustainability.

CHAPTER THREE

THE DESIGN OF 1964 PAVILION ³

3.1 Nation Building Project as Context

3.1.1 International and Domestic situation in 1950-60s

After independent, Sukarno formally lead the country as President, when he appointed by the Parliament in 18 August 1945. However, in the early period of his presidency, Dutch still tried to take Indonesia over their hand. They did the First Military Aggression on July 21, 1947 and repeated with Second Military Aggression on December 19, 1948. This made Indonesia focus was concentrated to defend its independency. After several physical confrontations and diplomatic negotiation, Dutch conceded the independence of Indonesia in December 27, 1949. However internal strife between groups inside the country started to happen since then.

Sukarno reintroduced the Constitution of 1945 in 1959. This gave him full power to control the country. during this time, he legalized his democracy style which named as “guided democracy” and had been introduced since 1956. It was officially marked by the issuance of a *Dekret Presiden* (Presidential Decree) No. 5/1959 and continued till 1965. In this system, the function of parliament was eliminated and took over by The Guider. The Guider who has strong leadership will ‘summarize the points into a compromise palatable to each faction’. Then Sukarno, as a citizen, appointed himself as The Guider.

³ Part of the content of this chapter has been published in three papers (see Kurniawan, 2018, 2019.a, and 2019.b)




Figure 3.1 Events before and surrounding the participation of Indonesia in 1964 NYWF

3.1.2 Nation Building Project

After the independency of Indonesia, the first President, Soekarno, put the making of pride of the nation as one of his goal. And by having an academic background in architecture, he understood the power of architecture and used it to play that role. He started to construct several new infrastructures under the name of nation-building or character-building projects (original English for both). Projects—as quoted from Sukarno (1963: 42)—were initiated 'to recover our national identity', which Sukarno (1963) said as important as the problem of food and clothing:

"Projects such as the Asian Games, the National Monument, Independence Mosque, the Jakarta By-pass, and so on, are examples of 'Nation-Building' and 'Character-Building' (...) of the whole Indonesian people striving to recover our national identity. I know and I understand very well that there are some people who are not aware of the meaning and function of those 'Nation-Building' and 'Character-Building' projects. They criticize and grumble under their breath about why such projects, which cost a lot of money, are given priority. They think it would be better to spend this money first developing projects to improve the daily life of people (...). In answer to them, I wish to insist that projects to improve the people's daily life are by no means neglected, and that" (problems of identity are problems of daily life)." Who is not aware that every people in the world is always striving to enhance its greatness and lofty ideals? Do you remember that a great leader of a foreign country told me that monuments are an absolute necessity to develop the people's spirit, as necessary as pants for somebody naked, pants and not a tie? Look at New York and

Moscow, look at any State capital, East or West it makes no matter, and you always find the centres of nations; greatness in the form of buildings, material buildings to be proud of...

Similar idea could be read either in two notes from Sukarno to Henk Ngantung about the need of beautiful city for its citizen—as recorded by Damais (1977: 155-158).

Several landmarks were built to transform Jakarta, which was the center of the struggle of the Indonesian people, into an inspirational city, beacon to struggling mankind and the emerging forces, and the portal of the country (Sukarno, 1962). Some landmarks were created to realize Sukarno’s visionary motif, such as Pola Building—the symbol and image of national development; Hotel Indonesia—the first modern hotel with 14 stories and 423 rooms designed by American Architect Abel Sorensen; Wisma Nusantara—the first modern office building in Indonesia and highest building in Asia (29 floors) at that time; the Jakarta By-pass—the first modern interchange and highway in Indonesia; the 500-hectare Ancol Recreation Complex—the biggest project and recreation place in Southeast Asia; Sarinah Department Store—the first modern shopping center and symbol of modern life of Indonesian people; Masjid Istiqlal—the largest masjid/mosque in the Southeast Asia and the symbol of tolerance—as it is stood side by side with the biggest cathedral in Indonesia; and CONEFO Building--a symbol of the power of Indonesian people and power of ‘emerging countries’. Several other buildings, monuments, and infrastructures were made to celebrate moments, such as Tugu Selamat Datang—a symbol of Indonesian hospitality in welcoming people during Asian Games; Tugu Dirgantara—a symbol of the courage of Indonesian air fighter; and Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat—a symbol of Irian Barat freedom from invaders’ interference. Meanwhile few projects, such as Ambarukmo Hotel in Yogyakarta and Bali Beach Hotel in Bali, were also built out of Jakarta (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1. Sukarno’s Nation Building Projects

No	Building	Year/Designer	Monument / Statue	Year/ Designer	Infrastructure	Year/ Designer	Location
1	Gelora/Asian Games Stadium (GAGS)	1961-62/L.S. Tyatenko (USSR)	Monumen/Tugu Nasional (M/TN)	1961-75/lr. Soedarsono	Semanggi Flyover	-	Jakarta
2	Hotel Indonesia (HI)	1962/Abel Sorensen (USA)	Tugu Dirgantara (TD)	1964-65/lr. Sutami – Edhi Sunarso	Jakarta By-pass	-	
3	Sarinah Department Store (SDS)	1966 / Kinoshita and Taisei Corporation (Japan)	Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat (TPIB)	1962/lr. Silaban– Henk Ngantung& Edhi Sunarso	Jalanan Senayan	-	

4	Masjid Istiqlal (MI)	1961/ Ir. Silaban	Tugu Selamat Datang (TSD)	1962/Henk Ngantung-Edhi Sunarso	Pedjompongan II	-	
5	Wisma Nusantara Building (WN)	1964 / Kinoshita, Kajima, and Taisei Corporation (Japan)					
6	Conefo Building (CB) - now the Parliament House	1965 /Sujudi	Statue of Kartini	1963/ (Japan)			
7	Pola Building (GP)	1961-63/Ir. Silaban	Patung Pahlawan/ Heroes' Monument	1963/Matvei and Otto Manizer (Moscow)			
8	Planetarium Cikini (PC)	1963/Ir. Ismail Sofyan, Ir. Ciputra, and Ir. Brasali (Perentjana Djaja)	Statue of Gajah Mada	1962/Mikail Wowor			
9	Teater Nasional (TN)	unbuilt	Statue of Diponegoro at M/TN Esplanade	1965/Cobertaldo (Italy)			
10	Menara Bung Karno	Unbuilt/ Hans Lintl (Austria) & Silaban					
11	Ancol Recreation Complex	1965. 1966/PT Pembangunan Jaya.					
12	Pavilion for 1964-1965 NYWF	1963-1964/ Ir. Soedarsono					New York, U.S
13	Ambarukmo Hotel	1960-1965/					Yogyakarta
14	Bali Beach Hotel (now – Inna Grand Beach Hotel)	1963-1966/ Taisei Construction (Japan) & PN. Pembangunan Perumahan (PP)					Bali
15	Samudra Beach Hotel, Pelabuhan Ratu	1962-1965/PN PP (Indonesia) and Taisei Kanko Kabushiki Kaisha Ltd. (Japan)					West Java

Soekarno, at the commemoration of Jakarta's 435th anniversary in June 1962 (in Sudradjat, 1991:191), explained the action he took by said: "Build up Djakarta as beautifully as possible, build it as spectacularly as possible, so that this city, which has become the centre of the struggle of the Indonesian people, will be an inspiration and beacon to the whole of struggling mankind and to all the emerging forces. If Egypt was able to construct Cairo as its capital, Italy its Rome, France its Paris and Brazil its Brasilia, then Indonesia must also proudly present Djakarta as the portal of the country".

During this period, architecture become the political tool. Architecture expressed the position and vision on building the country, with the slogan 'nation building'. All the nation building projects took monumental modern style which was internationally dominating the world at that time as its hallmark. The choice to take modern architecture was also mean to free Indonesia from the past, from the long story of colonialization by 'blot out the lingering images of the colonial past' (Silver, 2008: 100), from the status of new born country which identic with undeveloped condition, ready to put its mark on world map as a country with pride, and put Indonesia equal to the world. Frederich Silaban, an architect who helped Sukarno realize his NBP and shared the same vision about architecture, said—as explained in Pusat Dokumentasi Arsitektur (2012: 61)—that 'modern architecture can describe (or at least portray) Indonesia's identity'. Admiration of modern architecture can be found implemented in the NBP's design strategies—as compiled in Table 3. The strategy to situate the building at the center of the site (such as in Gelora/Asian Games Stadium, Tugu National, Tugu Dirgantara, Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat, and Tugu Selamat Datang) or pulled back from the site entrance (such as in Hotel Indonesia, Sarinah Department Store, Masjid Istiqlal, Gedung Pola, and Conefo Building) was arranged so the building could be seen as a three-dimensional statue. Sometimes, it was also strengthened by the appearance of a big pool in the courtyard to present a full reflection of the building. Modern architectural forms that give a freshness look were implemented in many functional and memorial-type buildings through simplified geometry. A small number displayed the used of sculptural form to generate surprising meaning to the user or viewer—which was a strategy used commonly by Niemeyer, such as at Conefo Building and Tugu Nasional (see Table 3). This modern architectural form was followed by the use of concrete and metal roof material and form—which was a common act—to replace the use of common form (such as pyramid and gable) and material (clay, wood, or straw) found in buildings in Indonesia at that time. Another strategy promoted by Niemeyer that could be found in NBP is the integration of the arts into the architecture and landscape design. All memorial-type buildings crowned their monuments with big figurative statues, such as human figures in Tugu Dirgantara, Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat, and Tugu Selamat Datang or the flame in Tugu Nasional (see Table 3 and Figure 2). Some small statues or sculptures were installed on the landscape around some buildings to strengthen the symbolic meaning of the buildings.



Figure 3.2 Buildings and Obelisk in Nation-Building Project Series




Figure 3.3 Nation Building Project position and its relationship to NYWF, 1964

3.2. Sukarno-Sudarsono Collaboration

Sukarno on 17 August 1963, in front of the tens of thousands who had gathered in the main Asian Games Complex Stadium ever said that “Revolution is destruction and construction (*pembangunan*). *Pembangunan* requires creativity, and *architect-minded* people” (Sukarno, 1963b: 11) Through this way of thinking, Nation Building Projects raised many figures from artist, architects, engineers, contractor companies, and others into the higher level. Artists was the first profession that intentionally brought up by Sukarno through his NBP. Sukarno said that this nation building projects are to bring back Indonesian artist into the largest scale project. Something that dwarfed during the colonialization period. They are challenged to work on new scale, purpose, material, and technique. Therefore, artist such as Edhi Sunarso and Henk Ngantung were involved in many landmark projects of NBP. Among those figures, Sudarsono appeared as one that has unique collaboration work with Sukarno, the president and maybe also the owner, the client, and the counter-architect in this NBP.

3.2.1. Sudarsono

Sudarsono or also wrote as Soedarsono was born in 1912. He got his knowledge about construction from Technische School “Princess Juliana School”, Yogyakarta in 1928-1932 when he studied railway and hydraulic engineering. Then he worked in several colonial government’s institutions as listed below (Salam, 1989):

- October 6, 1932-1936 – worked at Planology Section of Gementee (City Hall), Malang, East Java
- 1937-1938 – work in Provinciale Waterstaat, East Java
- 1938 -1942 – Civil/Military Building Design Section of T.T. Genie Bureau, City Hall, Bandung, West Java; under the lead of Ir. Thomas Nix
 - Topography Office Building
 - Military Buildings
 - Residential Projects
- 1942-1945 – Kantor Chokasabutai– Japan AirForce, Malang (designed—with architect Bouwman--water reservoir for Bugis Airport, Malang)
- 1945 – Fujitagumi—Japanese Engineer Bureau—as designing staff
- 1952 – Building Section, Surabaya, East Java

Sudarsono met President Sukarno for the first time in 1946 in Malang, East Java for preparation of building Tugu Pemuda (Youth Obelisk) in front of City Hall of Malang. The architect of Tugu Pemuda was Suparto, while Sudarsono was the member of the development Committee. (Salam, 1989) In April 1952, the Ministry of Public Work called Sudarsono to come to Jakarta to work on Presidential Building

section. He met Sukarno for the second time in Bogor Presidential Palace, where there Sukarno asked him to draw something based on Sukarno description. Through this test, Sudarsono began his career as Palace architect replacing Dutch architect-Volinga.



Figure 3.4 A House and Masjid (Mosque) designed by Sukarno, (source: <https://awsimages.detik.net.id/community/media/visual/2018/07/24/213f2c44-6c01-4f68-9565-ad0b8f5ea148.jpeg?a=1> accessed May 7 2016 (above) https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/9/94/Masjid_Jamik_Bengkulu.jpg accessed May 7, 2016 (below)

3.2.2. Sukarno

Sukarno was not only president at that time. He positioned himself as the architect of nation literally and symbolically. Literally Sukarno is a professional architect in the beginning of his adult life. he studied architecture in Technische Hoogeschool (TH) in Bandung or now known as Intitute Teknologi Bandung (ITB) and work under Prof. Wolf Schoemaker. He established and worked together with his schoolmate Ir. Anwari as professional architect in 1926. As architect, Sukarno had several built projects in several cities, especially Bandung, such as:

- Masjid Jami' Bengkulu –between 1938-1942
- Twin House in Malabar Street, Bandung
- Masjid PP Persis, Bandung (1935)
- House in Mangga Street, Bandung
- Houses in Kasim Street, Bandung
- House in Kaca-kaca Wetan Street, Bandung

3.2.3 Sukarno-Sudarsono Collaboration

Collaboration of Sukarno and Sudarsono was started when Sudarsono appointed as palace architect to replace Architect Volinga. During this period—from 1952 to 1961, Sudarsono worked on some projects, such as:

- the restoration of Istana (Presidential Palace) Bogor (1952)
- Istana Cipanas (1952)
- Istana Jakarta (1954)
- the new design of Istana Tampaksiring in Bali (1955/56)
- Wisma Riung Gunung (1957)
- Guest House Istana, and Masjid Baiturrahim in Istana Merdeka Jakarta (1958-60)
- Architect for Pancasila Senior High School, Yogyakarta and Engineering Building for Universitas Gadjah Mada

Then, Sudarsono has two big projects that done after he retired from his position as palace architect.

Those are:

- Tugu Nasional (TN) project (1961-1971)
- Indonesian Pavilion for 1964-1965 NYWF (1963-1964)




Figure 3.5 Guest House Istana (source: Star Weekly/ August 19, 1961)



Figure 3.6 Masjid Baiturahman (source: Star Weekly/ March 26, 1960)

3.2.3.1 Tugu Nasional

For Monument type, *Tugu* or obelisk was not a new architecture type in Indonesian context. Whether I cannot trace the history of *tugu* in Indonesia, at least the Tugu Golong Gilig which was built by Sultan Hamengku Buwono I, the first sultan and founder of Yogyakarta Sultanate in 1756 can give the basic form and function of *tugu* in Indonesia. As it was named, it take name golong which means silinder and gilig which means spherical form that refers to the crown of the obelisk. Then the function was to symbolize the spirit of unity between the people and the king. After this *tugu* was broken by 1867 earthquake, it was built again in 1889 in new form. After the independency, there are many other *tugu* built in every place to commemorate or symbolize something. Such as the early *tugu* proklamasi that than changed by Sukarno as Tugu Linggarjati, 1946; and then the new *tugu* proklamasi

that was built in 1961; *tugu muda* (Youth obelisk) Semarang, built 1951-1953, and *tugu pahlawan* (Heroes obelisk) Surabaya, 1951-1952.



Figure 3.7 *Tugu* or Obelisks that have been constructed before Tugu Nasional (source: <http://pamungkaz.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/tugu-golong-gilig.jpg>(1), [https://encrypted-tbn0.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcTVGDyLUdZsDI1Y5HzDIhhea2NI1PuWZ7BMnICeGgLyNi8kSr8H\(2\)](https://encrypted-tbn0.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcTVGDyLUdZsDI1Y5HzDIhhea2NI1PuWZ7BMnICeGgLyNi8kSr8H(2)), <https://kebudayaan.kemdikbud.go.id/bpcb jateng/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2017/09/tugu.jpg>(3), [https://awsimages.detik.net.id/customthumb/2014/09/13/10/162141_obelisk5.jpg?w=780&q=90\(4\)](https://awsimages.detik.net.id/customthumb/2014/09/13/10/162141_obelisk5.jpg?w=780&q=90(4)) accessed May 8, 2016)

Tugu Nasional stands in the center of *Lapangan Merdeka* (Independence Square) in Jakarta as a 130-meters high monument. The context which surrounded the creation of Tugu Nasional could be the most comprehensive illustration of the idea about NBP and national monument. In this project, Sukarno explained that, *first*, the constructing elements of a national monument—as delivered by Sukarno in his speech during the competition brief meeting with participants in June 27, 1960 (in Salam, 1989: 22)—are consisted of the site (Independence Square), main building (*Tugu Nasional*) and annexes, and buildings around the site; *second*, the representation form of Indonesian Revolution; *third*, the symbol of soul and spirit the nation—as delivered by Sukarno in his official speech during the groundbreaking ceremony of Tugu Nasional on August 17th, 1961 (in Salam, p.29, 1989); and, *fourth*, the form to connect present Indonesia to the past (Kusno, 2000: 64). In addition, Tugu Nasional also displayed the ideal relationship between the government, citizen, and NBP through the involvement of Indonesian citizen, not only as the object of the NBP, as the funders for the realization process. The construction cost was collected from people’s donation that organized by the special committee of Tugu Nasional. It could be seen in a memo wrote by President Sukarno which dated July 29th, 1963 (see Salam, 1989: 8). Leclerc (1993: 42) narrated this project as ‘sovereignty figure, a civic

temple and a reliquary for the cult of *Proklamasi*.’ In the beginning, the idea of Tugu Nasional—as explained by Leclerc (1993: 41)—was to be ‘a monument to the Indonesian nation’s valour, “an emblem of the people’s will to soar on high”, (and) an emblem of “rising up to the firmament”’. This generated the concept of grandeur that should be fulfilled by the architecture of TN. However, Sukarno’s decision for the Tugu Nasional to house the ‘sacred relic’, Bendera Pusaka Sang Dwiwarna, the very red and white flag that had been hoisted at Pegangsaan Timur on 17 August 1945 that changed the nature of TN from three-dimensional outdoor work into a programmatic monument.



Figure 3.8 *Tugu Nasional* and buildings around it (source: Damais, 1977)

It took long process and times to build TN. The idea was initiated by several peoples in early years of independence which then followed by the formation of—the first—special committee in September 17th, 1954. The structure of the committee was changed in 1959 and restructured again two years later with the appointment of President Sukarno as chief of committee as one of its main alteration (Salam, 1989). The search for the design took six years till finally concluded in its final form in 1961. It passed two national competitions in 1955-1956 and 1959-1960. The first competition awarded three entries without the first winner. The design submitted by Friedrich Silaban was chosen as the second winner while two others brought the third prize. The second competition, from 1959 to 1960, received 136 proposals but none was picked up by juries, which was including Silaban—the second winner for the first competition and another Sukarno’s favorite architect who share similar interest and admiration with modern architecture and built several NBP’s and government’s buildings during Sukarno’s era—and chaired by Sukarno, as the first—and even the second—prize winner. In

the process of building this Tugu Nasional, Sudarsono's involvement came when Sukarno asked Silaban and Sudarsono to propose a design that developed from the result of two previous competitions. Sukarno chose Sudarsono's design for its closest translation of Sukarno's vision about TN (see the comparison of both in Table 3.2).




Figure 3.9 The Process to build Tugu Nasional




Figure 3.10 the Final Design of Tugu Nasional made by Sudarsono (source: Star Weekly/ August 19, 1961)

Sukarno and Sudarsono collaboration in Tugu Nasional were read through Sudarsono's explanation and his respect for Sukarno. Sudarsono said—in Star Weekly (1961)—that, after two

competitions did not produce the desired design, the outlines of Tugu Nasional had been planned or designed by President Sukarno himself. However, Sudarsono did not want to give detail information about the form of Tugu Nasional and asked reporters to wait for the explanation directly from President Sukarno himself. Therefore, it is also common to found in the mass media that Soedarsono was called as ‘assistant architect/arsitek asisten’ or arsitek pelaksana/executive architect, such as:

- ‘Soedarsono adalah Arsitek asisten pembangunan monument nasional. Sedangkan arsiteknya adalah Ir. Soekarno (Soedarsono is assistant architect for the development of National Monument. Meanwhile the architect is Ir. Sukarno).’ (Star Weekly, 1961: 2)
- ‘Architect Soedarsono is executive architect of President Sukarno in the development of National Monument’. (Salam, 1989)

The construction was started with groundbreaking in August 17th, 1961 and opened officially in July 12th, 1975—after it was suspended for several years because of the unstable nation’s condition.

