



Defense Philosophy Perspectives on the Action of the Defenders of the Homeland (PETA) in Blitar in Indonesian History Education Curriculum

Mochammad Ferdion Firdaus^{1*}, Agus Sudarya², George Royke Deksin³

^{1,2,3}The Republic of Indonesia Defense University, Indonesia

ferdionunhanri@gmail.com^{1*}, agus.sudarya6795@gmail.com², georgeroykedeksino@gmail.com³

*Corresponding Author

Article Info

Article history:

Received: April 12, 2023

Revised: May 30, 2023

Accepted: August 27, 2023

Keywords:

Defenders of Homeland,
Defense Philosophy,
Historical Education,
Insurgency,
Rebellion

Abstract

The action of the Defenders of the Homeland (PETA) in Blitar is classified as a rebellion in the history curriculum for students in Indonesia. The use of the phrase rebellion associates the PETA action in Blitar with post-independence rebellions. Conceptually, this narrative raises the question of whether heroic actions can be considered rebellious actions simultaneously. From the perspective of defense science, the discourse of rebellious actions is classified as insurgency. The act of rebellion is a criminal act that cannot be tolerated. As a result, people are trapped in terms that have negative connotations in describing PETA's heroic struggle in Blitar. Therefore, this paper tries to straighten out this perspective so that the narrative of history education can be by defense science. The method used in writing this research uses descriptive qualitative research methods. Primary data collection was obtained by interviewing expert sources, non-participant observation of the activities of the Yayasan Pembela Tanah Air, and a literature study. The results showed that the action carried out by the PETA Army in Blitar was a resistance movement against the colonizers. This is because the Japanese government in Indonesia is illegitimate and a form of colonialization. Therefore, the PETA movement in Blitar cannot be called a rebellion that contains criminal elements and resistance to a sovereign state. This conclusion recommends an adjustment of terminology in the history learning narrative taught in Indonesian schools. So it becomes clear that the heroic action of PETA in Blitar was not a rebellion, but part of the action of defending the country.

DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.33172/jp.v9i2.8894>

2549-9459/Published by Indonesia Defense University. This is an open-access article under the CC BY-NC license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

INTRODUCTION

Defenders of the Homeland or *Pembela Tanah Air* (PETA) is a voluntary army formed by the Japanese Government when it controlled the Indonesian nation from 1942 to 1945. PETA has an important role in maintaining the independence of the Indonesian nation even though it was initially tasked with helping Japan in the Greater East Asia war. PETA is the forerunner of the formation of the Indonesian National Armed Forces abbreviated as TNI (Welianto, 2020). The birth of PETA was considered an opportunity to build a resistance force against the colonizers. This resistance is often considered a rebellion movement against the authorities. A famous movement, among others, carried out by PETA soldiers in Blitar occurred in 1945. This rebellion was motivated by the dissatisfaction and disappointment of PETA members with Japan's behavior towards the Indonesian people (Suwondo, 1996). Japan through forced labor or Romusha showed cruelty and deprivation of people's rights. The uprising was initiated by Soedanco (Platoon Commander) Supriyadi and Moeradi and supported by Chudanco (Company Commander), Dr. Ismangil.

The action of the heroes against the colonizers such as the action of the PETA Army in Blitar in the Indonesian education curriculum is still often referred to as a rebellion. The book "Indonesian History for Senior High School (SMA/MA/SMK/MAK) class XI" published by the Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia (Kemdikbud) in 2017 still uses the term "PETA rebellion". Kemdikbud in the book "Atlas of Indonesian History" published in 2018 also uses the phrase "rebellion" in the action carried out by H. Zainal Mustofa in Singaparna. The use of the phrase rebellion in these actions is not differentiated and is equated with post-independence rebellions such as the rebellion of the Indonesian Communist Party (*Partai Komunis Indonesia* or PKI) in Madiun, the Rebellion of the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Indonesia (*Pemerintah Revolusioner Republik Indonesia* or PRRI), and the Darul Islam/*Tentara Islam Indonesia* Rebellion (DI/TII). These books became references in History subjects for schools. As a result, most people believe that the actions of these heroes are rebellions.