Table 3.2 Comparison between Sukarno’s Vision and Soedarsono’s Design Ideas on *Tugu Nasional*

No	Sukarno’s Vision	Soedarsono’s Design Ideas
1	Representing ‘Nationalism’	Recalled Proclamation date (17-8-45) as dimensional keys to achieve the ‘nationalism’
2	Symbolizing Indonesian revolution	
3	describing Indonesian personality	Traditional symbolic elements drawn on a <i>lingga-yoni</i> ⁴ pattern
4	Illustrating the dynamics of Indonesia	Reveal the history of Indonesia brought out from dark into light and becoming light itself (a lighthouse) through the <i>lingga-yoni</i> (with museum inside)
5	reflecting the ideals of Indonesia	
6	Symbolizing and describing the fire that blazed within our chests	‘ever-burning fire’ of people’s spirit represented by a flame
7	Constructed by material that lasted for 1000 years	Built by materials which would ‘last for centuries’
8	Illustrating movement	Actualizing moving line that is not monotonous from the base till the top

Source: Leclerc (1993) and Salam (1989)

⁴ *Lingga-yoni* in traditional culture, as explained by Soedarsono in Salam (1989), is the symbol from ancient times to portray eternal life. It is consisted of eternal positive elements (*lingga*) and negative elements (*yoni*) in the world, such as the existence of day and night, male and female, and good and bad



Figure 3.11. Soedarsono (right)—with Governor Soemarno and vice governor Henk Ngantung-- accompanied President Sukarno to see the model of Tugu Nasional Project (source: Star Weekly/ August 19, 1961)

3.3 The Description of Indonesian Pavilion as Compared to NBP and TN

3.3.1 Elements of a Great Nation and Great World

Indonesian participation in 1964 NYWF shared to us the elements of a great nation and great world through two speeches by Sukarno. First, from his welcome speech to delegates who just returned from NYWF in Bogor on November 21, 1964, said that he took that decision to '[deny] the opinion of the world of *Nekolim—Nekolim* is Neo-colonialism, colonialism, imperialism—that Indonesia was not a *backward country*, that Indonesia was *on the verge of collapse*, that Indonesia was *in a complete chaos*, and etc.' Further, Sukarno—in the same occasion—wanted this participation to show that Indonesia is a nation that had experienced a glorious era and would rise again from the dark ages during colonialization into a glorious new age. This mission, as explained in the same moment, was a continuous effort taken by Sukarno, since the period of the fight for independence, to build the love of Indonesia to his homeland. The pavilion building, the exhibition material, and the delegations that sent were the manifestation of Indonesia's best richness to be proud of. For Sukarno

(1964), Indonesia's participation in the 1964 NYWF was a struggle: a struggle for homeland, state, and the republic. The second speech was made by Sukarno four years earlier at the 880th Plenary Meeting of United Nations General Assembly on Friday, 30 September 1960. Sukarno (1960: 290), in the end of his speech, invited the United Nation and all the nations to 'Build the world anew. The world that solid, strong, and sane; in which all nations exist in peace and brotherhood; that fit for the dreams and the ideals of humanity; break now with the past, for the day is at its dawning; break now with the past, so that we can justify ourselves with the future.' From both speeches, there are four elements of a great nation and great world which are modernity, a glorious past, a glorious future, and a lovely homeland. As a note, all previous elements should be done with each nation's own strength, because for Sukarno only by become self-reliance, those elements could be used to build a great nation. It was delivered by Sukarno in his 'Only a Nation with Self-reliance can become a great nation' (1962: 11) speech at a commemoration of National Reawakening Day, 20 May 1962 that: 'Hay, Indonesian People! We get assistance from the new emerging forces. We get assistance from several countries in our struggle to build our State, in our struggle for the liberation of West Irian, in our struggle to build a just and prosperous society, we get assistance, assistance, assistance, assistance, sympathy, sympathy, sympathy, but don't forget, that only a nation who stands on its own strength can become a great nation. Even more so, if this assistance doesn't exist, don't be down-hearted. Strengthen ourselves! Because only a nation who strengthens itself, can become a strong nation.'

Table 3.3 Comparison of nation-building projects and the Indonesian Pavilion in the 1964 NYWF

No	Characteristic	Functional-Type Building						Indonesia Pavilion	Memorial-Type Building			
		Gelora/Asian Games Stadium (GAGS)	Hotel Indonesia (HI)	Sarinah Department Store (SDS)	Masjid Istiqlal (MI)	Gedung Pola (GP)	Conefo Building (CB)		Tugu Nasional (TN)	Tugu Dirgantara (TD)	Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat (TPIB)	Tugu Selamat Datang (TSD)
Building Design												
1	Location on the site (Center = C; Setback = S)	C	S	S	S	S	S	C	C	C	C	C
2	Program/Function	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	-	-	-
3	Form											
	a. Simplified geometric form	V	V	V	V	V	-	-	-	V	V	V
	b. Sculptural form	-	-	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	-	-
	c. Sculptural form with traditional precedent/meaning	-	-	-	-	-	-	V	V	-	-	-
4	Roof											
	a. Concrete roof (flat = F; curved = C)	-	F+C	F	F+C	F	C	-	F	-	-	-
	b. Metal roof	V	-	-	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	-
5	Local architectural elements or principles											
	a. Long cantilever roof	V	V	-	V	V	V	V	-	-	-	-
	b. Ventilation block/louvers	V	V	V	V	-	V	V	-	-	-	-
	c. Traditional ornaments	-	-	-	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	-
6	Symbolic elements attached to the structure	-	-	-	-	-	-	V	V	V	V	V
Features of the Yard												
1	Sculpture	V	-	-	-	V	V	V	V	-	-	-
2	Pool	-	-	-	V	-	V	V	V	-	-	-

a. Modernity: Monument and monumentality

Leclerc (in Nas [ed.], 1993) said that a structure was made a monument by an epic narration and moment. He continued that “monuments are epic, have an epic function, and stand as the nation’s epic in the nation’s figurative center, the capital city.” Nation-building projects, as monuments, were built in the form of buildings, obelisks, statues, and infrastructure. As a series of projects, NBPs were a monument to re-build the people’s spirit, including the self-confidence of Indonesian artists who were relegated to minor works during colonial times into major three-dimensional outdoor works. Sukarno reminded people of Indonesia about the capability of their ancestor to build several grandeur monuments, such as Borobudur and Prambanan. He delivered this message in his speech at the groundbreaking ceremony of Masjid Istiqlal in 1961 (see Susanto (ed.), 2010: 145). This message could be found in the purpose of the construction of Hotel Indonesia, the Wisma Nusantara office building, Sarinah Department Store, a sports complex, main street of Jakarta, and big infrastructure to project Indonesia as “the beacon of the new Emerging Forces (Kusno, 2000: 56)” to people who came during the Asian Games in 1962 and the 1963 Games of the New Emerging Forces (GANEFO). The fact that only part of them was used or occupied after the completion was evidence that their existence was more essential than their use. *Tugu* played this commemorative meaning more visually. The Tugu Selamat Datang/ “Welcome Obelisk” was part of the commemoration of the 1962 Asian Games and the 1963 GANEFO. The Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat/Liberation of West Irian Obelisk was initiated by Sukarno to encourage the struggle to liberate West Irian from Dutch colonialism at that time. The Tugu Dirgantara/Aerospace Obelisk was initiated in 1964 by Sukarno to commemorate and honor Indonesian aviator heroes. The word symbolic, was also frequently used by Sukarno to strengthen his idea about the function of a monument, as read in Sukarno’s explanation on Tugu Nasional. Sukarno said that “‘*Tugu* itself is a symbol of virile grandeur and bravery.’ Tugu Nasional was intended to be a monument to the Indonesian nation’s valor; ‘an emblem of the people’s will to soar on high,’ an emblem of ‘rising up to the firmament,’ in short, ‘*lambang Revolusi Indonesia* (Leclerc, 1993: 41).’” The Indonesian Pavilion clearly stood at the center of the international community/pavilions to be a monument of the Indonesian revolution. For this purpose, it, displayed what Indonesia had (cultural and natural diversity and richness, and ideology) and wanted to reach (modern built environment and society). This could be seen through the collage of different symbolic elements in the participation and the architecture, such as the traditional architecture and culture appearing side by side with modern architecture and culture, the appearance of Pancasila tower and Indonesian natural elements (such as water), the collaboration between Indonesian architects and foreign architects, and the appearance of Sultan HB IX of Yogyakarta—the leader of the traditional government system—at the Indonesian Pavilion’s groundbreaking in 1963

and as the commissioner general to represent Indonesia. Ho (1963) either explained that the appointment of HB IX was to indicate the importance Indonesia was attaching to its appearance at the fair.

The first element that was clearly displayed in NBP and Indonesian pavilion was modern architecture. The use of modern industrial materials, such as concrete, steel, and glass, then the simple tube form, the white paint or the original color of the material which created a typical modern architecture image was founded in this Pavilion. Sukarno did not explicitly state the modern architecture word in his speeches about this Pavilion for 1964 NYWF. However, Sukarno, in 'Build a World Anew' speech, said that Indonesian appearance was fit for the dreams and the ideals of humanity; cut off now and the past so it could fit the future; and 'blot out the lingering images of the colonial past'. In architecture, this statement was parallel to the declaration of the birth of architectural modernism which was to 'refuse to adopt for their works the design principles of earlier epochs and of bygone social structures. This declaration was stated at the founding meeting of Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM) at La Sarraz in 1928 as quoted from Forty (2004: 199).

Both NBP and Indonesian Pavilion was also identic with monumentality, which is an image of the concept of grandeur achieved through combining quality of form and its location on the site. Holston (1989: 150) gave one of modern architecture's common strategies to achieve monumentality by saying "the buildings are all freestanding objects, and, as such, they are all monumental." The space or distance provided visitors with a chance to see and enjoy the building as a three-dimensional structure. This was found in the NBP's building and the Indonesian Pavilion (see Table 2), where buildings were building situated at the center of the site (such as in Gelora/Asian Games Stadium, Tugu National, Tugu Dirgantara, Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat, and Tugu Selamat Datang) or pulled back from the site entrance (such as in Hotel Indonesia, Sarinah Department Store, Masjid Istiqlal, Gedung Pola, and Conefo Building) was arranged so the building could be seen as a three-dimensional statue. Sometimes, it was also strengthened by the appearance of a big pool in the courtyard to present a full reflection of the building. Modern architectural forms that give a freshness look were implemented in many functional and memorial-type buildings through simplified geometry. A small number displayed the used of sculptural form to generate surprising meaning to the user or viewer—which was a strategy used commonly by Niemeyer, such as at Conefo Building and Tugu Nasional. Another strategy promoted by Niemeyer that could be found in NBP is the integration of the arts into the architecture and landscape design. All memorial-type buildings crowned their monuments with big figurative statues, such as human figures in Tugu Dirgantara, Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat, and

Tugu Selamat Datang or the flame in Tugu Nasional. Some small statues or sculptures were installed on the landscape around some buildings to strengthen the symbolic meaning of the buildings.

b. Glorious past

In the built-in design, the traditional elements could be found in several places. First, the traditional element was not only attached but also redesigned, such as the circular pitch roof, which was said to have taken the shape of a traditional umbrella and the abstraction of watery country through the pond that separated the entrance gate and the main building (connected by a bridge). Second, it used traditional ornaments in more places. Third, it installed an imitation of traditional architectural elements (Candi Bentar gate and Meru tower) as free-standing fixtures in its yard. These free-standing traditional elements, especially, were not found in other NBPs. For sure, the willingness to show traditional elements in the pavilion has been performed since early design process, as explained by Abel Sorensen on his 1962 letter to NYWF Corporation. He said that ‘a complete Minangkabau structure or other dwellings may be displayed as part of a historic exhibit’. (Quoted from Abel Sorensen’s letter to Mr. Gates Davison, dated March 20, 1962)



Figure 3.12 Traditional art and architecture that appeared during Indonesian participation in 1964 NYWF (Left: <https://www.worldsfairphotos.com/nywf64/images/indonesia-2.jpg>, accessed June 8, 2019; right: <https://www.worldsfairphotos.com/nywf64/images/indonesia-gateway.jpg>, accessed June 8, 2019)

Nation Building Project also presented this tradition elements, such as seen in Baiturahman Mosque, a mosque located in the national palace, that constructed by concrete and marble, but its wall was decorated by Indonesian styled ornament such as mango, pineapple, and others. (Pikiran Rakjat, 1960)

c. Glorious future

Sukarno put the NBP as a monument that should be read in its specific context, which consisted of time (event) and place—Indonesia in general. This was exemplified by the competition brief of *Monumen Nasional*, which was used as a complex that consisted of the main building, called Tugu Nasional, and several annexes built in the center of Independence Square. In a larger context, Sukarno visualized Jakarta—with its NBP—to be a lighthouse (monument) for Indonesia, *New Emerging Forces* countries, and the world. The relationship between a structure of an NBP and its context could be brought to understand the stressing use of modern architectural language over traditional architectural language for those structures. The context has provided values of traditions or localities for the urgency of modern structural construction. However, some NBP buildings still display the use of indigenous architectural principles and elements, such as long overhanging roofs and ventilation blocks, which were added as the second skin of the buildings. Both were taken from indigenous architectural principles to provide shading from direct sunlight and heavy rain, and good air circulation.

The Indonesian Pavilion has a similar basic attitude on using modern architectural language but, at the same time, it displayed extensive use of Indonesian tradition and art. Abel Sorensen, consulting architect for the Indonesian Pavilion, in his letter dated March 20th, 1962, to Mr. Gates Davison from NYWF Corporation, delivered the desire of Indonesia's government for contemporary design reflecting their progressive aims, as well as their cultural art forms. Even, a complete Minangkabau or other indigenous dwellings were planned to be placed within it as part of a historic exhibition. The extensive use of tradition and art in the Indonesian Pavilion could be seen in some forms. First, the traditional element was not only attached but also redesigned, such as the circular pitch roof, which was said to have taken the shape of a traditional umbrella and the abstraction of watery country through the pond that separated the entrance gate and the main building (connected by a bridge). Second, it used traditional ornaments in more places. Third, it installed an imitation of traditional architectural elements (*Candi Bentar* gate and *Meru* tower) as free-standing fixtures in its yard. These free-standing traditional elements, especially, were not found in other NBPs. As the whole, these forms created a bold juxtaposition of modern architectural language, tradition, and art. The reason for this bold juxtaposition could be read by recalling the structure-context relationship. The

context, which pictured the identity and condition of Indonesia at that time, was not provided by the NYWF' site, and, therefore, it had to be created to give full narration for the modern designed pavilion. The extensive use of traditional elements, especially with the installment of the *Candi Bentar* gate and *Meru* tower, was the fastest way to represent the image of Indonesia to visitors.




Figure 3.13 A letter from Abel Sorensen—consulting architect—to NYWF Committee that told about the intention of Indonesian Government in their pavilion's design. (source: NYWF 1964-1966 Corporation Archive - New York Public Library)

In non-physical form, the image of juxtaposition of modernity and tradition was picturized through several act. First, The appointment of prominent Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX as Commissioner General for the Pavilion of Indonesia and personal representative of President Sukarno for NYWF. Sultan Hamengku Buwono was the king or sultan of kingdom/sultanate of Jogjakarta. This kingdom is still run inside the Republic of Indonesia and even played important part during the independence movement. It is a metaphor how modern country system was built on or supported by the traditional system as its foundation. It was further indicating the importance Indonesia is attaching to its appearance at the fair, which is based on a much larger scale than its participation in any previous international fairs. Second, on how the committee treated this pavilion with 'slamatan' or pre-opening dinner party. Slmatan is traditional ceremony that held when the construction of a house was completed, and it will be used soon.




Figure 3.14 A letter that explain about 'Slamatan' (pre-opening dinner party) event (source: NYUF 1964-1965 Corporation Archive – Collection of New York Public Library)



Figure 3.15 the architecture of Indonesian pavilion was labelled as 'ultra-modern circular pavilion' by media (source: Travel Magazine/ April 1964)

3.3.2 Foreign Policy: Equality and Neutrality

The 1964 NYWF was held with the theme 'Peace through Understanding' under the situation where the issue of colonialism, imperialism, and the cold war was still around. Indonesia with its long history put itself as an active country that fights against any form of colonialism. Therefore, Indonesia used this participation to deliver their policy and vision on world peace, as was delivered by Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX in his speech at the groundbreaking ceremony of the Indonesia Pavilion (New

York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation, 1963.a, by saying that 'It is indeed the sincere hope of the Indonesian nation that its participation in the Fair will further the aims of world peace, develop better international understanding, and promote harmonious international relations.' This may not be a coincidence that the decision to participate was taken directly by Sukarno on his visit to the site in New York—as reported by Kalb (1961: 21)—right after he—and President Modibo Keita of Mali—delivered a formal proposal from the conference of unaligned nations in Belgrade, Yugoslavia—that was also delivered to Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union in Moscow—to President Kennedy in Washington a few days earlier. Indonesia's policy and vision on world peace in this pavilion, in more detail, could refer to the speech delivered by President Sukarno at the 880th Plenary Meeting of United Nations General Assembly on Friday, 30 September 1960. The speech, titled 'Build a World Anew', seemed selected to be adopted as the political theme of the pavilion and as guidance for the design. Sukarno, in this speech, explained that 'to Build the World Anew' is meant to build it solid, strong, and sane; build the world in which all nations exist in peace and brotherhood; build the world fit for the dreams and the ideals of humanity; break now with the past, for the day is at its dawning; break now with the past, so that we can justify ourselves with the future.

Indonesia took important role on the world peace by initiated the Asian-African Conference which then bore the third world or the Non-Aligned Countries and delivered and promoted Pancasila as an alternative ideology for the world thorough Sukarno' speech at 880th Plenary Meeting of United Nations General Assembly in 1960. These two actions display how equality and neutrality was the policy of Indonesia for foreign affair.

a. Site selection

The first implementation of this equality and neutrality policy was manifested in the process of choosing the site for Indonesian Pavilion. Sukarno since the beginning—as reported by Kalb (1961: 21) and some correspondent letters between Indonesian government and NYWF corporation—asked for a lot that geographically located in equal distance to both United States and planned Soviet Union pavilions. The discussion and changes around the site selection could be read in figure 3.16 below.




Figure 3.16 The location of the Indonesian Pavilion during the 1964 NYWF

b. Building mass

Circular shape of the main building was intended to show the neutral position of Indonesia against the conflict of ideologies.



Figure 3.17 Indonesian Pavilion (marked with red arrow) among other international participant's pavilions and Unisphere

3.3.3 The National Monument

a. Description

The comparison was started by discussing TN and Indonesian Pavilion in the context of building a national monument. The site, main building and annexes, and buildings around the site are

explained by Sukarno—in the briefing of TN competition in June 27th, 1960 (see Salam, p.22, 1989)—as elements to transform NBP into a national monument. The study on this element in both buildings (see figure 3.18) revealed the similar appearance and objective of it. It confirms either the Indonesian Pavilion characteristic as a *Tugu* in national monument.

First, the Independence Square, a 900.000 square meter trapezium field for the site, was an important part of the city since colonialization. This square, named as *Koningsplein* during Netherlands-Indies period, was place for events and it was planned through the commissioned of Dutch architect and city planner, Thomas Karsten, as ‘a kind of main crossroads and central venue, or, at least, a place to locate most of the city facilities and governing bodies (Leclerc: 1993: 38)’. One of the main elements of Karsten’s masterplan was a proposal to move the Town Hall to the very center of the square. Sukarno took over the design, function, and meaning of this park through the new masterplan and the position of TN in the location of proposed Town Hall. The importance of the site was found either in Indonesian Pavilion project through the selection of location, as has been explained in the first paper (Kurniawan, 2018).

Second, both TN and Indonesian Pavilion was composed by main building and annexes. The main buildings, which will be discussed more in next parts, were in the center of the site and standing firmly up into the sky. Meanwhile, the annexes were created to increase the greatness and splendor of the main buildings. TN has Statue of Pangeran (Prince) Diponegoro—one of the leader or hero in conflict against Dutch colonialization in 19th century—in the TN’s north park and four groups of statues of war—planned to be built—in front of each entrance of the History Museum to make TN more magnificent and add information about the greatness of Indonesia’ fight (Salam, 1998). Then, Indonesian Pavilion has 56 feet high Balinese temple (*Meru* tower), 86 feet high Candi Bentar (Balinese temple gateway), a lotus-filled pond, and a bridge over the pond to compliment the grand pavilion and share the identity of Indonesia’s beauty and the progress of transformation from a traditional into tradition-based modern country. Annexes, specially statues, was added into a *Tugu* as a balancer, complement, and a supporter to the overall beauty. Soedarsono preceded this as strategy with the harmonious unity of Balinese temples and their statues.




Fig. 3.18. Location of Elements of *Tugu Nasional* (left) and Indonesian Pavilion (right) and buildings around

Third, Independence Square where TN is built was surrounded by government buildings, including Istana Negara (Presidential Palace), Jakarta's City Hall, and Bank Indonesia (Central Bank of the Republic of Indonesia); and public buildings such as Istiqlal Mosque—another NBP's monument—and Gambir Train Station. These buildings were preserved and added as the root to strengthen symbolic meanings of TN. In another explanation, the meaning of 'buildings around site' has much wider coverage as it was also compared to the great structures that "Indonesia" ever created, such as Borobudur (Leclerc, 1993: 42). In 1964 NYWF, buildings surrounding Indonesian Pavilion braced the uniqueness of its architecture. This, by support of the site and the architecture of buildings and annexes, recalled back the grand purpose of TN as a monument that emerge from and connect the present Indonesia to the long tradition of the (for)ever existing "Indonesia" (Kusno, 2000). Kusno (2000) explained this statement as a sign of "continuity" that turn temporality into simultaneity—which in international exposition context is a right place to show the progress of a nation.

Table 3.4 Conclusion of comparison of *Tugu Nasional* and Indonesian Pavilion

No	<i>Tugu Nasional</i>		Indonesian Pavilion	
	Elements	Sukarno's vision ⁵	Ideas ⁶	Elements
1	Proclamation date (17-8-45) as dimensions of the building	Representing 'Nationalism'	Representing Indonesia	Ultramodern architecture (Modern design fused with traditional and symbolic elements)
2		Symbolizing Indonesian revolution	Symbolizing the struggle for homeland, state, and the republic	
3		<i>Lingga-yoni</i> as building form	Describing Indonesian personality	
4	History Museum, Independence Hall, and flame sculpture	Illustrating the dynamics of Indonesia	Reflection of rich and dynamic culture and natural resources, and possibilities of exploiting them	Exhibition Room, Restaurant, and Stage
5		reflecting the ideals of Indonesia	Reflecting the ideal of humanity	
6	Flame sculpture	Symbolizing and describing the fire that blazed within our chests	Symbolizing Pancasila as ideology or guidance of the life of Indonesia	Pancasila tower with five-petal flower with five shafts of light within it
7	Concrete, steel, marble	Constructed by material that lasted for 1000 years	Durable material that could be dis- and re-assemble	Steel, wood, glass, and modular concrete block
8	Silhouette of the building	Illustrating movement	Illustrating the movement	Silhouette of the building

⁵ As compiled from Sukarno's *Tugu Kepribadian Yang Melambangkan Revolusi* speech on November 17, 1960 that written in Salam, p.24, 1989

⁶ As compiled from a pamphlet about Architecture of the Indonesian Pavilion New York World's Fair, 1964-1965; Hamilton Wright Organization, pp.1-3, 1964.1.00; NYWF 1964-1965 Corporation: Groundbreaking at the New York World's Fair 1964-1965: The Pavilion of Indonesia, January 18, 1963 (transcript), New York: New York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation, p.4, 1963; and other documents in the archive of Indonesian Participation belonged to NYWF 1964-1965 Corporation

b. Building Form

Form was indispensable to modernist discourse where ‘architect’—according to Bernard Tschumi in *Architecture and Disjunction* (1987) in Forty (2000: 149) was strongly translated as ‘form-giver’. One of the reasons for ‘form’ to be adopted and made a cardinal term in architectural modernism was because it—according to Forty (2000: 161) was not a metaphor. The NBP displayed the use of modern architectural form through the domination of simplified geometric form without historical connotation. It could be seen mostly in the NBP’s functional type building, such as GAGS, MI, HI, and the main structure of the memorial type building. However, there are buildings that create form through precedent and symbolism. Those are *Tugu Nasional* and the Indonesian Pavilion. *Tugu Nasional* was identified as a single-volume building with sculptural quality form. It took *lingga-yoni* form as precedent, so it could deliver the asked narration as a national monument. *Lingga-yoni*, as explained by Soedarsono in Salam (1989), is the symbol from ancient times to portray eternal life that consists of eternal positive elements (*lingga*) and negative elements (*yoni*) in the world, such as the existence of day and night, male and female, and good and bad. Soedarsono also chose this indigenous form to reveal the history of Indonesia brought out from dark into light and becoming light itself (a lighthouse). It was based on Sukarno’s vision for Jakarta—the capital and NBP as lighthouse for Indonesia, Indonesian people, and *New Emerging Forces*. It also referred to Sukarno’s description about the characteristic of *tugu*—in his speech of President Sukarno at the meeting with competition’s participant of Tugu Nasional project at Istana Negara Jakarta on June 27, 1960, as quoted from Salam, (1989: 22)—that not flat and soars to the sky; and Sukarno’s request on an illustration of national personality. Meanwhile, the description of the idea of form in Indonesian Pavilion is not found yet, but the similarity to TN’s form and objective to give ‘description of Indonesian personality’ indicate the metaphoric form of *lingga-yoni* in Indonesia Pavilion. However, the appearance of TN’s form which is simple and clean is different with Indonesian pavilion’s form which was fused with traditional ornaments and form, such as the umbrella form for the roof and ornamentation for the fence. This brought the ultra-modern image and continuation of the used of traditional elements (*Candi Bentar* and *Meru* tower) located in the site.




Figure 3.20 Section drawings of *Tugu Nasional* (left) and Indonesian Pavilion in 1964 NYWF (right)

c. Building Figure

The silhouette's line of TN was clearly described by Soedarsono as the moving line. He literally narrated the movement by saying that 'the line is moved not monotonous—flatten, up-arched, jumped, flattened again then rose towering till finally waving at the top to form flames of fire.' This line answered Sukarno's challenge for the design of TN that created from strong and unchanged material but, at the same time, illustrate the movement. The silhouette lines of Indonesian Pavilion, in comparison with Tugu Nasional's, shows the similar—flatten, up, and rose towering—line movement (see figure). As, Indonesian Pavilion was erected to represent glorious era that had been experienced and effort to rise again from dark ages during colonialization into a glorious new age, the illustration of Indonesian revolution and development movement or progress in TN was looked to be appeared or displayed in Indonesian Pavilion too.

d. Building Function

There is similarity on the program for both buildings as exposed by the section drawings (figure 3.20). There are two spaces that vertically arranged in both architectures. The lower level housed active program transformed into History Museum in TN and exhibition hall in Indonesian Pavilion, and the upper floor's activities for both building required less movement and more concentration from the users. The Independence Hall—named as *Ruang Tenang* (Peaceful Room) in original program—in TN is an amphitheater room where people could see the symbols about Independency of Indonesia (such as proclamation text and the national emblem, Garuda) through quiet and contemplating sitting poses. This nature of activity was found either in the second floor's programs of Indonesian Pavilion. The restaurant surrounding the stage asked visitors to sit down for enjoying the food (restaurant) and the art performances. The purpose of Indonesian Pavilion programs to reflect Indonesia's way of life, rich and dynamic culture, huge natural resources and the possibilities of exploiting them; to contribute to world trade; and to attract foreign tourists were parallel to the vision of Sukarno for TN's programs as an illustration of the dynamics of Indonesia and reflection of the ideals of Indonesia.

e. Building Materials

The material of Indonesian Pavilion could be understood as an opposite manner with TN—or others NBP, as, since the beginning, Indonesian Pavilion was intended for temporary used (projected to stand for 1964 and 1965 New York World's Fair seasons) and would be dismantled, shipped back, and rebuilt for displayed in Jakarta. Steel, wood, glass, and modular concrete block were appropriate

materials to achieve this knocked down purpose and to present the lightness and transparency (another image of modern architecture) which were important to invite visitor's curiosity.

f. Symbolic Elements

The symbolic element, named the Pancasila Tower, was attached on an important position on the Indonesian Pavilion. The tower was around 35 meters high from the ground and stood on top of the roof. As it was named, the tower was purposed to symbolize the five points of guidance of life of Indonesia as a nation, Pancasila. Pancasila is a guidance of life that was informed and even proposed by Sukarno as an alternative besides two values, democracy and communism, which dominated and were at war at that time. It took the form of a flower with five petals that light would come out of and shoot to the sky. The importance of the tower was displayed by the long process of the design, as indicated by the timeline of published images and correspondence. It was mentioned in the minutes for the Conformity Committee Meeting, which was dated April 30th, 1962, but the image did not appear in the Indonesian Pavilion's image in August 1963's *The Concrete Era* magazine (see figure 3.21-top left). However, a photo of the design from the 1963 New York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation (see Figure 3.21-bottom left) and March 1963's *Varia Magazine* (see figure 3.21-top center), illustrated the idea for the tower, which was written on the 'Minutes of Conformity Committee Meeting-Indonesian Pavilion #C-359' April 30, 1963 signed by W.E. Potter, Chairman of Conformity Committee as 'a free-standing tower on top of the building with a hand symbolizing the five freedoms of Indonesia.' The hand figure in the earlier scheme referred to the social realist style, which was found in the human figure sculptures of *Tugu Dirgantara*, *Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat*, and *Tugu Selamat Datang*. The final design, which was a simplified form of the original, could be paired with the gold fire flame sculpture of *Tugu Nasional*. Furthermore, the location of the symbolic element as the crown of the structure strengthened the similarity between the Indonesian Pavilion and memorial-type buildings such as *Tugu Nasional*, *Tugu Selamat Datang*, *Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat*, and *Tugu Dirgantara*. However, the Indonesian Pavilion had spaces to accommodate several defined programs, which was comparable to a functional-type building and its program as the generator of its architecture. This duality could only be compared to *Tugu Nasional*, which was decided by Sukarno to house the 'sacred relic', *Bendera Pusaka Sang Dwiwarna*, that had been hoisted on 17 August 1945.' Therefore, the symbolic element and designated program are identified as the uniqueness of the Indonesian Pavilion.




Figure 3.21 Some changing on the tower design of Indonesian Pavilion and comparison with other obelisk in NBP

g. Building dimension

The use of symbolic number in building the NBP was displayed in many examples, such as in Syuhada Mosque with its 17 steps of its front stair, octagonal (8) gate columns, 4 domes in below, and 5 domes in upper level; in the height of Proclamation Obelisk (17 m). Sometimes it was used as the date for inaugurate an action, such as in the groundbreaking of National Obelisk project which dated August 17, 1962 (seventeen years after the proclamation date-August 17, 1945).

In Tugu Nasional, the numbers 17, 8, 45 was transformed as the dimensional keys of the building. It can be found in the height of podium (yoni part) and the 'flame' crown, and the width of roof of podium and the core (tower). This numbers signified the Proclamation Day of the independent of Indonesia which is August 17th, 1945. Sudarsono implemented these numbers to express "nationalism" criteria. Meanwhile, there is no explanation about the meaning of the dimensions of Indonesian Pavilion, but the dimension stated in archives of New York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation displayed the use of number 17 and 45 in several parts, such as the height of the building (floor to roof) and Meru tower, and the radius of the building (see figure 3.20).

3.3.4 Sukarno's Involvement

One main character of the NBPs was the intense involvement of President Sukarno in the projects. His involvement could be found during project initiation, architect selection, the design process, the construction process, as well as him echoing the importance of the projects in his

speeches. Henk Ngantung—a former Governor of Jakarta and also an artist who close to President Sukarno—gave comment about the importance of Sukarno’s appearance on those projects—as published on Damais (1977:170-179). The initial approval of Sukarno found on the design documents, such as on the design of the statue of Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat (could be seen in Damais, 1977: 192) and on the image of Wisma Nusantara (could be seen in Damais, 1977: 230) could be seen either as a proof of his involvement. In the initiation phase, Sukarno could urge that project be built—such as with Gelora Stadium, Conefo Building, Gedung Pola, and Tugu Dirgantara—or he could elevate the value of the project such as in Tugu Nasional—that at the beginning was only the idea initiated by a group of people to commemorate the proclamation of independence on August 17, 1945 (Salam, 1989: 17-18)—and Masjid Istiqlal—where Sukarno gave a description about the importance and grandeur of Masjid Istiqlal in his speech during the announcement of the competition’s winner (Aboebakar, 1955: 265-268). In the design process, Sukarno showed several ways to get the best design to fit his vision, such as requesting a design directly from his trusted architects—such as Soedarsono and Silaban—and artists—such as Henk Ngantung and Edhi Sunarso—or holding open competitions where Sukarno led the jury committee—such as for Masjid Istiqlal, Conefo Building, and Tugu Nasional. The complete illustration for this is the process behind the *Tugu Nasional* project where Sukarno himself stood to brief architects, artists, and engineers during the opening of a nationwide contest for a *Monumen Nasional* (National Monument), then led the project committee and the jury team in the first and second competition—with no first winner for both, then directly assigned Soedarsono and Silaban to propose the final design, and finally chose the design made by Soedarsono to be realized (Salam, 1989). Another example could be seen in the design of the statue of Tugu Dirgantara that explained by Edhi Sunarso—the sculptor of the statue—in ‘For Future Generations’ articles (in Endarmoko, and Dewanto [ed.], 2010: 78) as a redraw of Sukarno’s pose made while explaining his instruction to build the monument. Sukarno also did not hesitate to direct the architect or artist in order to meet his vision for NBP, as Sukarno’s instruction note was found on a design drawing of Wisma Nusantara to set the building’s wings back by 30 percent (could be seen in Damais, 1977: 230), or Sukarno’s sketch—that could be seen in Susanto (ed.), 2010: 136—with the note ‘Sdr. Henk! Begini lo! (Brother Henk! Follow this way!)’ for Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat given to Henk Ngantung, the artist. During the construction phase, Sukarno repeatedly made site visits and even donated some of his own money (Endarmoko, and Dewanto [ed.], 2010). The ‘Acc Soek (Sukarno’s approval)’ phrase, which marked Sukarno’s involvement, could be found in many documents in different phases, such as in Damais (1977); Endarmoko, Eko and Dewanto, Nirwan (ed.), 2010; Susanto (ed.), 2010; and ‘Suluh Indonesia’ Newspaper, 1964.4.21.



Figure 3.21 Sukarno gave his approval in the photo of model of Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat sculpture (left) and Sukarno gave speech during the inauguration on the Tugu (right) (source: Edhi Sunarso Solo Exhibition Catalog, 2010)



Figure 3.22 Sukarno exemplified how the pose of statue of Tugu Selamat Datang should be during his visitation to the workshop in Yogyakarta (left); Tugu Selamat Datang when the construction was completed (right) (source: Edhi Sunarso Solo Exhibition Catalog, 2010)



Figure 3.23 Sukarno's visitation for the groundbreaking of Tugu Nasional construction
(source: Star Weekly/ August 26, 1961)

The Indonesian Pavilion displayed a similar characteristic of Sukarno's involvement, as he explained in his welcoming speech for the delegation that returned from NYWF on November 21, 1964. He stated his reason for deciding the participation, his appearance at the park to choose the site for the Indonesian Pavilion, and his intention to choose the delegated aides by himself. Further, Sukarno's involvement could be seen in many aspects of the pavilion's design and exhibition. Sukarno's quick decision that he made during his first interaction with the NYWF's committee made Indonesia as the 14th nation, after Spain, to join an array of exhibitors in the international area and the first to sign a contract. He personally chose a 40,000 square feet lot as the site during his visit to the NYWF site at September 15th, 1961 and signed the contract on the same day. He supervised the participation through an inter-departmental organizer body, named The Indonesian New York World's Fair Committee, which was directly under the control of Dr. Chairul Saleh, Deputy Prime Minister III and Aham Erningpradja, Minister of State. He appointed Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX—the King of Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat Kingdom—as Commissioner General for the Pavilion of Indonesia and personal representative of President Sukarno for NYWF. Ho (1963) wrote in his newspaper article that 'the State Housing Development Company has been assigned to plan the pavilion and its landscaping under the supervision of President Sukarno.' Sukarno—as written in a letter from Sutomo Josowidigdo, Act. Consul-General of Indonesian in New York, to Mr. William Whipple, Jr, dated October 31, 1963—had '*especially requested this (Candi Bentar) gate, and indeed helped design it*'. The whole concept of the pavilion's architecture was developed from Sukarno's speech in front of the United Nations

General Assembly on September 30, 1960⁷. The speech's title, 'To Build the World Anew, became the political theme for the Indonesian Pavilion (Harian Merdeka, 1964). Sukarno even presented himself in the pavilion in a photo of himself with his mother that hang on the wall behind the logo of Pancasila (which is the entrance display) (Suluh Indonesia Newspapers, June 6, 1964). He requested—as written in a telegram No. 102790/M/PERDATAM/62 from Chairul Saleh to Governor Poletti which was dated September 19, 1962—that a roof tower is added to the pavilion and presented a painting he made in 1958 (Levick, 1964) as one of the main exhibited material. His intense involvement was concluded by his order to close down the pavilion and cancel Indonesia's participation commitment in the 1965 NYWF in his anger toward America for supporting Malaysia during the Indonesia-Malaysia confrontation period.




Figure 3.24 Newspaper's news and letter that shows Sukarno involvement on building the Pavilion (source: NYUF 1964-1965 Corporation Archive – Collection of New York Public Library)

⁷ The used of Sukarno' speech as the brief of a project has been demonstrated earlier in the final design of Tugu Nasional proposed by architect R.M. Soedarsono (see Salam, 1989, pp. 24-28).



Figure 3.25 Sukarno's painting with title 'Wanita (Woman)' (1958) which exhibited in Indonesian Pavilion (source: Suluh Indonesia Newspaper/ June 6, 1964)

3.4 Epilogue

1. Indonesian Pavilion was built with several big ideas and purposes
2. Indonesia Pavilion was built with a defined program, an appearance of symbolic sculpture, the meaningful form, and extensive use of traditional elements and arts.
3. There are many similarities between Indonesian Pavilion and National Obelisk. The differences are only in the context of place (audience and environment) and context of time (age of the building). These make the pavilion can be seen as the identical twin of National Obelisk created for different context.
4. 1964 Pavilion in general was in line with other nation building projects. With different designers (including foreign architects/artists), typologies, scales, and designing times, this could be a prove that Sukarno had strong influence and supervision on all the projects including 1964 Pavilion. Further detail comparison directs to a conclusion that 1964 Pavilion could be categorized as monument listed in Sukarno's nation building projects. The appearance of sculpture that attached to the main structure in 1964 Pavilion could only be found among the monuments. 1964 Pavilion has function that housed exhibition, restaurant,

and performances, this could be found in all building projects but only found in Monumen/Tugu Nasional among monument projects. Both 1964 Pavilion and Monumen/Tugu Nasional were designed by Soedarsono. However, it also goes beyond the limitation of NBP's building type which consist of functional building and memorial-type building, and the limited or eliminated use of traditional elements. In this sense, Indonesian Pavilion can be concluded as the summary of the nation-building projects.

5. It confirms either the Indonesian Pavilion characteristic as a Tugu in national monument

CHAPTER FOUR

HISTORY OF THE ARCHITECTURE

IN INDONESIA THROUGH

PAVILIONS⁸

4.1 Discussion on Indonesian Architecture

The process of searching or formulating Indonesian architecture still becomes a hot issue to be discussed and formulated. It was started since the beginning of the term 'Indies architecture' was generated in Netherlands-Indies period, then continued to the birth of 'Indonesian architecture' term in independent period, and it was still not fully formulated till today. Robi Sularto Sastrowardoyo (in Powell [1983:39]) explained this fact by said that "Discussions concerning the identity of Indonesian culture have often been held. But more often than not these discussions merely end in the general hope or wish to be able to discriminate as to whether a given work has an Indonesian identity, and sometimes end up agonizing over whether or not a given person's work has an Indonesian identity." This part will illustrate those discussions from period to period.

1920-1940s

Before Indonesia⁹ stands as independent country, Indonesia went to a long period of colonialism by several countries, where Netherlands is the longest by approximately 350 years. This colonialism has brought many stories of interaction between native and colonial civilizations. One small part of those stories is occurred in a period when Netherlands Indies reached their new political status and consciousness and 'embraced its role as a faithful sponsor of ethnographers (Gouda, 1995 as cited in Kusno, 2000: 29)' after the implementation of ethical policy. This new development, in architecture, triggered more study on indigenous architectures and explorations on new architecture style which more representing Netherlands Indies' identity. This spirit of exploration was also

⁸ Part of this chapter has been published in 10+1 web site. See Kurniawan, 2016

⁹ The word 'Indonesia' in 1920s-30s explanation is used to show similarities of regions and local communities with the independent Indonesia has. During this colonial era, especially in early period, colonialism was done on each districts of 'Indonesia' which each district/kingdom had their own leader or king.

supported by the conditions in which the established 19th century's colonial style—mostly in Neo-classic architecture—was considered no more appropriate with the Netherlands Indies' condition in facing climate and socio-cultural conditions. In anticipating the climate, Netherlands architects offered solutions learnt from indigenous architecture. The problem with rain, sun, and humidity was solved by implementing high pitch roof with long cantilevered veranda—which is basic elements of indigenous architecture, and by creating double façade with corridor along the building's perimeter.

In the hand of young Netherlands architects who came for worked during this period, the influence of modern architecture movement in Europe such as DeStijl, Art Nouveau, Art Deco, and Functionalism was merged in the problem-solving process. One of the examples is Wolff Schoemaker projects—such as Villa Isola (1933) and Preanger Hotel (1929)—which is simple in language but solve climate problem. Jan Van Dullemen used the *Tropical Modernity* phrase for the title of his book which discusses the work of C.P Wolff Schoemaker in Netherlands Indies. Another example is projected by Savoy-Homann Hotel by A.F. Aalbers (1947), Gouvernements Bedrijven (Gedung Sate/Governor Office of the West Java Province) by J. Gerber (1920), and PTPN XI Office Surabaya, East Java which is designed by Cuypers in 1924 (see figure 4.1). All this *Tropical Netherlands*¹⁰ buildings represented the perspective that western architecture was more superior than eastern architecture and as its implication eastern architecture could only be applied as ornament or decoration.



Figure 4.1 Gouvernements Bedrijven by J. Gerber (1920) (left), and PTPN XI Office Surabaya by Cuypers (1924) (right), (source: <https://www.ayobandung.com/images-bandung/post/articles/2015/10/22/4091/gedung-sate-mr2.jpg> (left) accessed July 6 2016, <https://2.bp.blogspot.com/-PBNNRr275sY/WucgCsXy3wI/AAAAAAAAASxU/M9OFUyWH2-wKWtvKajhiINc4UtU5fxaPQCLcBGAs/s1600/ptpn-xi-1.jpg> (right) accessed July 6, 2016)

¹⁰ Tropical Netherlands is Abidin Kusno's (2000) term to describe buildings built in style brought from Europe with local climate solution. (see Kusno, Abidin. (2000))

Other side of the story of modern architecture and identity, beside Tropical Netherlands vision, is also filled with the birth of 'new Indies style'. It was emerging in 1920-30s when some architects brought west and east together without suppressing either. H.P Berlage, famous Netherlands architect, who made a short visit from March to June 1923, formulated *Indies architecture* as a synthesis of two elements: the modern constructive spirit, born of a rationalistic and intellectual knowledge that is universal and therefore eternal, and the spiritual aesthetic elements that are particularistic and therefore everywhere different. The task was to integrate the two elements, one representing the modernist "West" and the other, the localized "East" (Kusno, 2000: 32). Henri Maclaine Pont and Thomas Karsten gave some best examples through the Bandoeng Technische Hoogeschool, today's Institute of Technology of Bandung, building (1919) in West Java and Poh Sarang Church Complex (1936) in East Java both designed by Maclaine Pont (see figure 4.2); and Sobokarti Theater (1931) in Central Java designed by Karsten. Here, the relation between the project's location and the used elements of indigenous architecture did not has to be conform- as seen in the use of Minangkabau (West Sumatra) roof form in Bandoeng Technische Hoogeschool which is located in West Java. The more important thing in this idea is the ability to use the principles of indigenous buildings so they can function well with the building programs.

The difference approach by two groups above triggered the debate. In 1923, *Indisch Bouwkundig Tijdschrift* ('East Indies Architectural Review') magazine became the media for a discussion between Charles Prosper Wolff Schoemaker and Maclaine Pont about the possibilities to develop an 'Indies architecture'. Maclaine Pont in his 'The Significance and future of indigenous architecture' article brought local (Java) architecture as a good basis for the development of a specific Netherlands Indies architecture style. Meanwhile, Wolf Schoemaker wrote his thinking on 'East Indies architecture and the possibilities of developing an Indo-European architectural style' where he dismissed traditional (Javanese) architecture as the source of inspiration for modern architecture in Netherlands Indies and condemned the application of Hindu-Javanese ornament without understanding to create an 'Indies architecture' (Akihary, 1988; van Dullemen, 2009; Passchier, 2016). This discussion influenced the way architects saw and cultivated indigenous architecture and culture.



Figure 4.2 Bandoeng Technische Hoogeschool Building (1919)(above) , Poh Sarang Church Complex (1936) (below), (source: <https://jendelabandungheritage.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/itb1.jpg> (above), <https://tbilanguageschool.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/pohsarang.jpg> (below) accessed July 6, 2016)

1950-1960s

The term 'discussion' on Indonesian architecture may be never existed during 1950-1960s period, because the development of architecture in Indonesia at this time was dominantly guided by a single figure which was President Sukarno. His intention on Indonesian architecture after independence was nation character building, which would exhibit the ability of Indonesia to build the country, and to rebuild and unify the spirit and soul of Indonesian people after 350 years colonialization and the fight for freedom. For wiped out the existence of Netherlands in Indonesia

cities and people's mind, Soekarno chose the similar strategy used in Chandigarh Capital Complex, India (designed by Le Corbusier in 1951-63) and National Assembly Building in Dhaka, Bangladesh (designed by Louis Kahn in 1962-74). Both are used as a symbol of pride.