In previous research, some researchers seem not to agree on the use of the phrase rebellion or resistance. Okcavia, Rudiyanto, Suwarno, Widodo, & Saragih (2022) mentioned that the actions of the PETA Army were familiarly called the PETA Rebellion in Blitar. The use of the term in the study has not been based on scientific considerations, but only according to custom. The use of the term rebellion was also found in an architectural study for a museum in Blitar City. Johensha & Kwanda (2022) mentioned that the term "Rebellion" as the name of a museum that stores historical objects of PETA actions in Blitar does not have deep scientific considerations. This also shows that the term is already commonly recognized by the public so it becomes a place name. One study that uses the term "against" is a study by Azarya, Pandi, Yohannes, & Yoannita (2020). The study places Japan as the colonizer who has no right to sovereignty in Indonesia and PETA as one of the actors who resisted the colonization. However, it does not explain scientifically the reason for using the phrase. These previous studies show that there is no scientific agreement on the use of the term

rebellion in the heroic history of PETA soldiers. The use of philosophically problematic terms will confuse, and can even become a justification for separatist movements who use the PETA events in Blitar as justification for their rebellious actions. This research fills the gap as a scientific consideration to place the right term related to the PETA event in Blitar. This is one of the novelties of this research.

The study of acts of rebellion that have been studied from the perspective of defense or security studies is classified as an act of insurgency. According to Metz & Millen (2004), the insurgency is seen as a criminal act that cannot be justified based on this perspective. The insurgency movement is also seen as a resistance operation that uses armed force where violence is the main way taken against a legitimate government (Sasongko, 2013). Therefore, acts of rebellion (insurgency) always refer to a negative connotation that needs to be eradicated. Regarding the actions of PETA soldiers in Blitar, the term "rebellion" in Indonesian history books needs to be reviewed. The explanation uses a defense philosophy review that can explain the reasons and the true truth of the action.

In this paper, the issue raised is the use of the term "rebellion" in the heroic actions carried out by PETA members in Blitar in terms of defense philosophy. The embedding of a term will affect the whole concept of how people view an event. Thus, by examining the accuracy of the use of the term "rebellion" in the PETA Action, it is hoped that it can provide new insights into a more responsible history learning curriculum. In addition, this paper is also expected to contribute to defense development and enrich the literature on PETA members and Defense Philosophy.

METHODS

The method used in writing this manuscript uses descriptive qualitative research methods. The object of this research is the view of defense philosophy in interpreting the PETA event in Blitar associated with the Indonesian education curriculum. Data collection is done through interviews, observations, and library research, which is an approach in research methods by collecting information and data and various kinds of data needed (Mardalis, 2006). George (2008) defines the library research method as a research method conducted by browsing computer machines or reading various kinds of literature to find knowledge and information to answer research questions. The literature used as primary sources are scientific works in the form of books, scientific journals, and other literature related to the philosophy of defense, philosophy of conflict, and philosophy of peace. Ulya (2010) asserts that in literature research, the analysis process has started since the data collection process. Every aspect that has been collected is always analyzed at the same time to get answers to problems.

In this study, data collection was carried out by collecting primary data sources through expert informants. The subject of this research is a historical analyst from the Coordinating Ministry for Human Development of the Coordinating Ministry for Human Development of the Republic of Indonesia and the management of the Defenders of the Homeland Foundation (Yayasan Pembela Tanah Air). Data collection was conducted

through in-depth interviews with historical analysts and historical experts affiliated with the Government, as well as non-participant observation through activities carried out by the Yayasan Pembela Tanah Air. Secondary data was collected through books, journals, articles, and reports that can be accessed online and in print. The collection process focused on deepening the meaning of the use of the term rebellion and the opinions of historical experts related to the PETA event in Blitar. The process of finding answers was carried out by synthesizing the opinions of experts in various literature.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Rebellion in Defense Philosophy

Philosophy is the study of all events of human life and thought critically and elaborating on fundamental concepts (Ibrahim, 2016). Philosophy is not explored by conducting experiments, but by expressing problems in detail, finding solutions to them, and providing proper arguments and reasons for certain solutions. The basic characteristics of philosophy by Jan Hendrik Rapar are expressed in at least five things, which are radical thinking, searching for principles, hunting for truth, seeking clarity, and rational thinking (Rewita & Salminawati, 2022). Lubis (2015) explains the characteristics of philosophy, namely:

1. Descriptive, which is a detailed description of something, explaining why something does so.
2. Critical, which is to question everything (including the results of philosophy), and not take for granted what is seen at first glance, what people say and do.
3. Analytical, which is reviewing and examining in detail and thoroughly something, including the basic concepts by which we think about the world and human life.
4. Evaluative or normative, meaning a serious effort to assess and address all issues faced by humans. This assessment can be in the form of determining the truth, feasibility, and goodness.
5. Speculative, which is an effort of human intellect that is receptive, exploratory, and supposing and does not limit only to sensory recordings and external observations

This study emphasizes the review of philosophy on the phenomenon of rebellion as a material object. Hakim & Saebeni (2008) explain that the material object in philosophy is something that exists in reality. Whether it is directly visible or something that is not directly visible. Something visible can be researched with an empirical approach, while the invisible (metaphysical) can be known from discussions and human thought itself.

Defense is a concept that cannot be separated from the life of living beings. Every creature needs a sense of security to maintain survival ties. Muazaroh & Subaidi (2019) argue that humans have a basic need in the form of a sense of security from all worries and threats as stated by Abraham Maslow and al Ghozali. In defense philosophy, maintaining this sense of security encourages humans to think about seeking various knowledge to understand why to survive, survive from what, survive from whom, and how to survive (Octavian, 2019). Through defense philosophy, humans and the state are

encouraged to understand all threats that have the potential to affect their lives. Threats for individuals depend on a reflection of their weaknesses and strengths. Within the scope of the state, there are four major branches of security threats, namely, first, threats to National Security using armed violence, such as armed rebellion, international terrorism, and piracy at sea. This threat is the task of the defense or military and security apparatus or the police (national defense and security). Second, threats to public security and order or *Kamtibmas*. For example, ranging from lawlessness to transnational organized crime and illegal migration. This is the realm and task of law and order (law and order/enforcement), and is the duty and function of the police apparatus and other law enforcement apparatus. Third, security threats to society or public security, for example, due to disasters (natural and artificial), environmental and energy security threats, infectious diseases such as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS), and the spread of disease. Fourth, human security threats, namely the duties of the state.

The results of research by Supriyatno & Ali (2018) explain the use of the term non-traditional threat, which is a threat that is often faced daily by a nation and state, such as terrorism, armed rebellion, and other non-military security threats, be it political, economic, social and cultural. Both in the context of those that come from outside (international and regional) and those that arise from within the country (national). In political terms, the need for defense can be realized due to two things. First, life is a struggle for power for those who have power or even for those who are power-hungry. Meanwhile, groups that tend to be weak (weak states) will only be trapped in defense or fight options. Defense is the only way to obtain a sense of security. In other words, defense is a necessity for life that cannot control others (Tippe, 2016). The ways taken in defense to achieve peace by using violence or not are dynamic situational choices. Taufiq (2021) explains Weil's thinking which prioritizes non-violent conflict resolution. On the other hand, the defense does not always have a passive connotation as a non-violent (defensive) action. Defense efforts are also made to prepare for an attack (offensive). Therefore, the philosophy of defense also includes conflict management, diplomacy, war, war prevention, and how to end the war that occurs (Aris, Mamahit, & Ras, 2022).

In defense, some sacrifices must be made. In other words, there will be losses from any defense effort itself. However, this can all be limited by the application of ethical philosophy. Ethics will provide limits to actions during the war to keep humanity first and to stay in the realm of decency and dignity. Downs & Swienton (2012) argue that all notions of good and evil have been filtered through various perspectives, allowing questions not only on the goodness of actions but also the use, truth, morality, and justice of actions. The basic principles of ethics are the substance of natural law that contains rules that are born from several principles, such as human rights (Hardjono, 2004). The substance of natural law was applied to the law of war and peace by Hugo Grotius, which became the forerunner of modern war law, as the Conduct of War (Putri, 2011). Humanitarian law has the value of legal certainty, the value of legal justice, and

the value of legal expediency; which provides absolute minimum protection and cannot be delayed because it is a nondelegable right as the most basic right of human rights.

Based on the description above, it can be understood that the purpose of the philosophy of defense is to explain how living beings can continue their lives in conditions of threat in civilized ways. Defense philosophy is also related to all ideas and thoughts about relationships between groups in the context of self-defense. Often, these defensive efforts, as mentioned earlier, are efforts related to controlling and being controlled, fighting and being fought, and resisting and being resisted. The culmination of these relations as a dispute between conflicting groups is a confrontation referred to as war.