President Sukarno got and trained his architecture knowledge from the western—Dutch—environment. He was a student at T.H. Bandung (1921-1926) during the peak of 1920s architecture debate, and even he was studied, worked, and being close friend with Wolf Schoemaker—one of the central figures in the debate. Projects constructed under Sukarno's Nation Building Project—see explanation in chapter 3—in general displayed the implementation of tropical modernity notion and abstracted form. They used modern architecture principles and built with local architecture's reference. Its transformation could be found on several government projects designed by foreign architect, such as Bung Karno Stadium (1962) and Istora Senayan (1962) by Russian architect, or Hotel Indonesia (1962) by Abel Sorensen, an American Architect; and by Indonesian architects through-as example-Istiqlal Mosque (designed by F.X. Silaban in 1955), Conefo Building (1964-65) -is today Representative House (Soejoedi Wirjoatmodjo), National Monument (designed by R.M. Soedarsono in 1961), and Indonesia Pavilion for New York World Fair 1964 (designed in 1963 by R.M. Soedarsono). While projects done by foreign architects show their pure modernism, projects done by Indonesian architects and artists brought forward the collaboration between art (sculpture) and architecture. It could be seen at National Monument that transform *lingga-yoni*—a symbol of fertility is often found in Hindu temples—to modern presentation, several monuments on Jakarta's main street such as Tugu Selamat Datang/'Welcome' Monument (1962), Tugu Pembebasan Irian Barat/West Papua Liberation Monument (1964-65), Tugu Dirgantara/Dirgantara Monument (1964-65), and the design of Indonesia Pavilion for New York World Fair 1964—even on the built version the hand sculpture for roof crown was replaced with more simple flower representation form. Silaban, who shared with Soekarno the same vision about architecture, said that 'modern architecture can describe (or at least portray) Indonesia's identity¹¹.' The uniqueness of Sukarno's ideas on Indonesian architecture was lied on how the modernity is stand side by side with indigenous or local art and architecture. Sukarno always explained—see more explanation in chapter three—his NBP in the context of place. He said in general that NBP was a face of modern Indonesia. He described National Monument as a building that related to others building around it. Even, Sukarno explaining his Masjid Baiturrahim in Istana Merdeka Jakarta as the media to change the 'Colonial' Palace into 'Indonesian' Palace by referred to the structure of Javanese royal palace compound that has a mosque as one of places where people and Sultanate meet. This conclude that Indonesian architecture at 1950s-1960s is a synthesis of modernity and tradition

¹¹ as cited in Pusat Dokumentasi Arsitektur, 2012: 61

where both have equal meaning. It could be transformed as a tradition that transform into modern form (such as through abstraction) or tradition that stand side-by-side to modernity.

Other fresh voices related to the search for Indonesian architecture during this period were heard from academician in Institute Teknologi Bandung (ITB). Professor F. Dicke and Prof. V.R. van Romondt became a mouthpiece for delivering ideas about Indonesian architecture. Dicke (1951 in Sudradjat, 1995) argued that Indonesian architect have to learn how a certain architecture problem—in the past—was solved according to that time’s *zeitgeist*; and at the same time, they are not allowed to close their eyes on the world dynamics when they are looking for the identity of national Indonesian architecture. Van Romondt (1958 in Sudradjat, 1995) believed that traditional architecture is rich sources for the formation of foundation of a new Indonesian architecture both in physical form and architectural principles. The ideas by Dicke and van Romondt opened the way of thinking of ITB’s architecture students during that time and gave impact on their philosophy in design when they became professional architects in 1970-1980s period.



Figure 4.3 The change of façade of Sarinah Department Store, where the 1960s original design (left) covered with ‘colourful’ cladding and three layers of gable roof as the hat of its podium in 1990s (right) (source: <https://3.bp.blogspot.com/-kqI5SGvG-Lo/WNU3rNOFTxl/AAAAAAAAAKY/sPIlrL3VtVod3zQYM5nTDLcdUKgD1P3ugCLcB/s1600/gedung-sarinah-tempo-dulu.jpg> accessed April 7 2016 (left), <https://mapio.net/images-p/90351641.jpg> accessed April 7, 2016 (right))

1970-1980s

In this era, Soeharto, the second President, put economic stability as his government’s main objective. Several activities such as opening opportunity for foreign investment and exporting oil were

done, and as the result, Indonesia reached high economic growth. During this era, government system was centralized in hand of National government, and one of its character is the perspectives and policies of National government will be implemented by local governments, even it is not written in the legal decree or regulation. Meanwhile growth of private sector made each company to brand their office with new and/or modern and/or personal architecture image. Therefore, the development of architecture during this period was varied, depended on building types or the actors of a building's design and construction. International Style, as first example, was dominating the big cities skyline. This tower buildings-usually serves as the office-is easily identified from its box mass and full glass façade. Second variation is European eclectic style which is popular as *Spanyolan* (Spanish-like style), Mediterranean style, *gaya Romawi* (Roman style), and *gaya Yunani* (Greece style). This eclectic style is dominating the residential projects, especially built by house developer, and done in both serious and comical quality of implementation of each styles' architectural character. Third variation is Traditional eclectic style. This term is used to describe buildings that built by attaching traditional architecture elements into modern type building (see figure 4.3 and 4.5). It was used in many local government offices as materialization of national government's 'instruction' to present their locality. Since then, this style became popular choice for implemented by ordinary people in many products such as village gate, building gate, and even for animal cage.



Figure 4.4 TEMPO Magazine, October 16, 1982, with cover title 'the Market of Indonesian architect' as their main coverage issue (left) and profile of some architects, including Robi Sularto and his project (insert photo in the page) (right)



Figure 4.5 This Bank Office display the forced mixture between traditional architecture (pyramid roof) and modern style architecture (source: Budiharjo, 1989)

This condition started several intense discussions among architects and academicians about what proper architecture should be built in Indonesia, or what Indonesian architecture is. This topic was also covered in seminars, books, and even magazine (such as in TEMPO Magazine, October 16, 1982, pp.69-71 with title '*Dari Dunia yang Baru Tumbuh*' (From a Newly Growing World)). The biggest event to discuss was happened in 2nd Congress of Institute of Indonesian Architects in 1982 in Yogyakarta. Several well-known architects and academicians delivered they viewed and discussed. As an exception, this period presented some outstanding projects such as Wisma Dharmala Office Tower (1986) by Paul Rudolph, Head Office of Universitas Indonesia (1984) by Gunawan Tjahjono, Soekarno-Hatta International Airport (1986-91) by Paul Andreu, Sendangsono pilgrimage complex (1974) and Wisma Kuwera (1986-1999) by Y.B. Mangunwijaya. For them, modernism-which is rational-was used as design approach while traditional architectures were taken as object of study.



Figure 4.6 This caricature illustrated the problem faced by architect in their effort to create an Indonesian architecture (source: Budi Harjo, 1983)

1990-2010s

One of important change in Indonesian architecture started in early 1990s, a few years earlier than the moment of the reform in 1998—a change of regime that gave effect to almost every aspect of live of Indonesian people. The new culture in Indonesian architecture was sounded by a group of young architects that named their selves as *Arsitek Muda Indonesia (AMI)*/Indonesian Young Architect. Through their manifesto—as cited in P.H., Arianto and Antar, Yori [ed.]. (1999), they stated their objective to “... fight for idealism. Idealism for festive climate in the world of architecture, which gives recognition to the architect as a creator.” They brought design critics—something that is uncommon in Indonesia during 1980s, discussions, open houses, and exhibitions into Indonesia architect community. It made public awareness on architecture is higher than before. At the same time, as also stated in the manifesto, they also proposed—with the spirit of freshness—new explorations on concept, form, and material to architecture design in Indonesia. They were supported by positive change brought by 1998 reformation, which is noted as one of bleak period in the history of Indonesia. The warranty for freedom of speech and gather, decentralized government power, new good governance government,

and more transparen bureaucracy for private sector established new economic and social demography, such as, by the increasing number of middle age rich people and small to middle private businesses. These new post-reformation condition, positively, generated more architecture projects- in numbers and types, more creative rooms for architects, and more opportunities to involve in government projects-as a result of transparent tender process. It is also noted that, during last 10 years, Indonesian architects gain bigger appreciation from common people, industrial and commercial sectors, mass media, and also head of government institutions. The result could be seen in more quality projects spread in various cities such as Andra Matin House in Jakarta (2007-2013) by Andra Matin, Library of Universitas Indonesia (2009) by DCM, Masjid Raya Sumatera Barat/West Sumatera Grand Mosque (2007) by Rizal Muslimin, Persada Soekarno Blitar: Museum and Presidential Library (2003-2004) by Baskoro Tedjo, and Duta Niaga House (1993) by Sardjono Sani, that bravely introduced deconstruction theory in house design.



Figure 4.7 The architecture of recently Regent Offices in Indonesia which do not share identity of the context (source: <http://storyza.files.wordpress.com/2011/05/kab-kepahiang-prop-bengkulu.jpg> (left above) <https://i2.wp.com/www.cahayapapua.com/wp-content/uploads/Kantor-bupati-Manokwari.jpg?fit=480%2C320> (left below), <https://www.goriau.com/assets/imgbank/06052015/df43629f28d0fb4c5ed190vtm-32405.jpg> (right above),https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/d/d2/Pilar_Depan_Kantor_Bupati_Bone_Bolango.jpg (right below) accessed May 7, 2016)

However, problems in architecture were also arise. With the bigger number of architects and projects and the freedom on developing the design, the question of identity, especially related to the public buildings, arose again. The problem such as illustrated in figure 4.7 was a fact that how a public architecture in different areas could have similar face and very different to the identity of its place. Any academic seminars or conferences in architecture almost had session about traditional architecture and the issue of identity. However, Symposium 111111 in 2011 could be the most awaited event because of architects—that very rarely involved in academic seminar—and academicians were sitting together and discussing about *Matinya Arsitektur Tradisional (The Death of Traditional Architecture)*. Then since 2013, an annual competition about *Arsitektur Nusantara* (Nusantara architecture) was held and sponsored by private sector.



Figure 4.8 Posters of seminars and symposiums on nusantara or traditional architecture

The discussions, competition entries, and well-appreciated projects during this period brought similarity in interpreting what is Indonesian/Nusantara architecture is. They took local/traditional architecture and/or art and/or cultural artefact or value as reference and transform it to its modern image. This approach gives more freedom dan variation on its final format, in line with the condition of time, but still easily associated to the context of its place or Indonesia. As closing statement of this period, we can see the resume and the tendency of how architecture created in Indonesia through the first participation of Indonesia in Venice Architecture Biennale. 14th International Architecture Exhibition, la Biennale di Venice which was curated by Rem Koolhaas gave the national pavilions a challenge to ‘conduct a retrospective, to retrace and to examine events, information, and experiences’

on the development of their 'national' architecture in last 100 year under the main theme- Absorbing Modernity: 1914-2014. With the great opportunity to display the history—of architecture—of a nation, Indonesia participated and performance itself for the first-ever in this prestigious architecture event. The Curatorial Team of Indonesian Pavilion, as explained in their book (Armand, et. al. [ed.], 2014: 9) published after the event, brought the theme *Ketukangan: Kesadaran Material* [lit. *Craftmanship: Material Consciousness*] as the approach to provide 'a glimpse into the dynamics of architecture practice and discourse in Indonesia occurring in the past one hundred years'. Indonesia pavilion offered a glimpse into the dynamics of architecture practice and discourse in Indonesia occurring in the past one hundred years and a fundamental thing in the process of producing and creating architecture, which is: craftsmanship. In related to the development of architecture in Indonesian, craftsmanship is stated in this pavilion as an Indonesia's unique approach to progress, growth, and evolution, which is deeply rooted in culture and locality and a conscious decision/choice that enjoys a close relationship with the quality of life in Indonesia. The Indonesia Pavilion explored a hundred years of architecture in Indonesia through the journey of six materials (timber, stone, brick, steel, concrete, and bamboo) that have contributed to the interwoven dialog of "craftsmanship" (Armand, et. al. [ed.]. (2014)).

4.2 The position of pavilion in the development of Indonesian Architecture




Figure 4.9 Diagram for relationship of discussion in Indonesian architecture events, architect figures, and Indonesian Pavilion in World Expos

P.A.J. Moojen, one of architect of 1931 Pavilion and believed to be the main architect, had big influence on the development of architecture in Netherlands Indies. He admired indigenous architectures, especially for Balinese architecture, as proved by his book '*Kunst op Bali*' (1926) but at the same time he with his rationalism, rejected the 'badly understood classical form in the rational architecture' and the the 19th century 'Indies' buildings that he called as an 'imitations without spirit of a Neo-Hellenism without soul' (Akihary, 1988). Moojen was called by H.P. Berlage as the pioneer of modern 'Indies' architecture. Berlage called two building designed by Moojen as the start of modern architecture in the Netherlands Indies. Those buildings are the NILLMIJ office building in Batavia (1909) and 'Kunstkring' (1913) (see figure 4.10). The 1920s debated also responded by Moojen where in his 1924 article he concluded that an Indies architecture could only develop if a community of interests arose between the peoples of the West and the East. He supported Maclaine Pont effort in studying indigenous architecture but also said that Pont' solution was not realistic at the time (van Dullemen, 2009). Pavilion for 1931 Paris Colonial World Fair could be a good example on how the discussion on

Indies architecture in 1920s and Moojen’s conclusion could be translated in a form. This 1931 Pavilion could be referred to Moojen’s design preferences (as seen in figure 4.10), the western architecture’s grandeur (as seen in figure 4.1), and indigenous architecture’s value and exoticism.

ARCHITECT
P.A.J. Moojen and



Pieter Adriaan Jacobus Moojen.
(26 June 1879-1 April 1955)



House in Menteng



Above: NILLMIJ Office Building, 1909
Below: Bataviasche Kunstkring, 1913-1914



Cirebon Kejaksan Station
1912



Figure 4.10 NILLMIJ Office Building (left) and ‘Kunstkring’ (right) (source:

<https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/2/24/NILLMIJ-Jakarta.jpg> (right above)

https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/e/e6/Bataviasche_Kunstkring_2012.jpg accessed July 7, 2016 (right below))

Pavilion for 1937 Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace Exposition (NPPPE) and 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition (GGIE), designed by the same architect—Robert Deppe, literally celebrated the freedom to explore traditional architecture. Robert Deppe, before assigned as architect for 1937 Pavilion, was responsible for designing the architecture of pavilions of Pasar Gambir in 1936—and for 1937 to 1939(?)—to replace J.H. Antonisse. Pasar Gambir had been started in early 1900s in a small scale, limited purpose and uncertain schedule till 1918. J.H. Antonisse—an, self-taught, architect and member of Pasar Gambir Committee—assigned to design Pasar Gambir in 1923 that successfully gained its popularity back. Since then, Pasar Gambir—an Annual Fair in Batavia that only operated for two weeks—become a workshop for experimenting the exploration of traditional architectures and temporary bamboo structure. Pasar Gambir offered different architectures and design themes for its each year, and it received many compliments from public and also architects. With the success of Pasar Gambir’s exploration on traditional architecture, Deppe brought his approach to design both

1937 and 1939 Netherland Indies Pavilions. Both pavilions displayed a free and bold interpretation and implementation of traditional architectures and its synthesis with modernity. 1937 Pavilion (see figure 2.11) showed how Balinese temple gate could be changed by pushed inside the main mass of the pavilion and how the replica of a Javanese temple created in white colour and simplified version. 1939 Pavilion (see figure 2.13) mixed a top part of Hindu *Penataran* Temple—that has been rescale—with others architecture. The approach, did by Deppe, continued Moojen's approach for 1931 Pavilion—with more freedom—and the discussion on finding specific Indies architecture.

Bouwmaterialenhandel
Phang Ten Soeij en Phang Tjeng Jam & Co.

Hoofdkantoor:

Laan Raden Saleh, Weltevreden. Telefoon No. 3808 WI.

Aldeeling PASIR-BOER | Aldeeling BAMBOE-ATEP
Laan Raden Saleh, Tel. 3808 WI. | Kramat Lontar 1, Tel. 3949 WI.



De bouwers van den Pasar Gambir 1921, '22, '23, '24 en '26
Belasten zich met het ontwerpen en uitvoeren van alle bouwwerken

Figure 4.11 Advertisement of a Contractor/Builder that shows the architecture of Pasar Gambir pavilions in early 1920s (source: D' Orient, No 36/ September 4, 1926)




Figure 4.12 The main gate of Pasar Gambir in 1936 (left) and 1937 (right) that both designed by Robert Deppe (source: colonialarchitecture.eu/obj?sq=id%3Auuuid%3A006907B7-0780-4917-931b-03ff29c77b1d accessed July 6 2016 (left), D' Orient, No 35/ August 28, 1937 (right))

1964 New York World's Fair as revealed in chapter three was a summary of NBP Project. While NBP is the manifestation of Sukarno's idea on Indonesian architecture, Indonesia Pavilion for 1964 NYWF can be concluded as—either—the summary or best example of the ide of Indonesian architecture in 1950-1960s. Both approaches to make a synthesis of modernity and tradition where both have equal meaning could be found in this 1964 pavilion. First, it could be found in the main building of the pavilion where traditional form—such as umbrella and flower—was abstracted. Second, it could be found in how traditional architecture such as Balinese temple gate and Meru tower was stood side by side to modern circular pavilion building.

1970 Osaka World Exposition is stood in transition time of 1950-60s discussion and 1970-80s discussion. Robi Sularto—the architect—was either man in transition. He was studied and influenced by Prof. van Romondt—one of the figures that gave another point of view in 1950-1960s—in Institute Teknologi Bandung (ITB). He was falling in love with Bali during his study trip. He was internship student at CONEFO Project and then worked in architecture office that both lead by architect Sujudi—an alumnus of Technische Universitat, West Berlin. Robi Sularto became one of the vocal and active figures in 1970-1980s discussions on the search for Indonesian architecture. Indonesian architecture, by this fact, could be seen as a development of Indonesian architecture that constructed by Sukarno

in 1950-1960s and as the prototype for the Indonesian architecture that sought by 1970-1980s discussion.

Pavilions for 2010 Shanghai World Expo and 2015 Milan World Expo was part of the celebration of 1990-2010s approach to search of Indonesian/Nusantara architecture. Architect for both pavilions used material (bamboo and rattan) to link the pavilion to its task to represent Indonesia. There are others traditional concept used such as breathable wall, semi open structure, and stilt house. However, in general the image of the building gave new look which free or not easily associated to one specific traditional architecture.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

“In the continuum of culture growth, old and new elements overlap, fuse, or exist side by side. Dates are only approximate dividers marking the introduction of new ideas or techniques without necessarily implying the disappearance of preceding beliefs and practices”

(Claire Holt, 1967)

The search for Indonesian architecture was a challenging task given. As it is proved, that since the discussion on this issue was sticking out in 1923 till recent time, there are never a single agreement on its terminology. However, each period shares the similarity, which is the old and the new (could be read as ‘indigenous/traditional and modernity’). The old is the inspiration for those seven pavilions. Those pavilions are connected to the local’s (Indonesian) cultural richness. What can be read from this are that identity of Indonesia is still an important aspect to be exhibited in the pavilion as it is a representation of Indonesia, and all were seen to agree that using indigenous vocabularies were important to quickly link the pavilion with the country it came from—and in the same time, it made visitors easily understand the owner of the pavilion. But at the same time, *first*, it displays the change on what kind of Indonesia that will be presented. As an example, in the pavilion built from 1931 to 1970, traditional architecture was chosen, while in 2010 and 2015 traditional architecture was brought from its principles, not physical form. *Second*, it displays that the first five pavilions (1931, 1937, 1939, 1964, 1970) chose one or several traditional architecture or elements to represent Indonesia. While the last two (2010 and 2015) researched the similarity of traditional architectures and elements spread across Indonesia and brought it to represent Indonesia.

The ‘new (lit. modernity)’ came in its image and method. As the modern image could be seen in its appearance, the modern method (such as collage and metaphor) was found to differ from one pavilion to another. 1931 –main–pavilion, as explained before, took several traditional architectures such as Meru towers, Minangkabau roof, Candi Bentar gate, and temple relief; and put them together into one big modern mass building. In 1937, Deppe articulated a box with two layers roof, a ‘bold’ replica of temple—colored in white, and a Benthar gate pushed into the building. In more monumental

scale, Deppe took and enlarge Penataran Temple and then put it together with roof shape, colours, and materials from other indigenous architectures. These three pavilions exhibited a collection of many architectures' forms and elements in a single building. When it was discussed with their participation motif, it could be concluded that the concept brought by pavilions during Netherlands-Indies is the metaphor of wealth, which was refer to the diversity of Indonesia's treasures. This concept was transformed by using the collage method—a 1920s Cubist artists technique, according to Farelly (2007), that use elements or references from other ideas to create a new architectural piece. After three Netherlands-Indies pavilions, Indonesia built its 1964 pavilion in new concept. For its first participation in international exposition, the specific metaphor—which translated the modernity that symbolized all Indonesia activities at that time into the modern architecture language—used to show Indonesia's strong idea and vision. 1970 pavilions also used specific form metaphor as it concepts by choosing a famous traditional architecture's form of Indonesia to be presented. The change was seen on the design of pavilions for 2010 and 2015. In both pavilions, architects avoided the use of the eclectic styles which will be difficult to accommodate the hundred styles exist in Indonesia but at the same time, also avoided the use of specific style which—they thought—would not be able to represent the diversity of Indonesia. Their solution for those was by finding the commonality or generalization from styles existed in Indonesia and brought or transformed it to the pavilion design. The architects played with the metaphor of commonality of building principles, materials, and manufactured method on those 2010 and 2015 pavilion. The similarity between 1964-1970 and 2010-2015 pavilion is in their transformation method that used abstraction. On those method, architects reduced and simplified the form and elements of the inspiration and produced the new image that could be associated and disassociated, and also multi-interpretation at the same time.

Become a 'now' without left the past was become the main theme of the design. This dualism was always part of Indonesian culture. Indonesian architecture is the story on dualism—become modern but at the same time was rooted to the tradition. Before, the development of architecture in Indonesia during 1950-60s was seemed as the only time that, in the discussion of the search for Indonesian architecture, modernity took over the tradition or the time when modern architecture was more important that traditional or indigenous architecture after the discussion of specific architecture for the Netherland Indies or Indonesia arose in 1920s. The strong appearances of modernity in the construction of the country become the reason for this conclusion—as explained in the Nation Building Project sub-chapter in the third chapter. Sukarno's orations that expressed his admiration on modernity strengthen the conclusion. However, the fact that revealed from the appearance of Indonesian Pavilion in 1964 New York World's Fair change those conclusions. The 1964 Pavilion, the only Nation Building Project built outside the country, proved that was not correct. This building

recalled back or reminded again about the real identity of Sukarno and its intention on Building Nation Project. This building proved that Sukarno's intention to present the modernity inside Indonesia was to arise the tradition—the glorious past of Indonesia back into its triumphant.

This study that took Indonesian Pavilions World Expos revealed that there is different and changing form of dualism that happened in the history of architecture in Indonesia. In 1931, 1937, and 1939 pavilions, the 'now' was appear as the base for traditional architectures' forms, as it was explicitly said by P.A.J. Moojen for his 1931 Pavilion: 'a modern expression' with all indigenous style on it'. Modern expression in 1931, 1937, and 1939 covered the scale, proportion, the robustness and firmness of the building. 1964 Pavilion shared two approach on dualism. First, 1964 Pavilion, through its main building and landscape elements, put traditional architecture, landscape, and art side by side to modern form to give the whole identity of Indonesian at—dreamed—that time. Second, 1964 Pavilion displayed in its main building that traditional form was abstracted than fused into the modern form. The last three pavilions (1970, 2010, 2015) exhibited another version of dualism. Here, traditional elements (architecture/art/culture) was abstracted to be appeared in modern expression. The difference was that 1970 pavilion chose one traditional element to be abstracted, while 2010 and 2015 Pavilions chose the generalization or similarity of many traditional elements to be abstracted.

At the end, this study shows that Indonesian pavilions in world expositions are closely related to the history of architecture in Indonesia. There is a pavilion which is pavilion for 1970 Osaka World Expo that appeared as the prescription for how the architecture in Indonesia should be created and others are constructed as the explanation and celebration on how the architecture is built in that time. Special note was made for pavilion for 1964 New York World's Fair which are appeared as the summary and the complete narration for architecture built in 1950-1960s period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- , 1930, De Kol. Tentoonstelling 1931 Te Parijs, Algemeen Handelsblad
- , 1931, 'La Paris En 1931, Exposition Coloniale Internationale : Guide Officiel', Paris: Editions Mayeux
- , Demaison A., 'Pay-Bays'
- , 1931, De Kol. Tentoonstelling 1931 Te Parijs, Bataviaasch Nieuwsblad
- , 1937, De Pacific-Vredestentoonstelling (The Pacific Peace Exhibition), De Indische Courant
- , 1937, Frisco's expositie. Indie's Deelname Zeker Geacht. (Frisco's exhibition. Indie's Participation Secure), De Indische courant
- , 1938, De Int. Expositie te San Francisco (The Int. Exposition in San Francisco), De Indische Courant
- , 1939, The Netherlands Indies on the Golden Gate International Exposition at San Francisco in 1939. The Netherlands Indies, Vol.7, No.2, pp. 5-7, Batavia: Department of Economic Affairs
- , 1939, The Netherlands Indies , Vol.7, No.2
- , 1962, Telegram No. 102790/M/PERDATAM/62 from Chairul Saleh to Governor Poletti, 1962.9.19 (Archive of New York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation at New York Public Library)
- , 1963, Letter from Sutomo Josowidigdo, Act. Consul-General of Indonesian in New York, to Mr. William Whipple, Jr, 1963.10.31 (Archive of New York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation at New York Public Library)
- , 2010, Edhi Sunarso Solo Exhibition Catalog, Jakarta: Galeri Salihara
- Aboebakar, H., 1955, Sedjarah Mesjid dan Amal Ibadah Dalamnja (The History of Mosque and the Worship in it), Djakarta-Banjarmasin: Fa. Toko Buku "Adil"
- Akihary, Huib., 1988, Architecture & Stedebouw in Indonesie, Zuthpeh: De Walburg Pers
- ANTARA, 1968, 'Meeting on Indonesia's Participation in Japan's Expo '70'

- Armand, Avianti., et. al. [ed.], 2014, *Ketukangan: Kesadaran Material (Craftmanship: Material Consciousness)*, Jakarta: PT Imaji Media Pustaka
- Atmadi, T., [ed.], 1970, *Indonesian Man and His Culture: as Reflected at Pavilion Indonesia Expo '70 Osaka Japan'*, Djakarta: The National Committee for Expo '70
- Bloembergen, Marieke., 2006, *Colonial Spectacles: the Netherlands and the Netherlands-Indies at the World Exhibitions, 1880-1931*, Singapore: Singapore University Press
- Holt, Claire., 1967, *Art in Indonesia, Continuities and Change*, New York: Cornell University Press
- Caro, Robert A., 1965, *Indo Blows Top at Fair at High Cost to Rip Down*, Nonlewsday
- Commemorative Association for the Japan World Exposition, 1971, *Japan World Exposition, Osaka, 1970: Official Photo Album*, Osaka: Commemorative Association for the Japan World Exposition
- Commemorative Association for the Japan World Exposition, 1972, *Official Report of the Japan World Exposition, Vol.2*, Osaka: Commemorative Association for the Japan World Exposition
- Cotter, Bill and Bill Young., 2014, *The 1964-1965 New York World's Fair' (Images of Modern America)*, New York: Arcadia Publishing
- Damais, Soedarmadji J.H., 1977, *Karya Jaya: Kenang-Kenangan Lima Kepala Daerah Jakarta 1945-1966 (Masterpiece: Memoires of the Five Governors of Jakarta 1945-1966)*, Jakarta: Pemerintah DKI Jakarta (in Indonesian)
- Dicke, F., 1951, *De Opleiding Van de Bouwkundig Ingenieur of Architect in Indonesië*, Bandung: N.V. Mij Vorkink
- Dullemen, Jan Van., 2009, *'Tropical Modernity - Life and Work of C.P. Wolff Schoemaker'*, Amsterdam: SUN
- Endarmoko, Eko and Dewanto, Nirwan (ed.), 2010, *Monumen: Edhi Sunarso*, Jakarta: Galeri Salihara
- Budiharjo, Eko., 1983, *Menuju Arsitektur Indonesia*, Bandung: Alumni
- Budiharjo, Eko., 1989, *Jati Diri Arsitektur Indonesia*, Bandung: Alumni
- Exposition Coloniale Internationale de Paris, 1931, *Exposition Coloniale internationale de Paris 1931: Album, 2e ed.*, Paris: L'illustration
- Fakih, Farabih., 2005, *Membayangkan Ibukota Jakarta di Bawah Soekarno (Imagine the Capital of Jakarta Under Soekarno)*, Yogyakarta: Ombak

- Farely, Lorren., 2007, 'The Fundamental of Architecture', Lausanne: AVA Publishing
- Forty, Adrian., 2000, Words and Buildings: A Vocabulary of Modern Architecture, London: Thames & Hudson Ltd
- Garn, Andrew et al., 2007, Exit to Tomorrow: World's Fair Architecture, Design, Fashion, 1933-2005. New York: Universe
- , Kultermann, Udo., 'Anticipation of the Future: The Origin and History of World's Fairs'
- Hamilton Wright Organization, 1964, Indonesia Sums up life in Pavilion of Past and Present, New York: Hamilton Wright Organization
- Harian Merdeka, 1964, Paviljun Indonesia Salah Satu Front Terdepan untuk Kumandangkan dan Mentjanankan Revolusi Kita (Indonesian Pavilion is One of the Foremost Instrument to Declare and Proclaim the Indonesian Revolution), Harian Merdeka (newspaper) (in Indonesian)
- Hitchcock, Jr., 1936, Henry-Russell: Exposition Architecture, inside The Bulletin of the Museum of Modern Art, Vol. 3, No. 4, The Museum of Modern Art Stable, pp. 2-8 URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4057883>, Accessed: October 10, 2015
- Ho, Sie Pek., 1963, Indonesia Plans N.Y.Fair Exhibit, The Christian Science Monitor
- Holston, James., 1989, The Modernist City: An Anthropological Critique of Brasilia, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- IAI, 1984, *Rekaman Kongres Nasional II IAI (Ikatan Arsitek Indonesia)*, Yogyakarta Desember 1982, Jakarta: Bidang Sintar IAI
- , Prawirohardjo, Darmawan and Robi Sularto., Menuju Arsitektur Indonesia
- Jackson, Anna., 2008, Expo: International Expositions 1851-2010, London: V&A Publishing
- Japan Association for the 1970 World Exposition, 1970, Expo 70: Indonesia [brocuher], Japan: Japan Association for the 1970 World Exposition
- JAPENPA [ed.], 1971, Indonesia Handbook 1970, Jakarta: JAPENPA Foreign Language Publishing Institute
- Kalb, Bernard., 1961, Sukarno Chooses Site at 1964 Fair, New York: New York Times
- Kostof, Spiro, 1985, A History of Architecture, Settings and Rituals, New York: Oxford University Press

- Krippendorff, Klaus., 2004, Content Analysis an Introduction to its Methodology 2nd Edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Kripenndorff, Klaus., 1991, Analisis Isi : Pengantar Teori dan Metodologi, Jakarta : Rajawali Press
- Kurniawan, Harry., 2009, Arsitektur minimalis (thesis-unpublished), Yogyakarta: Universitas Gadjah Mada
- Kurniawan, Harry., 2016, Indonesia — Why Modernism is Inherited, 10 + 1 web site, (<http://10plus1.jp/monthly/2016/10/issue-03-2.php>, accessed October 19, 2016)
- Kurniawan, Harry., 2018, The Architecture Explained by President Sukarno —Indonesian Pavilion in 1964 New York World’s Fair Part 1—, AIJ Journal of Technology and Design, Vol. 24, No. 58, AIJ, pp.101-106, 2018.10, DOI <http://doi.org/10.3130/aijt24.101>
- Kurniawan, Harry., 2019a, The Indonesian Pavilion In The 1964 New York World's Fair As Summary Of Nation-Building Projects, Journal of Architecture and Planning (Transactions of AIJ), Volume 84, Issue 757, pp. 703-712, 2019.03, DOI <https://doi.org/10.3130/aija.84.703>
- Kurniawan, Harry., 2019b, The Architecture in Comparison with Tugu Nasional —Indonesian Pavilion in 1964 New York World’s Fair Part 2—, AIJ Journal of Technology and Design, Vol. 25, No. 60, AIJ, PP. 977-982, 2019.06, DOI <https://doi.org/10.3130/aijt.25.977>
- Kusno, Abidin., 2000, Behind the Postcolonial: Architecture, Urban Space, and Political Cultures in Indonesia, London: Routledge Kegan Paul
- Kusno, Abidin [ed.], 2017, ‘Postcolonial traditionality: Gunawan Tjahjono and Josef Prijotomo’, Inaugural Speeches in the Built Environment: Global and Contextualized, issue 2, TU Delft Open ----, Gunawan Tjahjono, “Arsitektur Di Indonesia: Kancah Penjelajahan Tanpa Batas”
- P. Nas (ed.), 1993, Urban Symbolism, Vol. 8, Studied in Human Society, Leiden: Brill
- , Leclerc, Jacques., Mirrors and The Lighthouse: A Search for Meaning in the Monuments and Great Works of Sukarno's Jakarta, 1960-1966, pp. 38-58
- La Federation Francaise des Ancien Coloniaux (ed.), 1931, Le Livre D'Or: De L'Exposition acolonique Internationale de Paris 1931, Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion
- Levick, 1964, L.E: Spirit of Indonesia, N.Y. American, p.7, 1964.8.1

- Lukito, Yulia Nurliani., 2016, Exhibiting Modernity and Indonesian Vernacular Architecture: Hybrid Architecture at Pasar Gambir of Batavia, the 1931 Paris International Colonial Exhibition and Taman Mini Indonesia Indah, Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden
- Matte, Erik.,1998, 'World's Fairs', New York: Princeton Architectural Press
- Morton, Pat., 1998, A Study in Hybridity: Madagascar and Morocco at the 1931 Colonial Exposition, Journal of Architectural Education (1984-), Vol. 52, No.2, Taylor & Francis Ltd., pp. 76-86 (<http://www/jstor.org/stable/1423423>, accessed September 30, 2015)
- Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace Exposition, 1938, Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace Exposition Journal, Nagoya: Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace Exposition, (in Japanese) (名古屋汎太平洋平和博覧会: 名古屋汎太平洋平和博覧会誌, 名古屋 : 名古屋汎太平洋平和博覧会)
- New York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation, 1963.a, Groundbreaking at the New York World's Fair 1964-1965: The Pavilion of Indonesia, January 18, 1963 (transcript), New York: New York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation
- New York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation,1963.b, Architecture of The Indonesian Pavilion New York World's Fair, 1964-1965, New York: New York World's Fair 1964-1965 Corporation
- Nakata, Hitoshi: The Background of the Nagoya Pan-Pacific Exhibition in 1937, in New Edition of Nagoya City History Editing Committee: Shinshuu-Nagoya-shi-Shi (New Edition of Nagoya City History), Nagoya City, Chapter 6, pp.141-158, 1997 (in Japanese) (中田平 : 名古屋汎太平洋平和博覧会の背景、 新修名古屋市史編集委員会編: 新修名古屋市史, 名古屋市, 第 6 巻、 pp.141-158, 1997)
- Noguchi, Hideo., 1971, The Tradition and The Creation of Architecture: an Analysis of Indonesia Pavilion at Expo '70
- Norberg-Schulz., 1963, Intentions in Architecture, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Pangestu, Mari Elka. [ed.], 2011, Our House: Indonesia Pavilion World Expo Shanghai 2011, Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama
- Pareanom, Yusi A., 2016, Paviliun Indonesia World EXPO Milan 2015: Indonesia Menawan/Enchanting Indonesia, Jakarta: Koperasi Pelestari Budaya Nusantara dan Artha Graha Peduli
- Passchier, Cor., 2016, Building in Indonesia 1600-1960, Volendam: LM Publishers
- P.H., Arianto and Antar, Yori [ed.],1999, Perjalanan 1999, Jakarta: Arsitek Muda Indonesia(AMI)

- Powell, Robert., 1983, *Exploring Architecture in Islamic Cultures 1: Architecture and Identity*, Singapore: Concept Media Pte Ltd
- , Robi Sularto Sastrowardoyo, *Indonesia: Identity in Diversity within Unity*
- Pusat Dokumentasi Arsitektur, 2012, *Tegang Bentang*, Jakarta: Pusat Dokumentasi Arsitektur
- Salam, Solichin., 1989, *Tugu Nasional dan Soedarsono (National Obelisk and Soedarsono)*, Jakarta: Kuningmas (in Indonesian)
- Salain, Putu Rumawan (ed.), 2001, *Ucapan, Pikiran, dan Karya Robi Sularto dalam Untaian Kenangan*, Denpasar: PT. Cipta Paduraksa
- , Robi Sularto Sastrowardoyo, "Arsitektur itu dilahirkan, bukan dibuat". *Arsitek digembleng, sebuah dongeng'*
- Savarese, Nicola and Richard Fowler, 1988, Antonin Artaud Sees Balinese Theater at the Paris Colonial Exposition, *TDR* (1988-), Vol.45, No.3 (Autumn, 2001), pp. 51-77, The MIT Press (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1146912> accessed on October 1, 2015)
- Shanken, Andrew M., 2014, *Into the Void Pacific: Building the 1939 San Francisco World's Fair*, California: University of California Press
- Silver, Christopher., 2008, *Planning the Megacity: Jakarta in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Routledge
- Sudradjat, Iwan.,1991, *A Study of Indonesian Architectural History*. PhD Thesis (unpublished), Sydney University
- Sudradjat, Iwan., 1995, *Arsitektur Indonesia Dalam Kritik : Ditinjau Dari Latar Belakang Sejarah Dan Perkembangannya*, Makalah Simposium "Arsitektur Indonesia : Sebuah Tinjauan", Jakarta: Universitas Tarumanagara
- Sukarno, 1960.a, 'to Build the World Anew', 880th Plenary Meeting of United Nations General Assembly, fifteenth session Official Records, New York: United Nations
- Sukarno, 1960.b, *Build World anew*, New York: United Nations General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Official Records, 880th Plenary Meeting, pp.278- 290 (<http://kepuustakaan-presiden.pnri.go.id/>, accessed July 4, 2017)
- Sukarno, 1962.a, *Only a Nation with Self-reliance can become a great nation*, Djakarta: Department of Information, Republic of Indonesia

Sukarno, 1962.b, Amanat Presiden Sukarno pada peringatan Ulang Tahun ke-435 kota Djakarta di Gedung Olah Raga Djakarta pada tanggal 22 Juni 1962 (The Mandate of President Sukarno at the commemoration of the 435th anniversary of the city of Djakarta at Djakarta Sports Hall on June 22, 1962), Jakarta: Department of Information, Republic of Indonesia (in Indonesian)

Sukarno, 1963, "*Ambeg Parama-Arta!*", Jakarta: Department of Information, Republic of Indonesia

Sukarno, 1964, Pidato PJM Presiden Sukarno Dihadapan Para Utusan Jang Telah Kembali dari New York World Fair (The Speech of PJM President Sukarno in front of delegation who has been returned from New York World Fair), Bogor: The Ministry of State Secretariat of the Republik of Indonesia (in Indonesian)

Taishiro Yamamoto (ed.), 1970, *The Kenchiku Bunka*, No. 282, Tokyo: The Shokukusha Publishing Co., LTD.

Time-Life Books [ed.], 1964, *Official Guide, New York World's Fair 1964/1965*, New York: Time Incorporated

Tjahyawulan, Indah., 2011, *Representasi 'Indonesia' Melalui Anjungan di World Expo pada Masa Kolonial dan Kemerdekaan (Representation of 'Indonesia' through Pavilions in World Expos during Colonial and Independent Era)* (unpublished thesis), Jakarta: Institut Kesenian (in Indonesia)

T. Vu, W. Wongsurawat., 2009, *Dynamics of the Cold War in Asia: Ideology, Identity, and Culture*, Springer

NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

---, 1931, *De ingenieur*, Number 27, 1931.7.3, P.A.273-A.278, Uthrect: N.V.A. Oosthoek

Algemeen Handelsblad, 1930, Amsterdam: Nederlandse Dagbladunie

Bataviaasch Nieuwsblad, 1931, Batavia: KOLff & Co

D'Orient, No 36, September 4, 1926, Weltevreden: Weekblad D'Orient

D'Orient, No.21, May 22, 1937, Weltevreden: Weekblad D'Orient

D'Orient, No 35, August 28, 1937, Weltevreden: Weekblad D'Orient

D'Orient, No 30, July 23, 1938, Weltevreden: Weekblad D'Orient

De Graafschap-bode, 1931, Doetinchem: C. Misset (N.V.)

De Indische Courant, 1937, Malang

Harian Merdeka, 1964, Bandung

Star weekly, 1961.a, 'Susunan ukuran Tugu nasional berpokok pada angka 17-8-45', Tahun XVI, No. 816, Jakarta: P.T. Pers. Dag & Pertjetakan 'Keng Po'

Star Weekly, 1961.b, Star Weekly, Tahun XVI, No. 817, Djakarta: PT. Pers. Dag & Pertjetakan "Keng Po"

Star Weekly, 1961.c, 'Pembahuruan Kota Djakarta. Pameran Pembangunan – Perombakkan di lapangan merdeka – soal-soal lalulintas", No. 809, Jakarta: P.T. Pers. Dag & Pertjetakan 'Keng Po'

Suluh Indonesia Newspaper, June 6, 1964, Jakarta: Partai Nasional Indonesia

TEMPO Magazine, October 16, 1982, Jakarta: Tempo Media Group

Voorwaarts, No. 2918, January 30, 1930, Berlin: M.Bading

Voorwaarts, No. 3388, August 5, 1931, Berlin: M.Bading

ATTACHMENT ONE

INDONESIAN PAVILION IN WORLD EXPO

Info Source	Expo Name	Date	Status	Theme	Government Era	Participation Status	Note and References
☑*@	The great Exhibition of the works of industry of all Nations (1 st world expo)	01.05 - 11.10.1851	World Exhibition	Industry of all Nations	Dutch East Indies/ Netherlands- Indies Era	Holland (Netherlands) participated	
0*@	The Great Industrial Exhibition - Dublin, Ireland, 1853	13.05 – 31.10.1853	Would be considered a (Recognized) Expo today			Holland (Netherlands) participated	
0*@	Exhibition of the Industry of All Nations - New York, 1853-1854	14.07 – 30.11.1853 01.01 – 01.11.1854	Due to its size, in today's vernacular, would be considered a Special Exhibition.			Holland (Netherlands) participated	
☑*@	Exposition Universelle des produits de l'agriculture, de l'industrie et des beaux-arts de Paris 1855	15.05 – 15.11.1855	World Exhibition	Agriculture, Industry and fine arts		Netherlands (Pays-Bas) and Colonies participated (part of display of pavilion Netherlands)	Visite à l'exposition Universelle de Paris en 1855_inde p72
☑*@	1862 London	01.05 – 01.11.1862	World Exhibition	Industry and Art		Holland (Netherlands) participated	
0*@	International Exhibition of Arts and Manufactures – Dublin, 1865	9.05 – 10.11.1865	Would be considered a (Recognized) Expo today			Netherlands participated	
@	New Zealand International Exhibition – Dunedin, 1865	12.01 – 06.05.1865				Part of Holland was represented (no indication of official/full participation) [1] Netherlands not participated [2]	[1] http://christchurchcitylibraries.com/Heritage/Publications/1906InternationalExhibition/OfficialRecord/1906ExhibitionRecord.pdf , accessed 7des2017 → file: 1906New Zealand_ExhibitionRecord.pdf p.13 [2] Music in Christchurch during the 1882 International Exhibition.pdf → p.12
@	Intercolonial Exhibition – Melbourne, Australia, 1866	24.10.1866 – 08.12.1866				There is exhibition from Netherlands-Indies [1]	[1] https://guides.slv.vic.gov.au/interexhib/1866to67 , accessed 7des2017 [2] http://digital.slv.vic.gov.au/view/action/singleViewer.do?dvs=1512627888373~974&locale=in_ID&metadata_object_ratio=10&show_metadata=true&VIEWER_URL=/view/action/singleViewer.do?&preferred_usage_type=VIEW_MAIN&DELIVERY_RULE_ID=10&frameId=1&usePid1=true&usePid2=true , accessed 7des2017 → p.8 [3] http://digital.slv.vic.gov.au/view/action/singleViewer.do?dvs=1512627884471~860&locale=in_ID&metadata_object_ratio=10&show_metadata=true&VIEWER_URL=/view/action/singleViewer.do?&preferred_usage_type=VIEW_MAIN&DELIVERY_RULE_ID=10&frameId=1&usePid1=true&usePid2=true , accessed 7des2017 → p.55 (1866 Melbourne Int colonial exhibition_catalog.pdf)
☑, @*	Exposition Universelle de Paris 1867	01.04 – 03.11.1867	World Exhibition	Agriculture, Industry and Fine Arts		Pays-Bays (Netherlands) Participated in Plan Du Palais	
0@	London International Exhibitions, 1871 - 1872					Netherlands not participated	https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=gri.ark:/13960/t8sb93z8n;view=1up;seq=42;size=75 , accessed 27nov2017
@	Polytechnic Exhibition – Moscow, Russia-1873	May-1872–	National exhibition [1]			[1] https://www.memoriachilena.cl/602/w3-article-688.html , accessed 7des2017	
☑*@	Weltausstellung 1873 in Wien	01.05 – 31.10.1873	World Exhibition	Culture and Education	Netherlands and Netherlands Colonies Participated		
@	London International Exhibitions, 1873				There is exhibition from Hollands [1]	[1] https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.32044108417700;view=1up;seq=62 , accessed 7des2017, p.2 dan p.vii	
0@	London International Exhibitions, 1874				Netherlands participated	https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=gri.ark:/13960/t41r8pv47;view=1up;seq=37 , accessed 27nov2017	
@	Exposicion Internacional de 1875 – Santiago, Chile	16.09.1875 – 16.01.1876			Netherlands not participated [1]	[1] http://www.memoriachilena.cl/602/w3-article-688.html , accessed 7des2017	