Conventional war has always been associated with a war between state actors against other states, not a war between state actors and non-state actors. This is because the conventions and laws of war in the past applied to wars between states, while non-state wars, such as the state against armed insurgency within the country commonly referred to as the war against an insurgency or the so-called counter-insurgency, were not formally included in the conventions and were only included in the "Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions" of August 12, 1949, as well as those relating to the "Protection of Victims of International (Protocol I) and Non-International (Protocol II) Armed Conflicts" in 1977. In other words, today war is not only between state and state but also between state and non-state actors. Even today, an individual can fight against the state as terrorists do with their suicide bombings against certain countries. The actions of non-state actors are carried out in asymmetrical warfare or unequal warfare.

The House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia (2003) in the Academic Paper on Terrorism Law explains that separatism originates from an ethnic group that feels excluded from existence by other groups due to the development of a nation-state. This separatism then becomes the choice of one form of struggle to realize the nationalist ambitions of ethnic groups who feel disadvantaged by the existing system. Terrorism was chosen as one of the methods to carry out its struggle and create a situation so that the world knows its existence and sympathizes with its struggle. However, in recent times, separatism does not only arise from the desire for nationalism. Hartati (2010) compiles the factors that cause separatism such as ideology, political injustice, economics, and even foreign intervention.

In contrast to separatism, the insurgency has an interest in overthrowing or fighting the authorities. According to Hapsari (2017), the insurgency is a movement carried out to overthrow the regime in power including officials who have been legally elected. Meanwhile, the United States Ministry of Defense added that the insurgency movement is an organized movement through subversive means and armed conflict (Hapsari, 2017). On the other hand, according to Elshelmani (2016), the insurgency is classified into two, national insurgency and independence insurgency. National insurgency is closer in meaning to a political coup. Meanwhile, independence insurgency has a meaning close to separatism.

Based on the description above, separatism and insurgency have the same meaning: against the legitimate government or ruler using violence or conflict. Separatism and insurgency have different backgrounds, namely, separatism is triggered by the idea of ethnic nationalism and disintegration. Meanwhile, the insurgency is motivated by hatred of the authorities and group political interests. Insurgency movements can trigger separatism and vice versa. Meanwhile, terrorism is a method that can be chosen by separatist and insurgency groups to achieve their goals. Terrorism can also occur without the benefit of separatism or insurgency if it only aims to gain attention for the imposition of will. For example, lone-wolf terrorists act on the idea of radicalism.

To achieve their goals, insurgency and/or separatists essentially design intermediate objectives as stages of attacking a state. Military and political means are still used to achieve these intermediate objectives, but the main objectives themselves are political, including separating from the state and increasing insurgency capabilities in the field of public services, isolating the government from international diplomatic relations, and seeking support to increase international support for the rebel struggle, increasing legitimacy at the domestic and international levels, and other activities aimed at destroying the state and nation and the legitimate government. There are four categories of insurgency, namely politically organized, military, traditional, and urban or urban insurgency, but there is no single category of insurgency and they are usually multi-organized. Meanwhile, armed insurgency or separatists use weapons or military means to resist and want to separate themselves from the authority of a legitimate and sovereign state or government recognized by the United Nations, and threaten and destroy the state, threaten the safety of the nation, society, and individual citizens, are illegitimate military movements and violate both national and international law (unlawfulness). Armed rebels, separatists, and terrorists are illegitimate entities in terms of national and international law. Insurgencies, separatists, or terrorists consist of armed civilians who can be classified as a combatant force and their supporters who are legitimate to fight.

The discourse of rebellion above is fully interpreted as an act of rioting and a threat to the stability of the state. However, according to Western thinker Albert Camus in his phenomenal book *L'Homme Revolte*, (*The Rebellious Man*) the face of rebellion presented by historical texts is the wrong rebellion (Setyadi, 2021). That is why, for Camus, rebellion is considered a social pathology as well as a criminal act that does not care about life. He then explored the principle of rebellion in his book and concluded that the basic value of rebellion is greater than the existing history. He also offered to return to the primary value (*le noblesse premiere*) of rebellion itself. Clarifying Camus' view on rebellion, Ricoeur underlines three points of Camus' thought. First, Camus rejects the laws of history that become guidelines that justify acts of terror. Second, Camus recognizes the existence of limits as an implication of the absolute philosophy of history. Ricoeur gave an example of a slave's rebellion against his master's orders. The

rebellion is because the slave believes that oppression and rebellion have limits. Third, according to Camus, means are what justify the purpose of rebellion.

Another view of rebellion can be seen in Conflict Theory. Conflict Theory was constructed by several thinkers such as Karl Marx and Dahrendorf. According to Marx, the social system always consists of two camps: the oppressor and the oppressed. The relationship between the two camps is exploitative or coercive (Tamburaka, 1999). Meanwhile, according to Dahrendorf, the tendency of powerful groups of society will impose on weaker groups of society so that they are controlled (Ritzer, 2007).

Looking at a more recent perspective, another thinker, Tilly & Wood (2020), identifies rebellion as a social movement because it is a series of continuous acts of resistance from aggrieved groups against the authorities. According to Tilly & Wood (2020), this resistance includes actions outside of formal legal political channels. The definition has several elements, namely being organized, rejecting self-consciousness, and having a common identity. Rusmanto (2013) explains that revolt in the classic social movement perspective is an irrational group action. The rebellion is no different from riots and political chaos. Meanwhile, the new social movement paradigm tends to be rational and mature in determining action and not blindly.

The new social paradigm itself is built from several perspectives. One of them is the view of structural tension which is characterized by Robert Ted Gurr. According to Gurr (2015), the trigger for resistance and resistance is the feeling of being deprived (relative deprivation). The deprivation in question is the gap between the expected value (such as objects or living conditions that are believed to be right) and the value that can be achieved based on capabilities (goods or living conditions that are believed to be achieved). The feeling of deprivation will then ignite dissatisfaction, which, if it cannot be facilitated, will turn into violent rebellion (which can take the form of conspiracy, chaos, and domestic conflict). The history of colonization is a history of dispossession. Colonialism is a form of power that rarely gives grace, and the ability to think critically to humans (Kirom, 2020). In line with this, Ishak (2012) highlights that colonization is the control of a country over another country which hurts the lives of the people of the colonized country in all aspects of life, especially humanity.

The above ideas and perspectives on rebellion have emphasized several things. First, rebellion is always triggered by a feeling of disappointment felt by the weak or controlled group. Second, rebellion to be free from oppression is a revolutionary resistance or part of a social movement. Third, rebellion is always followed by violent acts that tend to deprive the opponent of their rights, including the right to life. Fourth, in the philosophy of defense, rebellion against a sovereign government should be eradicated because it disrupts security as a basic need of living beings. Rebellion against a legitimate ruler can be categorized as a criminal act or social pathology and must be eradicated even by society itself. Fifth, rebellion in the sense of a revolution for independence in the review of defense philosophy is an effort to achieve security or peace of life so that it can be supported. Rebellion against colonization, deprivation of rights, and imposition of the will of one group on another is a form of patriotism.

PETA's Action in Blitar in Defense Philosophy

The Defenders of the Homeland or PETA in Blitar was a voluntary militia formed by the Japanese Colonial Government through Osamu Sirei No. 44 on October 3, 1943. This army, which was intended to defend the island of Java, was the result of Gatot Mangkupraja's proposal as one of the movement figures who was trusted to be the Chairman of the 3A Propaganda Movement (Nippon Cahaya, Protector and Leader of Asia) to Gunseikan and Seikosikikan (Suryanegara, 1996).

Gatot Mangkupraja's proposal was welcomed by the Japanese as the only Asian power involved in World War II (WWII) because it was supported by several reasons. Abdulgani (1996) explained that the first reason was the Japanese position which was increasingly pressed by the Allied forces and their defeat in the Alexian Islands so they were forced to evacuate. American troops were quite successful in approaching strategic islands in the Southeast Asian region which included the Philippines and the eastern part of the archipelago. The second reason was the need for additional personnel for Japan to respond to the challenges posed by the Allied success in occupying Southeast Asia. Although Japan had previously formed an auxiliary army (*Heiho*) in September 1942, the need for combat personnel was still too much compared to what was available. Meanwhile, the third reason is the nationalism that grew among the people. This nationalism, according to Abdulgani (1996), cannot be separated from the indirect impact of the establishment of the Japanese-formed organization, namely the People's Power Center (PUTERA). As an organization of indigenous intellectuals used to support Japan's war interests, PUTERA succeeded in fostering the mentality and readiness of the people to organize and welcome Indonesian independence two years later.