☑*@	Centennial Exhibition of Arts, Manufactures and Products of the Soil and Mine, 1876, Philadelphia	10.05 – 10.11.1876	World Exhibition	Arts, Manufactures and Products of the Soil and Mine		Netherlands, (Incl. East Indian Colonies) participated. No own pav for colonies	
@	South African International Exhibition-Cape town, South Africa, 1877	15.02.1877 -				No data	
☑*@	Exposition Universelle de 1878, Paris	20.05 – 10.11.1878 (Official Inauguration 01.05.1878)	World Exhibition	New Technologies		Netherlands, participated. Built own pavilion for Netherlands. Ned. Indies exhibited in the common exhibition building in the Champs de Mars [1]	L'Exposition universelle de 1878 illustrée . p.7 [1] Bloombergen, p.18
0*@	Sydney International Exhibition 1879 - 1880	17.09.1879 – 20.04.1880	Would be considered a Special category Recognized event today due to size and participation			Netherlands participated	
☑*@	International Exhibition of Arts, Manufactures and Agricultural and Industrial Products of all Nations, 1880 Melbourne	01.10.1880 – 30.04.1881	World Exhibition	Arts, Manufactures and Agricultural and Industrial Products of all Nations		Netherlands participated	
0	International Cotton Exposition – Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 1881	05.10 – 31.12.1881				Netherlands not participated [1]	[1] Prospectus: 1881 The International Cotton Exposition of Products, Machinery and Manufactures. Atlanta, GA: Jas. P. Harrison & Co., Printers and Publishers. 1881 [2] http://atrailcorridorarchive.org/exhibits/show/cotton-states-and-internat/the-south-and-the-world , accessed 27nov2017
@	Adelaide International Exposition – Adelaide, Australia, 1881					Netherlands not participated [1]	[1] https://trove.nla.gov.au/newspaper/article/91285914 , accessed 7des2017
@	New Zealand International Exposition – Christchurch, New Zealand, 1882	10.04.1882 (for 14weeks)		Did by private enterprise with government assistance [1]p.14		Netherlands not participated [2]	[1] http://christchurchcitylibraries.com/Heritage/Publications/1906InternationalExhibition/OfficialRecord/1906ExhibitionRecord.pdf , accessed 7des2017 p.14 [2] Music in Christchurch during the 1882 International Exhibition.pdf → p.12
0+@	Internationale Koloniale en Untvoerhandel Tentoonstelling- Amsterdam, 1883	01.05.1883 -				Ned. Indies (Named as East Indies colonies) Participated and exhibited in colonies zone	Image Representative: Replica of Kampong Aceh
0, +@	Calcutta International Exhibition 1883-1884					Ned. And Ned Indies Participated. Netherlands India (name as in document) participated in Indian Court Hall.	Exhibited collection of raw materials and food-products, fine arts and wearing apparel, books and photographs (buku report p.84)
**	International Fisheries Exhibition, London, England 1883	12.05 – 31.10.1883				Netherlands participated	https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.hwfk75;view=1up;seq=543 , accessed 27nov2017
*+	INTERNATIONAL HEALTH EXHIBITION 1884, London, England					Netherlands participated	https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=gri.ark:/13960/t2v43m960;view=1up;seq=307 , accessed 27nov2017
*+	International Inventions Exhibition, South Kensington, London, 1885						
*	Edinburgh, Scotland 1884						
0@	The American Exhibition of the Products, Arts and Manufactures of Foreign Nations – Boston, 1883-1884					Ned and Ned.Indies not participated	https://archive.org/stream/officialcatalog00goog/officialcatalog00goog_djvu.txt , accessed 27nov2017
*	LOUISVILLE, USA 1883 Southern Exposition	01.08 – 10.11.1883	Would be considered a Recognized Expo			Holland's work exhibited in Art Gallery	
0*@	The World's Industrial and Cotton Centennial Exposition - New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, 1884-1885	16.12.1884 – 01.06.1885	Would be considered today a Registered Event			Ned and Ned.Indies not participated	
0*@	Exposition Universelle d'Anvers / Wereldtentoonstelling van	02.05 – 02.11.1885	Would be considered a Recognized Expo			Netherlands participated	

	Antwerpen – Antwerp, Belgium, 1885					
*	International Exhibition of Navigation, Commerce and Industry - LIVERPOOL, ENGLAND 1886	11.05 – 08.11.1886	Would be considered a Special Recognized Expo			Netherlands appeared in the International Court
0*@	International Exhibition of Industry, Science and Art – Edinburgh, UK, 1886	06.05 – 30.10.1886	Would be considered a Recognized Expo			Holland participated
0@	Colonial and Indian Exhibition – London, UK, 1886					Nederland not participated https://archive.org/stream/cihm_05255#page/249/mode/2up/search/holland , accessed 27nov2017
0*@	Jubilee International Exhibition - Adelaide, Australia, 1887-1888					Nederland participated https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adelaide_Jubilee_International_Exhibition , accessed 27nov2017
☑*@	Universal Exhibition of Barcelona 1888	08.04 – 10.12.1888	World Exhibition	Fine and Industrial Art		Nederland participated in small presence [1] [1] Cultures of International Exhibitions 1840-1940: Great Exhibitions in the ... Oleh Marta Filipová: p.57 https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=oTQrDwAAQBAJ&pg=PR5&dq=New+Zealand+International+Exhibition+%E2%80%93+Dunedin,+1865&hl=id&source=gbs_selected_pages&cad=3#v=onepage&q=New%20Zealand%20International%20Exhibition%20%E2%80%93%20Dunedin%2C%201865&f=false , accessed 7Dec2017
0*@	Glasgow International Exhibition - Glasgow, United Kingdom, 1888	08.05 – 10.11.1888	Would be considered a Recognized Expo			Holland participated
*	Centennial Exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States - CINCINNATI, USA 1888	04.06 – 08.11.1888	Would be considered a Recognized Expo			Nederland not participated
@	Grand Concours International des Sciences et de l'Industrie – Brussels, Belgium, 1888	10.05 – 08.11.1897				Hollande participated in a big hall with other foreign countries [1] [1] http://www.irismonument.be/fr.Bruxelles_Extension_Est.Parc_du_Cinquantenaire.11.html , accessed 7des2017. Lihat denah
*+	Nordic Exhibition of 1888 - Copenhagen, Denmark 1888					https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nordic_Exhibition_of_1888 , accessed 27nov2017
0*@	Centennial International Exhibition - Melbourne, Australia, 1888-1889	01.08.1888 – 31.01.1889	Would be considered a Special category Recognized event today			Holland (Netherlands) participated
☑*+@	Exposition Universelle de 1889, Paris	05.05 – 31.10.1889	World Exhibition	Celebration of the centenary of the French revolution		Netherlands was participated. Netherlands-Indies (names as Indes Neerlandaises) Participated in Esplanade des Invalides Image Representative : Replica of 'Kampong Javanais' Village de Archipel Indien (dari denah di buku Paris-Exposition soixante centimes)
0*@	New Zealand and South Seas Exhibition - Dunedin, New Zealand, 1889-1890	26.11.1889 – 19.04.1890		Mark the jubilee of the proclamation of British Sovereignty over New Zealand [2]:p.14		Nederlands and Ned.indies not participated [1] http://the-lothians.blogspot.jp/2016/09/the-new-zealand-and-south-seas_26.html , accessed 27nov2017 [2] http://christchurchcitylibraries.com/Heritage/Publications/1906InternationalExhibition/OfficialRecord/1906ExhibitionRecord.pdf , accessed 7des2017
*	International Exhibition of Electricity, Engineering, General Inventions and Industries - EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND 1890	01.05 – 01.11.1886	Would be considered a Recognized Expo			Nederlands and Ned.indies not participated
0@	Jamaica International Exhibition - Kingston, Jamaica, 1891					
@	Tasmania International Exhibition – Launceston, Australia, 1891-1892					Netherlands & Ned. Indies not participated [1] [1] Official record of the Tasmanian International Exhibition, held at Launceston, 1891-92. Pdf dari https://archive.org/details/officialrecordof00launiala , accessed 7des2017
@	South Africa and International Exhibition – Kimberley, South Africa, 1892	08.09.1892 -				No data

0	Exposición Histórico-Americana - Madrid, Spain, 1892					
☑*+@	World's Columbian Exposition 1893, Chicago	01.05 - 03.10.1893	World Exhibition	Forth centenary of the discovery of America	Ned. And colonies participated without own building	[1] https://www.fieldmuseum.org/java-village-1893-worlds-columbian-exposition , accessed 24des2017 [2] http://ecuip.lib.uchicago.edu/diglib/social/worldsfair_1893/gallery/09-11_midway.html , accessed 24des2017
0*@	Exposition Universelle d'Anvers / Wereldtentoonstelling van Antwerpen - Antwerp, Belgium, 1894	05.05 – 12.11.1894	Would be considered a Registered Expo		Nederlands and Dutch East Indies (Java, Sumatra, and Madura) participated	
0*@	California Midwinter International Exposition - San Francisco, California, USA, 1894	27.01 – 04.06.1894	Would be considered a Special style Registered event today		Ned. And colonies not participated	
0@	Tasmanian International Exhibition - Hobart, Australia, 1894-1895					
0*@	The Cotton States and International Exposition - Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 1895	18.09 – 31.12.1895	Would be considered a Special style Recognized event today		Ned and colonies not participated	
☑*@	International Exhibition of Brussels 1897	10.05 – 08.11.1897	World Exhibition	Modern Life	Nederlands participated	
0@	Exposición Centroamericana - Guatemala City, Guatemala, 1897					
0*@	Tennessee Centennial International Exposition - Nashville, Tennessee, USA, 1897	01.05 – 30.10.1897	Would be considered a Recognized Expo		Ned and colonies not participated	
0*@	Allmänna Konst- och Industriutställningen - Stockholm, Sweden, 1897					
@	Queensland International Exhibition – Brisbane, Australia, 1897				No data	
0*@	Trans-Mississippi and International Exposition - Omaha, Nebraska, USA, 1898	01.06 – 31.10.1898	Would be considered a Special style Registered event today		Ned and colonies not participated	
☑*@	L'Exposition de Paris 1900	15.04 – 12.11.1900	World Exhibition	19th century: an overview	Ned participated. Netherlands-Indies (Les Indes Néerlandaises) Participated in 'colonies étrangères' zone	Image Representative : Replica of 2 Rumah Gadang and 1 Candi Sari
0*@	<i>Pan-American Exposition- Buffalo, NY, USA, 1901</i>	01.05 – 02.11.1901	Would be considered a Registered event today		Ned and colonies not participated	
0*@	<i>Glasgow International Exhibition – Glasgow, UK, 1901</i>	02.05 – 09.11.1901	Would be considered a Recognized Expo		Ned and colonies not participated	
0@	<i>the South Carolina, Interstate, and West Indian Exposition – Charleston, South Carolina, USA, 1901-1902</i>					
0@	<i>Prima Esposizione Internazionale d'Arte Decorativa Moderna - Turin (Torino), Italy, 1902</i>					
0@	<i>Esposition Française et Internationale - Hanoi 1902-1903</i>				Ned. Indies participated	[1] p.83, paragraph ke4
☑*@	Louisiana Purchase Exposition, 1904	30.04 – 01.12.1904	World Exhibition	Celebration of the centennial of the Louisiana Purchase	Netherlands (Holland) was participated	
☑*@	Universal Exhibition of Liege 1905	27.04 – 06.11.1905	World Exhibition	Commemoration of the 75th anniversary of independence	Pays-Bas (Netherlands) participated	
0*@	The Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair – Portland, Oregon, USA, 1905	01.06 – 15.10.1905	Would be considered a Special Category, Registered event today		Holland participated	

☑*@	Esposizione internazionale del Sempione, 1906 Milan	28.04 – 11.11.1906	World Exhibition	Transportation		Netherlands participated	
0*@	New Zealand International Exhibition - Christchurch, New Zealand, 1906 - 1907	01.11.1906 – 15.04.1907				Netherlands item is represented (no indication that participated officially)	
0*@	Irish International Exhibition - Dublin, Ireland, 1907	04.05 – 09.11.1907	Would be considered a small scale Special expo			Ned. And colonies not participated	
0*@	Jamestown Tercentenary Exposition - Jamestown, Virginia, USA, 1907	26.04 – 30.11.1907	Would be considered a Special Category, Registered event today			Netherlands NAVAL participated with exhibit	
0*@	Franco-British Exhibition - London, United Kingdom, 1908	14.05 – 31.10.1908	Would be considered a Recognized Expo with Special qualities			Ned. And colonies not participated	
0*@	Alaska-Yukon-Pacific International Exposition - Seattle, Washington, USA, 1909	01.06 – 16.10.1909	Would be considered a Special Category, Registered event today			Ned. And colonies not participated	
☑*@	Universal and International Exposition of Brussels 1910	23.04 – 07.11.1910	World Exhibition	Works of Art and Science, Agricultural and Industrial Products of All Nations		Ned. Participated. Ned-Indies Not participated (part of display of pavilion Netherlands)	
@	Japan-British Exhibition – London, Great Britain, 1910	14.05 – 29.10.1910				Ned. And colonies not participated [1]	[1] http://www.oldtokyo.com/japan-british-exhibition-london-1910/ , accessed 7des2017
0@	Nanking South Seas Exhibition - Nanking, China, 1910						
*	The Scottish Exhibition of National History, Art, and Industry - GLASGOW, SCOTLAND 1911	03.05 – 04.11.1911	Would be considered a Recognized Expo with Special qualities			Netherlands and Holland participated	
0*	Festival of Empire - London, United Kingdom, 1911						
*+@	<i>Turin International 1911 Turin-Italy</i>	29.04 – ???.11.1911		industry and labour		Netherlands participated	https://ipfs.io/ipfs/QmXoypiziW3WknFijNkLwHCnL72vedxjQkDDP1mXWo6u.co/wiki/Turin_International.html , accessed 27nov2017
☑*@	International Universal Exhibition of Ghent 1913	26.04 – 03.11.1913	World Exhibition	Peace, Industry and Art		Netherlands participated	[1] https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=oTQrDwAAQBAJ&pg=PR5&dq=New+Zealand+International+Exhibition+%E2%80%93+Dunedin,+1865&hl=id&source=gbs_selected_pages&cad=3#v=onepage&q=netherlands&f=false , accessed 7dec2017
+	1914 Koloniale Tentoonstelling in Semarang						
☑*@	Panama-Pacific International Exposition, 1915, San Francisco	20.02 – 04.12.1915	World Exhibition	Celebrating the opening of the Panama Canal		Netherlands and colonies participated (part of display of pavilion Netherlands)	http://sfpl.org/html/libraries/main/sfphotos/ppie/ppiemap.htm
0*@	Panama California Exposition - San Diego, California, USA, 1915 - 1916	01.01 – 31.12.1915 01.01.1916 – 01.01.1917 02.01 – 31.03.1917				Netherlands participated in 1916 season	
*	Marseilles, France 1922						
0*@	Exposição Internacional do Centenário do Brasil – Rio de Janeiro, 1922 – 1923	07.09.1922 – 24.07.1923	Would be considered a Special category Registered event today			Ned and colonies not participated	
0*@	British Empire Exhibition – Wembley, London, 1924 - 1925	23.04 – 01.11.1924 09.05 – 31.10.1925	Would be considered a Special category Registered event today			Ned and colonies not participated	
0*@	New Zealand and South Seas Exhibition – Dunedin, New Zealand, 1925-1926	17.11.1925 – 01.05.1926				Ned and colonies not participated	Only for british empire → http://the-lothians.blogspot.jp/2011/11/memories-of-new-zealand-south-seas.html , accessed 27nov2017
0*@	<i>1925 Exposition Internationale des Arts Decoratifs, Paris</i>	29.04 – 08.11.1925	would be considered a Specialized registered event today			Holland (Netherlands) participated. Ned.-Indies not Participated	
0*@	<i>Sesqui-centennial International Exposition - Philadelphia, 1926</i>	31.05 – 30.11.1926	Would be considered a Special style Registered event today			Holland (unofficial) participated without own pavilion	

0	<i>Pacific Southwest Exposition- Long Beach, California, 1928</i>	27.07 – 03.09.1928				Netherlands participated	Holland and its colonies exhibited bulbs and seeds, traditional wooden shoes, spices, tea, sugar, tobacco, and tin. [1] [1] https://www.kcet.org/shows/lost-la/flappers-and-indians-in-the-dream-city-the-jazz-age-ends-in-long-beach , accessed 27nov2017
*	North East Coast Exhibition -Newcastle, England 1929	14.05 – 26.10.1929					
☑* @	International Exhibition of Barcelona 1929	20.05.1929 - 15.01.1930	World Exhibition	Industry, Art and Sport		Ned and Ned-Indies not participated (Netherlands - unofficial private was participated)	
0*@	Esposición Ibero-Americana – Seville, 1929	09.05 – 21.06.1930	Would be considered a Special (Registered) Expo today			Ned and Ned-Indies not participated	
0*@	Exposition Internationale- Antwerp, Belgium & Liège Belgium, 1930	26.04 – 05.11.1930	Would be considered a Registered Expo			Holland participated in Antwerp. les Pays-Bas participated in Liege	
0* @	Exposition Coloniale Internationale (Colonial World Fair) 1931, Paris	06.05 – 15.11.1931	would be considered a special theme medium scale registered event today	Dutch East Indies / Indies Netherlands Era		Netherlands (Java, Batavia, Buitenzorg, Suriname, Curacao) participated in Own building	was generally inspired by the style of construction indigenous to Java and Bali (Indes Neerlandais1es9 3l a; Indes Neerlandais1es9 3l b). Iwan Sudrajat disertasi
☑*@	A Century of Progress, International Exposition, 1933-34 , Chicago	27.05 - 12.11.1933, 01.06 - 31.10.1934	World Exhibition	The independence among Industry and scientific research.		Not participated	
☑*@	Exposition universelle de Bruxelles 1935	27.04 - 06.11.1935	World Exhibition - (General International Exposition 1st Category)	Transport		Netherlands participated	
0*@	California-Pacific International Exposition - San Diego, California, USA, 1935-1936	29.05 – 11.11.1935	Suggests a registered event of the smaller variety			Ned. And Ned. Indies not participated	
*@	Great Lakes Exposition - CLEVELAND, UNITED STATES 1936-37	27.6 – 12.10.1936 29.05 – 26.09.1937	Suggests a recognized event of Special theme			Dutch participated	
☑@	ILIS International Aerospace Exhibition Stockholm 1936	15.05 - 01.06.1936	Special Exposition	Aviation		Netherlands participated	
0*	Empire Exhibition - Johannesburg, South Africa, 1936-1937	19.09.1936 – 1937		Johannesburg Jubilee year [1]		Ned and Ned.-Indies not participated	[1] https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3557441.pdf , accessed 27nov2017 [2] https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2022/2331/32%281-2%29%203-30.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
*	Texas Centennial Exposition 1936 Greater Texas and Pan American Exposition 1937 - DALLAS, UNITED STATES 1936-37	06.06 – 29.11.1936 12.06 – 31.10.1937	Suggests a recognized event of Special theme			Ned and Ned.-Indies not participated	
☑* @	International Exposition of Arts and Technics in modern life, 1937 Paris	25.05 - 25.11.1937	World Exhibition – (General International Exposition 2nd Category)	Arts and technics in modern life		Netherlands was participated (Ned.- Indies exhibited)	
+	Pan Pacific Peace Exposition 1937 Nagoya		World Exhibition			Own building	
0*@	British Empire Exhibition - Glasgow, United Kingdom, 1938	03.05 – 29.10.1938	Would be considered a Registered Expo with Special qualities			Ned and Ned.-Indies not participated	
☑@	Second International Aerospace Exhibition of the League of Air Defence of Finland - SILLI	14.05 - 22.05.1938	Special Exposition	Aerospace		No data	
@	Deutsche Kolonial Ausstellung – Dresden, Germany, 1939					No data	
☑@	International Exhibition of the Art of Water, 1939 LIEGE - Belgium	20.05 - 02.09.1939	Special Exposition	Art of Water		Netherlands participated	
0	New Zealand Centennial Exhibition – Wellington, 1939-1940	08.11.1939 – 04.05.1940				Ned and Ned.-Indies not participated	https://teara.govt.nz/en/interactive/45443/attendance-at-major-new-