However, the establishment of PETA was still not enough to counterbalance the Japanese government's policies, which were more detrimental to the Indonesian people. In the political field, Japan openly boycotted political activities by the Indonesian people. The prohibition was contained in Japanese Government Law No. 2 of 1942 released on March 8 and Japanese Government Law No. 3 of 1942 released on March 20 (Suriyatun, 2009). Japanese policies in the economic field were also very detrimental to the Indonesian people. Suriyatun (2009) explains that Japan implemented the Autarchy System as their economic policy, causing all resources owned by the nation to be used for the benefit of Japan. The colonial government established *keizeibu* as a government organ to seize foodstuffs belonging to the people. Not only that, but the people also had to engage in forced *romusha* labor. Anyone who opposed the policy would be subject to physical punishment. At that time, Japan showed its brutality as a colonizer.

Japan officially controlled Indonesia, as previously described, on March 9, 1942, when the charter was signed from the Netherlands to Japan around the Kalijati area. The problems faced by Japan in the early twentieth century were population growth rates, limited natural resources, especially petroleum, limited domestic markets, and racial discrimination carried out by Western countries, then all became factors that motivated Japan to carry out expansion politics. The Japanese colonial system in the archipelago was based on Japan's need for the archipelago's resources. The Japanese government's

policy towards the Indonesian people had two priorities: to eradicate Western influence among the people and to mobilize them for the victory of the Japanese army. In addition, when viewed from the system of government established in the archipelago by the Japanese, they used a military system of government, so that the commander of the army was in charge. In contrast to the government system by the Dutch government, which implemented a civilian government so that the Governor General was in charge (Fadli & Kumalasari, 2019). Based on this fact, it is clear that the Japanese occupation of the Nusantara was only for their interests without any intention of liberating the Indonesian people.

Indeed, Japan's efforts to colonize the Indonesian people have been evident from their "Nipponization" propaganda since they first took control of the archipelago (Widiastuti, Rokiyah, Melavenic, Rahman, & Al-Barbasy, 2022). Sopanudin (2016) explains that nipponization was carried out by force with efforts to eliminate the culture and habits of the people. The Japanese tried to make their language the lingua franca while narrowing the use of other languages, such as Arabic. In addition, youth organizations such as the Seinendan also became propaganda tools.

According to other less popular literature, the suffering of the people during the Japanese domination of Indonesia was not only due to Japanese policies. Mulyatari (2000) explains the views of Shigeru Sato in his book *War, Nationalism and Peasants: Java Under the Japanese Occupation* which alludes to other factors of suffering such as the character and lifestyle of the people, the influence of Dutch-era colonialization and the effects of the raging global war. As for the rice policy, Sato revealed that the *Pangreh Praja* also put pressure on the people and that there was a reason for the sanyo (Japanese advisors from the natives) in the rice policy itself. Furthermore, Sato stated that the seizure of foodstuffs was a way to control food surpluses due to the massive irrigation development in the Dutch era, in which the seized food was distributed to other Japanese-occupied areas in the archipelago and outside the archipelago. Sato notes, however, that rice exports from the archipelago were quite limited, given the unsafe sea routes during the turmoil of the Great East Asia War.

The fact of endless misery of the people with various causes has knocked the ratio and feelings of the PETA Army to fight back. The resistance, according to the explanation of the Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia on the munasprok.go.id website, was designed as a revolution to seize independence. The revolutionary movement was initiated by Shodanco Supriyadi in September 1944 by mobilizing support from all Indonesian national figures. In line with this, research by Lebra (2010) explains that the selection of the time and place of the operation was based on the momentum of the meeting of all PETA members and commanders in Blitar on February 14, 1944. The momentum was chosen in the hope of support from the entire PETA Army. However, due to plans that had been sniffed out by the Japanese, the action was successfully thwarted. The movement led by Supriyadi fueled the spirit of struggle for fighters in other areas.