						zealand-exhibitions-1865-1940 , accessed 27nov2017	
☑@	New York World's Fair 1939-1940	0.04 - 31.10.1939 11.05 - 27.10.1940	World Exhibition – (General International Exposition 2nd Category)	Building the World of Tomorrow	Soekarno Government Era	Netherlands participated only in 1939	Iwan Sudrajat disertasi
0@	1939 Golden Gate International Exposition	18.02 – 29.10.1939 25.05 – 29.09.1940	Would be considered a Universal style Registered event today	Pageant of the Pacific		Netherlands participated. And Ned. East Indies participated too in own building	Iwan Sudrajat disertasi
☑@	International Exhibition on Urbanism and Housing, 1947 PARIS - France	10.07 - 15.08.1947	Special Exposition	Urbanism and Housing		Indonesia not participated	
☑*@	Bicentennial International Exhibition of Port-au-Prince, 1949-1950, Haiti	08.12.1949 - 08.06.1950	World Exhibition – (General International Exposition 2nd Category)	The festival of Peace		Indonesia not participated	http://islandluminous.fiu.edu/part09-slide18.html , accessed 27nov2017
☑@	The Universal Exhibition of Sport of Lingiad, 1949 STOCKHOLM – Sweden	27.07 - 13.08.1949	Special Exposition	Sport and physical culture			
☑@	Exhibition of Rural Habitat, Lyon 1949 - France	24.09 - 09.10.1949	Special Exposition	Rural Habitat		No data	
☑@	International Textile Exhibition – Lille 1951 – France	28.04 - 20.05.1951	Special Exposition	Textile			
☑@	The conquest of the Desert – International Exhibition, 1953, JERUSALEM – Israël	22.09 - 14.10.1953	Special Exposition	Conquest of the Desert		Indonesia not participated	https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=JlWmV-mSTBkC&pg=PA43&lpg=PA43&dq=The+conquest+of+the+Desert+%E2%80%93+International+Exhibition,+1953,+JERUSALEM+%E2%80%93+Isra%C3%A9l&source=bl&ots=cvEYvUuett&sig=05tHz6h - JIDbVnmwDAtCG4pqA&hl=id&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwid2e69kd7XAhUFGJQKHS eECE0Q6AEIYjAM#v=onepage&q=The%20conquest%20of%20the%20Desert%20%E2%80%93%20International%20Exhibition%2C%201953%2C%20JERUSALEM%20%E2%80%93%20Isra%C3%A9l&f=false , accessed 27nov2017
☑@	Agricultural Exposition of Rome 1953 – Italy	26.07 - 31.10.1953	Special Exposition	Agriculture			
☑@	International Exhibition of Navigation , 1954 NAPLES – Italy	15.05 - 15.10.1954	Special Exposition	Navigation			
☑@	International Expo of Sport Turin 1955 – Italy	25.05 - 19.06.1955	Special Exposition	Sport		Indonesia not participated	http://www.bie-paris.org/site/en/1955-turin , accessed 27nov2017
☑@	H55 International Exhibition of Applied Arts of Housing and the Interior, 1955 HELSINGBORG - Sweden	10.06 - 28.08.1955	Special Exposition	Modern Man in the Environment		Indonesia not participated	
☑@	Exhibition of Citriculture, 1956 BEIT DAGON - Israël	21.05 - 20.06.1956	Special Exposition	Citrus		Indonesia not participated	
☑@	Interbau - International Building Exhibition, Berlin 1957	06.07 - 29.09.1957	Special Exposition	Reconstruction of Hansa District		Indonesia not participated – for invited architects	
☑*@	Exposition Universelle et Internationale de Bruxelles - Wereldtentoonstelling Brussel 1958	17.04 - 19.10.1958	World Exhibition – (General International Exposition 1st Category)	A World View: A New Humanism		Indonesia not participated	
☑*@	International Labour Exhibition – Turin 1961	01.05 - 31.10.1961	Special Exposition	Celebration of centennial of Italian unity		No data	
☑*@	Century 21 Exposition, Seattle, 1962	21.04 – 21.10.1962	World Exhibition – (General International Exposition 2nd Category)	Man in the Space Age		Indonesia not participated	
*@	New York world fair 1964-1965	22.04 – 18.10.1964 21.04 – 17.10.1965		peace Through Understanding		Indonesia participated with Own Building	Netralitas, bebas aktif, ekspresi kemerdekaan, ideology dan semangat (Jackson, 2004 dalam Indah, 2012). “to build the World anew” (Gelora, 12/V-64)
☑*	IVA - International Transport Exhibition, Munich 1965	25.06 - 03.10.1965	Special Exposition	Transport		Info not found	
☑*@	Universal and International Exhibition Montreal Expo '67	28.04 – 27.10.1967	World Exhibition – (General International Exposition 1st Category)	Man and his World		Soeharto Government Era	Not participated
☑*@	Hemisfair 1968, SAN ANTONIO – USA	06.04 - 06.10.1968	Special Exposition	The confluence of civilizations in the Americas	Not participated		
☑*@	Japan World Exposition Osaka 1970	15.03 – 13.09.1970	World Exhibition – (General International Exposition 1st Category)	Progress and Harmony for Mankind	Own Building	Unity in Diversity (bhinneka Tunggal Ika)	

							Shaped as a Cut pyramid, with a roof top resembling the stupas of Borobudur (Indonesia Handbook 1970) (construction cost \$ 700.000)
☑@	Exhibition World of Hunting, Budapest 1971 – Hungary	27.08 - 30.09.1971	Special Exposition	The Hunt through the World		Not participated	http://gyulaihunthungary.com/hunting_world_exhibition , accessed 25nov2017
☑*@	International Exposition on the Environment, Spokane 1974 – USA	04.05 - 02.11.1974	Special Exposition	Celebrating Tomorrow's Fresh New Environment		Not participated	
☑@	International Ocean Exposition, Okinawa 1975 – Japan	20.07.1975 - 18.01.1976	Special Exposition	The Sea We would like to See		Indonesia not participated [1]	[1] http://www.meio-u.ac.jp/library-contents/wakukawa-image/Wakukawa0211.jpg , accessed 29des2017
*	The Kobe Port Island Exposition - Kobe, Japan 1981	20.03 – 15.09.1981	Without the sanction of BIE	Creation of a new Cultural City on the Sea		Indonesia not participated (just had performance on Indonesian day-17-18august)	http://his.vis.ne.jp/portopia81/pavilions/pavilion.html , accessed 25nov2017
☑@	Hunting World Exposition, Plovdiv 1981 – Bulgaria	14.06 - 12.07.1981	International Specialised Expo	Hunting		No data	
☑*@	The Knoxville International Energy Exposition – Energy Expo 82 – USA	01.05 - 31.10.1982	International Specialised Expo	Energy turns the World		Not participated	
☑* @	The 1984 Louisiana World Exposition - USA	12.05 - 11.11.1984	International Specialised Expo	The World of rivers – Fresh Water as a source of life		Not participated	
☑*+@	International Exhibition, Tsukuba Japan 1985	17.03 - 16.09.1985	International Specialized Expo	Dwellings and Surroundings - Science and Technology for Man at Home		Shared Expo Module with Srilanka	
☑@	World Achievements Exhibition of Young Inventors - 1985 PLOVDIV – Bulgaria	04.11 - 30.11.1985	International Specialized Expo	Inventions		No data	
☑*@	The 1986 World Exposition on Transportation - Vancouver	02.05. – 13.10.1986	International Specialized Expo	Transportation and Communication: World in Motion - World in Touch		Used One Expo Module.	A nation of thirteen Thousand Islands
☑*@	International Exhibition on Leisure, Brisbane 1988	30.04 - 30.10.1988	International Specialized Expo	Leisure in the Age of Technology		Used One Expo Module	Uniqueness of Nation Culture / Keunikan budaya bangsa the Indonesian Pavilion featured an impressive façade recreation of a Sulawesi 'Toraja' house, with batik and crafts displays on the inside of the Pavilion (sumber: http://www.celebrate88.com/aboutzoes.html)
☑@	Expo Plovdiv 1991 – Bulgaria	07.06 - 07.07.1991	International Specialized Expo	The activity of young people in the service of a World of Peace		No data	
☑*@	Specialised International Exposition Genoa 1992 - Italy	15.05 - 15.08.1992	International Specialized Expo	Christopher Columbus: The Ship and the Sea		Not participated	
☑*@	Exposicion universal de Sevilla, 1992	20.04 - 12.10.1992	World Exhibition	The Age of Discovery		Shared Building with Philippines	Limited data
☑*@	The Taejon International Exposition, Korea 1993	07.08 – 07.11. 1993	International Specialized Expo	"The Challenge of a New Road of Development		Inside International Hall	
☑*@	Lisboa Expo'98 – 1998 Lisbon World Exposition	22.05 – 30.09.1998	International Specialized Expo	The Oceans: a heritage for the Future	Habibie Governme nt Era	Not invited	
☑*@	Expo 2000 Hannover	01.06 – 31.10.2000	World Exhibition	Man - Nature - Technology	Megawati Governme nt Era	Inside International Hall (Hall 26)	Earth rhythms from the world's largest group of islands
☑*@	EXPO 2005, Aichi, Japan	25.03 - 25.09.2005	International Specialized Expo	"Nature's Wisdom"	SBY Governme nt Era	Used One Expo Module	'kembali kepada kehidupan yang harmonis antara manusia dengan alam sekelilingnya'
☑*@	International Recognized Exhibition Expo 2008 Zaragoza	14.06 - 14.09.2008	International Recognized exhibition	Water and sustainable development		Inside International Hall (Hall P8)	A magical journey through times
☑*@	Expo Shanghai 2010	01.05 - 31.10.2010	International Registered exhibition	Better City, Better Life		Own Building	Indonesia is a biodiverse city
☑*	Expo Yeosu 2012	12.05 - 12.08.2012	International Recognized exhibition	The living ocean and coast		Inside International Hall	Indonesia Waterland – Passage to The Greatest Discovery The Rainforest of the Sea

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *	International Registered Exhibition Expo 2015 Milan	01.05 - 31.10.2015	International Registered exhibition	Feeding the Planet, Energy for Life	Joko Widodo Government Era	Own Building	Bubu and lumbung
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *	2017 Astana	10.06 - 10.09.2017	International Recognized exhibition	Future Energy			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	World Expo 2020	20.10.2020 - 10.04.2021	International Registered exhibition	Connecting Minds, Creating the Future			

Source: (☑) = <http://www.bie-paris.org/site/en/expo-timeline> , accessed 16 November 2016 for update

(0) = <http://www.expomuseum.com/> , accessed 16-17 nov17

(*) = <http://jdpecon.com/expo/expolist.html> accessed 18-20 nov 17

<http://web.archive.org/web/20120822150600/http://www.lib.umd.edu/artarch/exhibition/>, accessed 17Nov17

@ = anna Jackson, 2008,

ATTACHMENT TWO

The List of Events on Indonesian Architecture										
No	Time	Event Type	Name of Event	Theme/Topic	Organizer	Place	Figure	who take rule	used terminology	
1	1920s		kongres, majalah, kuliah (Congress, Magazines, Lecturers)	<i>pendekatan arsitektural Barat versus atau bersama dengan konsep arsitektur vernakular lokal. Masa depan adalah penggabungan keduanya, yaitu arsitektur "Indo-Eropa" (Western architectural approach versus or with local vernacular architectural concept. the future is combination of both, that is "Indo-Europe" architecture) (Cor Passchier at tegang bentang, p.36 & 38)</i>			Charles Prosper Wolff Schoemaker vs Maclaine Pont (each articles on Indisch Bouwkundig Tijdschrift, 1923)			
	1922	Congres	Kongres Perumahan Umum (Volkshuisvestingscongres/ Public Housing Congress)					Karsten vs Charles Prosper Wolff Schoemaker	Government	indo-eropa architecture / Indonesian Architecture
2	1931	1931 Paris World Colonial Exposition					ZW.J.G. Zweedjick and P.A.J. Moojen			
	1937	1937 Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace International Exposition					Robert Deppe			
	1939	1939 Golden Gate International Exposition					Robert Deppe			
3	1941	Lecture	Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar (Inauguration Speech) Profesor Lemei		Institut Teknologi Bandung (ITB) - Bandung Institute of technology	ITB, Bandung				
	1951	15 Des	Lecture	Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar (Inauguration Speech) Profesor Ir. Dicke	ITB	ITB, Bandung				
3	1954	Lecture	Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar (Inauguration Speech) Profesor V.R. van Romondt	"Menuju Sebuah Arsitektur Indonesia" (Towards an Indonesian Architecture)	ITB	ITB, Bandung	Profesor V.R. van Romondt	Academician	Indonesian Architecture	
	1959	17-Sep	IAI Berdiri (Establishment of Indonesian Institute of Architects)	"Menuju Profesi Arsitektur Indonesia yang Sehat" (Towards a Healthy Indonesia Architectural Profession)		Bandung	Three senior architects (Ars. Moh. Soesilo, Ars. Silaban, and Ars. Liem Bwan Tjie) together with 17 first generation of architecture scholars led by Ir. Soehartono Susilo (son of Ars. Moh. Susilo) agreed to establish Indonesian Institute of Architects (IAI)			
4	1964	1964 New York World's Fair					Soedarsono			
5	1970	1980 Osaka World Exposition					Robi Sularto Sastrowardoyo			
6	1981	4 - 5 des	Symposium	Simposium IAI (Symposium of Indonesian Institute of Architects)	Arsitektur Tradisional (Traditional Architecture)	IAI	Jakarta	Eko Budiharjo (Menuju Arsitektur Indonesia), Bondan Hermanislamet (Menuju Arsitektur Indonesia: Suatu Kerangka Penelitian); Zaenudin Kartadiwiria (Gejala-gejala transisional: faktor penentu dalam menuju arsitektur indonesia); Harjo Sabrang (Upaya Menuju Terciptanya Arsitektur Indonesia); Robi Sularto Sastrowardoyo (Peranan Arsitektur Tradisional),	Profesional Intitution	
	1982	2- 4 des	Congres	Kongres Nasional II IAI (2nd National Congress of Indonesian Institute of Architects)	"Mencari Arsitektur Indonesia" (The Search for Indonesian Architecture)	IAI	Yogyakarta	Architect: F. Silaban, Y.B. Mangunwijaya, Yuswadi Saliya, Darmawan Prawirohardjo, Robi Sularto Sastrowardoyo non architect: Darmanto Jt. (psikolog-penyair); Kyai Habib Chirzin (santri muda dari Pabelan); Damardjati (filsuf); dokter Baswedan (dokter), Dr. Seno (ahli energi matahari); Guno (pelawak dari proyek Javanologi)	Profesional Intitution	Indonesian Architecture
	1983		Book	Book	Menuju Arsitektur Indonesia (Towards Indonesian Architecture)	Eko Budiharjo	Bandung: Alumni			
	1984	10-Sep	Symposium		Peranan Identitas Budaya dalam Arsitektur (The Function of Cultural Identity in Architecture)	IAI-DKJ-DITTABA	Jakarta			
	1984	September	Seminar	Seminar	Jatidiri arsitektur nasional (Identity of National Architecture)	IAI			Profesional Intitution	National Architecture / Indonesian Architecture
	1985	14-16 Mar	Congres	Kongres Nasional III IAI (3rd National Congress of Indonesian Institute of Architects)		IAI	Jakarta			
	1988		Book	Book	Pasang Surut Arsitektur di Indonesia (Flux and Reflux of Architecture in Indonesia)	Josef Prijotomo	Surabaya: cv. Ardjun			
1989		Book	Book	Jati Diri Arsitektur Indonesia (Identity of National Architecture)	Eko Budiharjo	Bandung: Alumni		Academician		
7	1995	3-Jun	Symposium	Simposium Arsitektur Indonesia (Indonesian Architecture Symposium)	Sebuah Tinjauan (an Overview)	IMARTA	Universitas Tarumanegara, Jakarta,		Academician	Indonesian Architecture
	1995	9-Sep	Seminar	Seminar Arsitektur Nusantara (National Architecture Seminar)	Keajegan dan Perubahan (Constancy and change)	Arsitektur Insititute Technology Surabaya (ITS) - ITS, Surabaya			Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)
8	2002		Seminar	Seminar Nasional (National Seminar)	"Kematian Arsitektur Tradisional" (Death of Traditional Architecture)	Univ. Atma Jaya Yogyakarta	Yogyakarta		Academician	Traditional Architecture
	2008	12-13 september	Seminar	Seminar Jelajah Arsitektur Nusantara 1 080808 (080808 1st Seminar of Nusantara Architecture Exploration)	"Ke-Bhinekaan Bentuk Dalam Arsitektur Nusantara" (the diversity of Form in Nusantara Architecture)	Jurusan Arsitektur FTSP ITS	Surabaya, East Java	Keynote Speaker : Dr. Ir.Galih Widjil Pangarsa, DEA	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)
	2009	9-Oct	Seminar	Seminar Jelajah Arsitektur Nusantara 2 090909 (090909 2nd Seminar of Nusantara Architecture Exploration)	"Ke-Bhinekaan Ruang Dalam Arsitektur Nusantara" (the diversity of Space in Nusantara Architecture)	Jurusan Arsitektur FTSP ITS	Surabaya, East Java	Keynote Speaker : Ryadi Adityavarma – Proffesor, Savannah College of Art & Design, GA, USA	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)
	2010	2010 Shanghai World Exposition						Budi Lim		
	2010	21-Jun	Seminar	Seminar Nasional Arsitektur Nusantara (National Seminar of Nusantara Architecture)		Prodi Arsitektur Universitas Khairun	Halmahera Room, Bela international Hotel, Ternate	Keynote Speaker: Prof. Josep Prijotomo, Prof. Sangkertadi	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)
	2011	27-Apr	Discussion	Discussion	Arsitektur Sebagai Pembentuk Karakter Bangsa (Architecture as the builder of Nation Character)	Urbanus	jakarta	Discussant: Prof. Josef Prijotomo (architect), Taufik Rahzen (humanist)	Profesional Intitution	
	2011	11-Nov	Symposium	Simposium 111111 (symposium 111111)	"Matinya Arsitektur Tradisional" (The Death of Traditional Architecture)	Universitas Tarumanegara (UNTAR)	UNTAR, Jakarta	22 Architects & Academicians	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)

2011	18-19 okto	Seminar & Workshop	Seminar dan Lokakarya Nasional Arsitektur 2011 (2011 National Seminar and Workshop)	"(Re-)Kontekstualisasi Arsitektur Nusantara" ([re-]contextualization of Nusantara Architecture)	Balai Pengembangan Teknologi Perumahan Tradisional (PTPT) Denpasar Puslitbang Permukiman Badan Litbang Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum (PU) dengan Dinas PU Provinsi Bali serta IAI Provinsi Bali	Wisma Werdapura, Sanur Denpasar Bali.	Speakers: 1. Direktur Penataan Bangunan dan Lingkungan (Ditjen Cipta Karya) 2. I Made Mangku Pastika (Gubernur Provinsi Bali) 3. Ir. I Dewa Putu Punia Asa (Kepala Dinas PU Provinsi Bali) 4. I Ketut Rana Wircha (Ketua IAI Provinsi Bali) 5. Prof. Dr. Ir. Josef Prijotomo, M.Arch (Staf Pengajar Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember) 6. Ir. I Gusti Made Putra, M.Si (Staf Pengajar Universitas Udayana) 7. Yori Antar (Arsitektur Muda Indonesia) 8. Dr. Ir. Galih Widjil Pangarsa, DEA (Staf Pengajar Universitas Brawijaya) 9. DAS Albantani (Pendiri Komunitas Banten Creative Community) 10. Dr. Army Susandi, MT (Dewan Nasional Perubahan Iklim)	collaboration between government and professional institution	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2012	12-Dec	Seminar	Seminar Nasional 12.12.12 : Semesta Arsitektur Nusantara 1 (National Seminar 12.12.12: 1st Nusantara Architecture)	Ruang Bersama "Nusantara" untuk Kehidupan yang lebih baik ("Nusantara" Gathering Space for Better Living)	Universitas Brawijaya (UB)	Malang, Jatim	keynote speaker: Prof. Dr.Ir. Josef Prijotomo, M.Arch (ITS); Sigit Kusumawijaya (Arsitek-Urbanis); Gede Kresna (Gede Kresna Architect Bali); Ir. Jenny Ernawati, MSP,Ph.D (Universitas Brawijaya)	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2013		Competition	Propan Sayembara Desain Arsitektur Nusantara (Propan Nusantara Architecture Design Competition)	"Desain Rumah Budaya Nusantara" (Nusantara Cultural House Design)				collaboration between private and professional institution	Indonesian Architecture	
2013	6-Sep	seminar	Seminar Nasional (National Seminar)	"Arsitektur Nusantara – Apa, Mengapa dan Milik Siapa?" (Nusantara Architecture - What, Why and Belong to Whom?)	Univeristas Parahyangan (UNPAR), Jur Arsitektur	Bandung, West Java	Prof. Dr. Ir. Josef Prijotomo M.Arch (Akademisi ITS Surabaya dan Peneliti Arsitektur Nusantara), Dharmali Kusumadi (Senior Vice President Banyan Tree Hotels & Resort, Principal Architect ARCHITRAVE DESIGN & SERVICE), Yuwono Imanto (Direktur PT. Propan Raya)	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2013	11 october	seminar	Seminar Arsitektur Nusantara (Nusantara Architecture Seminar) with Propan	"Desain Arsitektur yang Mampu Mengkinikan Arsitektur Nusantara" (Architecture Design that able to updating Nusantara Architecture)	Propan dan Binus	kampus anggrek BINUS UNIVERSITY, Jakarta	Yori Antar	collaboration between private and professional institution	Indonesian Architecture	
2013	27 nov	seminar	Seminar Nasional Jelajah Arsitektur Tradisional Ke-5 (5th National Seminar on Traditional Architecture Exploration)	"Teknologi di Arsitektur Nusantara dan Upaya Keberlanjutannya" (Technology in Nusantara Architecture and its sustainability efforts)	Balitbang PU	Grand Aston City Hall Medan,	Keynote Speech: Ir. Guratno Hartono, MBC (Direktur PBL, Direktorat Cipta Karya, Kementerian PU) Prof. Ir. Nawawi Lubis, M.Phil, Ph.D (Universitas Sumatera Utara) Prof. DR. Ir. Josef Prijotomo, M.Arch (Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember) Prof. (R) DR. Ir. Anita Firmanti, MT (Puslitbang Permukiman, Badan Litbang, Kementerian PU)	Government	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2013	11-12 Des	Seminar	SEMESTA ARSITEKTUR NUSANTARA (SAN) 2 (Nusantara Architecture)	"Arsitektur Nusantara Berkelanjutan" (Sustainability of Nusantara Architecture)	Jurusan arsitektur Universitas Brawijaya (UB)	UB, Malang, East Java	Keynote speaker : Paulus Mintarga (Arsitek Profesional) Prof. Ramlil Rahim (Univ. Hasanuddin) DR. Surjamanto Wonorahardjo* (Institut Teknologi Bandung) Prof. Tri Harso Karyono (Tanri Abeng University) Prof. Prasasto Satwiko (Univ. Atma Jaya) DR. Ing. Eugenius Pradipto (Univ. Gadjah Mada)	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2014	22-May	Seminar	seminar nasional (National Seminar)	"Quo Vadis Arsitektur Nusantara" (Quo Vadis of Nusantara Architecture)	UAJY	Gedung Thomas Aquinas, Kampus II UAJY, Yogyakarta	Prof. Ir. Totok Roesmanto, M.Eng., dan Ir. Yori Antar	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2014	23-May	Seminar	seri seminar nasional (National Seminar Series)	"Arsitektur Merah Putih" (Red-White Architecture)	IAI-UKDW	UKDW, Yogyakarta		collaboration between academician and professional institution	Red-White Architecture	
2014		Competition	Propan Sayembara Desain Arsitektur Nusantara 2 (2nd Propan Nusantara Architecture Design Competition)	Desa Wisata Nusantara (Nusantara Tourism Village)				private company	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2014	8-Aug	Book	Compilation of Propan Nusantara Architecture Design Competition Result	Eksplorasi Desain Arsitektur Nusantara (Exploration of Nusantara Architecture Design)	PT Propan Raya	jakarta		private company	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2015			2015 Milan World Exposition					Miranti Gumayana, Rubi Roesli, and Dani Hermawan		