Based on the explanation above, the action carried out by the PETA Army in Blitar was a revolutionary movement and different from a criminal or pathological rebellion. This was similarly expressed by the informant of this study that the mention of the PETA movement in Blitar would have been more appropriate if it was called a resistance movement. This opinion is also by the fact that PETA is an independent state armed force, which will defend the country's sovereignty from invaders (Fatgehipon, 2017). Viewed from the philosophy of defense, PETA's action was an act of state defense because it was a response to independence from the arbitrary behavior of the Japanese Government. As explained earlier, efforts to achieve peace are included in defense efforts.

Another reason is that the action is not a criminal rebellion because the Japanese Government is not a sovereign government in the archipelago but a colonial government. Japan at that time deserved to be called a colonizer because of its policies that were not pro-people and carried out real oppression. This is reinforced that the proclamation of Indonesian Independence was the highest political decision to change from a colonized nation to an independent nation. The opinion of this Constitutional Law expert and former Chief Justice of the Constitutional Court explicitly states that the Indonesian nation before independence was in a colonized condition by other nations. Thus, the colonization of other nations at that time was a colonial government that was not sovereign. Thirdly, when the revolutionary action was carried out there was no evidence of violence so the action was declared a failure. Therefore, the movement of Supriyadi and his friends cannot be called a rebellion that contains criminal elements and resistance to a sovereign state.

The action of PETA soldiers in Blitar was also far from being a rebellion. Events that can serve as comparisons and examples of rebellion are the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) Rebellion in Madiun, the Rebellion of the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Indonesia (PRRI), and the Darul Islam/*Tentara Islam Indonesia* (DI/TII) Rebellion. These events were criminal acts and coups against the legitimate government. There was no justifiable reason behind these rebellious operations.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Based on this study, several important points can be concluded. First, rebellion is always triggered by the disappointment felt by the weak or controlled party towards the authorities. Second, rebellion against colonial authority that lacks legitimacy to be free from oppression is part of a social movement. Third, rebellion is always followed by acts of violence that tend to deprive opponents of their rights, including the right to life. Fourth, in the philosophy of defense, rebellion against the sovereign government must be eradicated because it disrupts security as a basic need of living beings. Rebellion against a legitimate government can be categorized as a criminal act or social pathology and must be eradicated even by society itself.

Based on this philosophical explanation, the action carried out by the PETA Army in Blitar was a resistance movement against the colonizers. This is completely different

from the term rebellion which is criminal or pathological. Therefore, the PETA movement in Blitar cannot be called a rebellion that contains criminal elements and resistance to a sovereign state. This conclusion recommends adjusting the terminology in the learning narrative of history taught in Indonesian schools. So it becomes clear that PETA's heroic actions in Blitar were not a rebellion, but instead part of an act of national defense.