ATTACHMENT TWO

The List of Events on Indonesian Architecture										
No	Time	Event Type	Name of Event	Theme/Topic	Organizer	Place	Figure	who take rule	used terminology	
1	1920s		kongres, majalah, kuliah (Congress, Magazines, Lecturers)	pendekatan arsitektural Barat versus atau bersama dengan konsep arsitektur vernakular lokal. Masa depan adalah penggabungan keduanya, yaitu arsitektur "Indo-Eropa" (Western architectural approach versus or with local vernacular architectural concept. the future is combination of both, that is "Indo-Europe" architecture) (Cor Passchier at tegang bentang, p.36 & 38)			Charles Prosper Wolff Schoemaker vs Maclaine Pont (each articles on Indisch Bouwkundig Tijdschrift, 1923)			
	1922	Congres	Kongres Perumahan Umum (Volkshuisvestingscongres/ Public Housing Congress)					Karsten vs Charles Prosper Wolff Schoemaker	Government	indo-eropa architecture / Indonesian Architecture
2	1931	1931 Paris World Colonial Exposition					ZW.J.G. Zweedjick and P.A.J. Moojen			
	1937	1937 Nagoya Pan-Pacific Peace International Exposition					Robert Deppe			
	1939	1939 Golden Gate International Exposition					Robert Deppe			
3	1941	Lecture	Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar (Inauguration Speech) Profesor Lemei		Institut Teknologi Bandung (ITB) - Bandung Institute of technology	ITB, Bandung				
	1951	15 Des	Lecture	Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar (Inauguration Speech) Profesor Ir. Dicke	ITB	ITB, Bandung				
3	1954	Lecture	Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar (Inauguration Speech) Profesor V.R. van Romondt	"Menuju Sebuah Arsitektur Indonesia" (Towards an Indonesian Architecture)	ITB	ITB, Bandung	Profesor V.R. van Romondt	Academician	Indonesian Architecture	
	1959	17-Sep	IAI Berdiri (Establishment of Indonesian Institute of Architects)	"Menuju Profesi Arsitektur Indonesia yang Sehat" (Towards a Healthy Indonesia Architectural Profession)		Bandung	Three senior architects (Ars. Moh. Soesilo, Ars. Silaban, and Ars. Liem Bwan Tjie) together with 17 first generation of architecture scholars led by Ir. Soehartono Susilo (son of Ars. Moh. Susilo) agreed to establish Indonesian Institute of Architects (IAI)			
4	1964	1964 New York World's Fair					Soedarsono			
5	1970	1980 Osaka World Exposition					Robi Sularto Sastrowardoyo			
6	1981	4 - 5 des	Symposium	Simposium IAI (Symposium of Indonesian Institute of Architects)	Arsitektur Tradisional (Traditional Architecture)	IAI	Jakarta	Eko Budiharjo (Menuju Arsitektur Indonesia), Bondan Hermanislamet (Menuju Arsitektur Indonesia: Suatu Kerangka Penelitian); Zaenudin Kartadiwiria (Gejala-gejala transisional: faktor penentu dalam menuju arsitektur indonesia); Harjo Sabrang (Upaya Menuju Terciptanya Arsitektur Indonesia); Robi Sularto Sastrowardoyo (Peranan Arsitektur Tradisional),	Profesional Intitution	
	1982	2- 4 des	Congres	Kongres Nasional II IAI (2nd National Congress of Indonesian Institute of Architects)	"Mencari Arsitektur Indonesia" (The Search for Indonesian Architecture)	IAI	Yogyakarta	Architect: F. Silaban, Y.B. Mangunwijaya, Yuswadi Saliya, Darmawan Prawirohardjo, Robi Sularto Sastrowardoyo non architect: Darmanto Jt. (psikolog-penyair); Kyai Habib Chirzin (santri muda dari Pabelan); Damardjati (filsuf); dokter Baswedan (dokter), Dr. Seno (ahli energi matahari); Guno (pelawak dari proyek Javanologi)	Profesional Intitution	Indonesian Architecture
	1983		Book	Book	Menuju Arsitektur Indonesia (Towards Indonesian Architecture)	Eko Budiharjo	Bandung: Alumni			
	1984	10-Sep	Symposium		Peranan Identitas Budaya dalam Arsitektur (The Function of Cultural Identity in Architecture)	IAI-DKJ-DITTABA	Jakarta			
	1984	September	Seminar	Seminar	Jatidiri arsitektur nasional (Identity of National Architecture)	IAI			Profesional Intitution	National Architecture / Indonesian Architecture
	1985	14-16 Mar	Congres	Kongres Nasional III IAI (3rd National Congress of Indonesian Institute of Architects)		IAI	Jakarta			
	1988		Book	Book	Pasang Surut Arsitektur di Indonesia (Flux and Reflux of Architecture in Indonesia)	Josef Prijotomo	Surabaya: cv. Ardjun			
1989		Book	Book	Jati Diri Arsitektur Indonesia (Identity of National Architecture)	Eko Budiharjo	Bandung: Alumni		Academician		
7	1995	3-Jun	Symposium	Simposium Arsitektur Indonesia (Indonesian Architecture Symposium)	Sebuah Tinjauan (an Overview)	IMARTA	Universitas Tarumanegara, Jakarta,		Academician	Indonesian Architecture
	1995	9-Sep	Seminar	Seminar Arsitektur Nusantara (National Architecture Seminar)	Keajegan dan Perubahan (Constancy and change)	Arsitektur Insititute Technology Surabaya (ITS) - ITS, Surabaya			Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)
8	2002		Seminar	Seminar Nasional (National Seminar)	"Kematian Arsitektur Tradisional" (Death of Traditional Architecture)	Univ. Atma Jaya Yogyakarta	Yogyakarta		Academician	Traditional Architecture
	2008	12-13 september	Seminar	Seminar Jelajah Arsitektur Nusantara 1 080808 (080808 1st Seminar of Nusantara Architecture Exploration)	"Ke-Bhinekaan Bentuk Dalam Arsitektur Nusantara" (the diversity of Form in Nusantara Architecture)	Jurusan Arsitektur FTSP ITS	Surabaya, East Java	Keynote Speaker : Dr. Ir.Galih Widjil Pangarsa, DEA	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)
	2009	9-Oct	Seminar	Seminar Jelajah Arsitektur Nusantara 2 090909 (090909 2nd Seminar of Nusantara Architecture Exploration)	"Ke-Bhinekaan Ruang Dalam Arsitektur Nusantara" (the diversity of Space in Nusantara Architecture)	Jurusan Arsitektur FTSP ITS	Surabaya, East Java	Keynote Speaker : Ryadi Adityavarma – Proffesor, Savannah College of Art & Design, GA, USA	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)
	2010	2010 Shanghai World Exposition					Budi Lim			
	2010	21-Jun	Seminar	Seminar Nasional Arsitektur Nusantara (National Seminar of Nusantara Architecture)		Prodi Arsitektur Universitas Khairun	Halmahera Room, Bela international Hotel, Ternate	Keynote Speaker: Prof. Josep Prijotomo, Prof. Sangkertadi	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)
	2011	27-Apr	Discussion	Discussion	Arsitektur Sebagai Pembentuk Karakter Bangsa (Architecture as the builder of Nation Character)	Urbanus	jakarta	Discussant: Prof. Josef Prijotomo (architect), Taufik Rahzen (humanist)	Profesional Intitution	
	2011	11-Nov	Symposium	Simposium 111111 (symposium 111111)	"Matinya Arsitektur Tradisional" (The Death of Traditional Architecture)	Universitas Tarumanegara (UNTAR)	UNTAR, Jakarta	22 Architects & Academicians	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)

2011	18-19 okto	Seminar & Workshop	Seminar dan Lokakarya Nasional Arsitektur 2011 (2011 National Seminar and Workshop)	"(Re-)Kontekstualisasi Arsitektur Nusantara" ([re-]contextualization of Nusantara Architecture)	Balai Pengembangan Teknologi Perumahan Tradisional (PTPT) Denpasar Puslitbang Permukiman Badan Litbang Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum (PU) dengan Dinas PU Provinsi Bali serta IAI Provinsi Bali	Wisma Werdapura, Sanur Denpasar Bali.	Speakers: 1. Direktur Penataan Bangunan dan Lingkungan (Ditjen Cipta Karya) 2. I Made Mangku Pastika (Gubernur Provinsi Bali) 3. Ir. I Dewa Putu Punia Asa (Kepala Dinas PU Provinsi Bali) 4. I Ketut Rana Wircha (Ketua IAI Provinsi Bali) 5. Prof. Dr. Ir. Josef Prijotomo, M.Arch (Staf Pengajar Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember) 6. Ir. I Gusti Made Putra, M.Si (Staf Pengajar Universitas Udayana) 7. Yori Antar (Arsitektur Muda Indonesia) 8. Dr. Ir. Galih Widjil Pangarsa, DEA (Staf Pengajar Universitas Brawijaya) 9. DAS Albantani (Pendiri Komunitas Banten Creative Community) 10. Dr. Army Susandi, MT (Dewan Nasional Perubahan Iklim)	collaboration between government and professional institution	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2012	12-Dec	Seminar	Seminar Nasional 12.12.12 : Semesta Arsitektur Nusantara 1 (National Seminar 12.12.12: 1st Nusantara Architecture)	Ruang Bersama "Nusantara" untuk Kehidupan yang lebih baik ("Nusantara" Gathering Space for Better Living)	Universitas Brawijaya (UB)	Malang, Jatim	keynote speaker: Prof. Dr.Ir. Josef Prijotomo, M.Arch (ITS); Sigit Kusumawijaya (Arsitek-Urbanis); Gede Kresna (Gede Kresna Architect Bali); Ir. Jenny Ernawati, MSP,Ph.D (Universitas Brawijaya)	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2013		Competition	Propan Sayembara Desain Arsitektur Nusantara (Propan Nusantara Architecture Design Competition)	"Desain Rumah Budaya Nusantara" (Nusantara Cultural House Design)				collaboration between private and professional institution	Indonesian Architecture	
2013	6-Sep	seminar	Seminar Nasional (National Seminar)	"Arsitektur Nusantara – Apa, Mengapa dan Milik Siapa?" (Nusantara Architecture - What, Why and Belong to Whom?)	Univeristas Parahyangan (UNPAR), Jur Arsitektur	Bandung, West Java	Prof. Dr. Ir. Josef Prijotomo M.Arch (Akademisi ITS Surabaya dan Peneliti Arsitektur Nusantara), Dharmali Kusumadi (Senior Vice President Banyan Tree Hotels & Resort, Principal Architect ARCHITRAVE DESIGN & SERVICE), Yuwono Imanto (Direktur PT. Propan Raya)	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2013	11 october	seminar	Seminar Arsitektur Nusantara (Nusantara Architecture Seminar) with Propan	"Desain Arsitektur yang Mampu Mengkinikan Arsitektur Nusantara" (Architecture Design that able to updating Nusantara Architecture)	Propan dan Binus	kampus anggrek BINUS UNIVERSITY, Jakarta	Yori Antar	collaboration between private and professional institution	Indonesian Architecture	
2013	27 nov	seminar	Seminar Nasional Jelajah Arsitektur Tradisional Ke-5 (5th National Seminar on Traditional Architecture Exploration)	"Teknologi di Arsitektur Nusantara dan Upaya Keberlanjutannya" (Technology in Nusantara Architecture and its sustainability efforts)	Balitbang PU	Grand Aston City Hall Medan,	Keynote Speech: Ir. Guratno Hartono, MBC (Direktur PBL, Direktorat Cipta Karya, Kementerian PU) Prof. Ir. Nawawi Lubis, M.Phil, Ph.D (Universitas Sumatera Utara) Prof. DR. Ir. Josef Prijotomo, M.Arch (Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember) Prof. (R) DR. Ir. Anita Firmanti, MT (Puslitbang Permukiman, Badan Litbang, Kementerian PU)	Government	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2013	11-12 Des	Seminar	SEMESTA ARSITEKTUR NUSANTARA (SAN) 2 (Nusantara Architecture)	"Arsitektur Nusantara Berkelanjutan" (Sustainability of Nusantara Architecture)	Jurusan arsitektur Universitas Brawijaya (UB)	UB, Malang, East Java	Keynote speaker : Paulus Mintarga (Arsitek Profesional) Prof. Ramlil Rahim (Univ. Hasanuddin) DR. Surjamanto Wonorahardjo* (Institut Teknologi Bandung) Prof. Tri Harso Karyono (Tanri Abeng University) Prof. Prasasto Satwiko (Univ. Atma Jaya) DR. Ing. Eugenius Pradipto (Univ. Gadjah Mada)	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2014	22-May	Seminar	seminar nasional (National Seminar)	"Quo Vadis Arsitektur Nusantara" (Quo Vadis of Nusantara Architecture)	UAJY	Gedung Thomas Aquinas, Kampus II UAJY, Yogyakarta	Prof. Ir. Totok Roesmanto, M.Eng., dan Ir. Yori Antar	Academician	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2014	23-May	Seminar	seri seminar nasional (National Seminar Series)	"Arsitektur Merah Putih" (Red-White Architecture)	IAI-UKDW	UKDW, Yogyakarta		collaboration between academician and professional institution	Red-White Architecture	
2014		Competition	Propan Sayembara Desain Arsitektur Nusantara 2 (2nd Propan Nusantara Architecture Design Competition)	Desa Wisata Nusantara (Nusantara Tourism Village)				private company	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2014	8-Aug	Book	Compilation of Propan Nusantara Architecture Design Competition Result	Eksplorasi Desain Arsitektur Nusantara (Exploration of Nusantara Architecture Design)	PT Propan Raya	jakarta		private company	Nusantara Architecture (Traditional Architecture)	
2015			2015 Milan World Exposition					Miranti Gumayana, Rubi Roesli, and Dani Hermawan		

ATTACHMENT THREE

TIME LINE

International		Indonesian Background		Indonesian Pavilion at World Expo	Year	Activities on 'Indonesian Architecture'	Landmark Project	
Background	Architecture World							
1901- "Ethical Policy". Minister of the Colonies, A.W.F. Idenburg, declared in 1901 the new mission of Dutch Colonialism (Kusno, 'Post-colonial p.28)	Art Nouveau (1880-1910); Beaux-Arts (1885-1920);	Implementation of "Ethical Policy" by Dutch colonial. Since 1910	L'Exposition de Paris 1900	1900s			
	Art Deco (1910-1940); Russian Constructivism (1917-1930); Dutch Neoplasticism 1918-1924 [7]			1910s			
				1920s	1920s: Discussion on 'Western Architectural Approach versus or with Indigenous Architecture'			
					kongres, majalah, kuliah (Congress, Magazines, Lecturers)		Aula ITB /Maclaine Pont, 1919	
		the economic crisis and the threat of a new war. Colonialism reached its end	Colonial World Fair 1931, Paris	1930s	20s and 30s, elaborated elements of Indonesian traditional architecture with new technology and European Modern architecture principles		Pasar Gambir Annual Fair Pavilions, 1921-1939	
			Pan Pacific Peace Exposition 1937 Nagoya					
			1939 Golden Gate International Exposition					Pos Sarang Church/Maclaine Pont, 1936
World War II till 1945		Indonesia Independence Day - 17 August 1945		1940s				
Dutch military aggression 1945-1950								
	Modernism (The Bauhaus/Germany & USA 1925-1954; Rationalism, Purism and Brutalism" France 1923-1965; Monumentality and Rationalism 1923-1980) [7]	New Indonesian Government (Orde Lama Era) - 1945-1966		1950s	Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar(Inauguration Speech) Profesor Ir. Dicke (1951) and Profesor V.R. van Romondt (1954)			
					16 Sep 1959 - IAI Berdiri (Establishment of Indonesian Institute of Architects)			
		Nasionalization Program, started on 1957. Government took over Dutch's companies and assets. Dutch retaliated by pulling the whole experts from Indonesia, including educators and professional architects [1]	1964-1965 New York World Fair	1960s	Build strong national identity through architecture (by used of modern architecture) led by President Sukarno		National Monument, GBK Stadium/1962, Istiqlal Mosque, CONEFO Complex, Hotel Indonesia	
		1964-1966 political crisis [2]						
		1968 - Orde Baru (New Order) Era					end 1960s: Preparation for Expo 1970	
		government power is very strong (in economic, political, military, social and culture), and set all things			implementation of traditional architecture's roof model on the design of public building was requested by government & also on other conventional modern buildings [1]		Soekarno Hatta International Airport in Cengkareng by Paul Andreau (also the architect of Aeroport du Paris)- 1977. commissioning for phase 1: 1985	
World Oil Crisis 1973 and World Energy Crisis 1979 [8]		the period of rapid economic development following the increase in oil prices. Money was distributed to the development and improvement of state infrastructure	Expo 70 Osaka	1970s	prosperity is reflected in the bourgeois style: the proliferation of villas which seemed to classic style with Greek or Roman pillars, and futuristic capsule houses [1]		mid 70s - Taman Mini Indonesia Indah opened (collecting 1:1 traditional architecture building from all 26 provinces)	
		since 1970s, the involvement of private enterprises in development projects was increased [1]						
	critical regionalism 1981 [7]	economic growth	World Expo 85, Tsukuba	1980s				
			Expo 86, Vancouver			1982 - Kongres Nasional II IAI (2nd National Congress of Indonesian Institute of Architects) : "Mencari Arsitektur Indonesia" (The Search for Indonesian Architecture)		
		during the decade of the 80s, the construction of the city began to spread beyond the city center. the construction of skyscrapers and other large projects resulted in the eviction of the village and the destruction of historic buildings [1]	World Expo 88, Brisbane			September 1984 - Seminar by IAI : Jatidiri arsitektur nasional (Identity of National Architecture)		1986 _ Aga Khan Award for Said Naum Mosque/ Atelier Enam Architects and Planners / Adhi Moersid
Oil booming Era, 1980-1990s	Postmodern Architecture (brought optimism on the vitalization of modern regional architecture in Indonesia, but in fact classic style which was revived)	in end of 80s and mid of 90s, foreign investment was rise rapidly. Encourage the flow of foreign architects to Indonesia and they made big influence in the formation of architecture of cities in Indonesia	Exposicion universal de Sevilla , 1992	1990s			1992 _ Aga Khan Award for Kampung Kali Code/ Yousef B. Mangunwijaya	
Asian financial crisis of 1997		Orde Baru Regim (32 years) is collapsed and new reformation era started. One of power that pushed the reformation is university student - 1998				Seminars on Nusantara & Indonesian Architecture		1984 - Head Office of Universitas Indonesia / Gunawan Tjahjono
		Indonesian reformation era. A number of noteworthy reforms (started on 1998) were:	World Expo 1993 Taejon (Daejon, Korea)					1986 - Wisma Dharmala Building / Paul Rudolph
		• Introduction of freedom of the press • Allowing the establishment of new political parties and unions • Release of political prisoners • Limiting the presidency to two terms of five years • Decentralization of power to the regions [9]						
		The Indonesian economy stabilized in 1999 [3]						
2008 Oil prices hit a record high The Internet continues to boom [4]		booming of new young executive class (25-40 years old) and increasing on established class on 2000s	The 2000 Hanover's World Exposition	2000s				
			EXPO 2005, Aichi, Japan			Seminars on Nusantara & Traditional Architecture		

	global economic was slowing down	In late 2004 Indonesia faced a 'mini-crisis' due to international oil prices rises and imports. The currency reached Rp 12,000/USD1 before stabilizing.[5]	World Expo 2008 Zaragoza			
			Expo Shanghai 2010	2010s	11 Nov 2011 -Simposium 111111 (symposium 111111)	
					2010-2014 Seminars	
		This statistic shows the number of social network users in Indonesia from 2012 to 2018. In 2016, it is estimated that there will be around 84.5 million social network users in Indonesia, up from 55.9 million in 2013.[6]	Expo Yeosu 2012		2013-2014 design competitions with themes arsitektur nusantara	2013 _ The Mbaru Niang preservation (one of 20 projects on the shortlist for the Aga Khan Award 2013)
			Milan Expo, 2015		architecture collective Rumah Asuh Movement (Documentating, repair and reconstructions of several Traditional Architectures)	2014- Indonesian Pavilion on Venice Bienalle: "Ketukangan/Craftmanship"

[1] (Tjahjono [ed.]..

[2] (<http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Indonesia.aspx>)

[3] (http://www.photius.com/wfb2000/countries/indonesia/indonesia_economy.html)

[4] (<http://futuretimeline.net/21stcentury/2000-2009.htm>)

[5] (<en.wikipedia.org>)

[6] (<http://www.statista.com/statistics/247938/number-of-social-network-users-in-indonesia/>)

[7] Kenneth Frampton, 2007, The Evolution of 20th Century Architecture: A Synoptic Account, Springer-VerlagA/Vien and China Architecture & Building Press, Beijing, China

[8] <http://theworldenergycrisis.wikidot.com/>

[9] <http://www.indonesia-investments.com/culture/politics/reformation/item181>