REFERENCES

- Abdulgani, R. (1996). *PETA: The Voluntary Army of the Homeland Defenders*. Jakarta: Sinar Harapan Library.
- Aris, T., Mamahit, D. A., & Ras, A. R. (2022). Pemahaman terhadap Filsafat Ilmu Pertahanan sebagai Upaya Meningkatkan Kemampuan Dasar Bela Negara. *Jurnal Defendonesia*, 6(1), 58–65. <https://doi.org/10.54755/defendonesia.v6i1.116>
- Azarya, P. D., Pandi, Yohannes, & Yoannita. (2020). Rancang Bangun Edugame “History of Shodanco Supriyadi”: Sejarah Perlawanan Pasukan PETA Blitar terhadap Jepang. *Jurnal Teknik Informatika Dan Sistem Informasi*, 6(1), 10–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.28932/jutisi.v6i1.1979>
- Downs, J. C. U., & Swienton, A. R. (2012). *Ethics in Forensic Science*. Oxford: Academic Press.
- Elshelmani, A. (2016, March 31). What are the Defining Characteristics of Insurgency from Prehistory to Ca.1975? Retrieved July 28, 2023, from <https://www.e-ir.info/2016/03/31/what-are-the-defining-characteristics-of-insurgency-from-prehistory-to-ca-1975/>
- Fadli, M. R., & Kumalasari, D. (2019). Sistem Ketatanegaraan Indonesia pada Masa Pendudukan Jepang. *Sejarah Dan Budaya: Jurnal Sejarah, Budaya, Dan Pengajarannya*, 13(2), 189–205. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um020v13i22019p189>
- Fatgehipon, A. H. (2017). History of Indonesian Military Role in the Era of Independence Revolution, 1945-1950. *Tawarikh: International Journal for Historical Studies*, 8(2), 217–228. <https://journals.mindamas.com/index.php/tawarikh/article/view/829>
- George, M. W. (2008). *The Elements of Library Research: What Every Student Needs to Know*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Gurr, T. R. (2015). Why Men Rebel. In *Why Men Rebel*. New York: Routledge.
- Hakim, A. A., & Saebeni, B. A. (2008). *Filsafat Umum: dari Metodologi sampai Teofilosofi*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia.
- Hapsari, S. (2017). Evolusi Insurjensi di Era Modern. *Adalah: Buletin Hukum & Keadilan*, 1(10), 99–100. <https://doi.org/10.15408/adalah.v1i10.9024>
- Hardjono. (2004). *Etika Hukum Humaniter*. Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya Universitas Indonesia, Depok.
- Hartati, A. Y. (2010). Separatisme dalam Konteks Global (Studi tentang Eksistensi Republik Maluku Selatan (RMS) sebagai Gerakan Separatis Indonesia). *Spektrum: Jurnal Ilmu Politik Hubungan Internasional*, 7(2). <https://publikasiilmiah.unwahas.ac.id/index.php/spektrum/article/view/836>
- Ibrahim, F. W. (2016). *Dimensi Filsafat Ilmu dalam Wacana Integrasi Ilmu Pengetahuan*. Yogyakarta: Darussalam.
- Ishak, M. (2012). Sistem Penjajahan Jepang di Indonesia. *Jurnal Inovasi*, 9(1), 1–12. <https://ejurnal.ung.ac.id/index.php/jin/article/view/705>
- Johensha, B. D., & Kwanda, T. (2022). Museum Pemberontakan PETA di Kota Blitar. *E-*

- Dimensi* *Arsitektur* *Petra*, 10(1), 321–328.
<https://publication.petra.ac.id/index.php/teknik-arsitektur/article/view/12559>
- Kirom, S. (2020). Memutus Kuasa Postkolonial di Indonesia dalam Perspektif Filsafat Sejarah Kritis. *Kamboti: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 1(1), 13–20.
<https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/349005-memutus-kuasa-postkolonial-di-indonesia-ee494e64.pdf>
- Lebra, J. C. (2010). *Japanese-Tained Armies in Southeast Asia*. Singapura: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Lubis, N. A. F. (2015). Pengantar Filsafat Umum. In *Ar Ruzz Media*. Medan: Perdana Publishing.
- Mardalis. (2006). *Metode Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Proposal*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Metz, S., & Millen, R. (2004). *Insurgency and Counterinsurgency in the 21st Century: Reconceptualizing Threat and Response*. Carlisle: Strategic Studies Institute U.S. Army War College.
- Muazaroh, S., & Subaidi. (2019). Kebutuhan Manusia dalam Pemikiran Abraham Maslow (Tinjauan Maqasid Syariah). *Al-Mazaahib: Jurnal Perbandingan Hukum*, 7(1), 17–33. <https://doi.org/10.14421/al-mazaahib.v7i1.1877>
- Mulyatari, D. (2000). “Buku Putih” Masa Pendudukan Jepang. *Wacana: Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*, 2(1), 140–144. <https://doi.org/10.17510/wjhi.v2i1.277>
- Octavian, A. (2019). *Buku Ajar Filsafat Ilmu Pertahanan*. Bogor: Universitas Pertahanan Republik Indonesia.
- Okcavia, S. C., Rudiyanto, Suwarno, P., Widodo, P., & Saragih, H. J. R. (2022). Pembela Tanah Air (PETA): Bela Negara sebagai Implementasi Nasionalisme dalam Kemerdekaan Indonesia. *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan*, 6(1), 579–589. <https://journal.upgris.ac.id/index.php/civis/article/view/572>
- Putri, R. W. (2011). *Hukum Humaniter Internasional*. Bandar Lampung: Universitas Lampung.
- Rewita, S., & Salminawati. (2022). Konsep dan Karakteristik Filsafat. *Journal of Social Research*, 1(3), 754–760. <https://doi.org/10.55324/josr.v1i4.74>
- Ritzer, G. (2007). *Sosiologi Ilmu Pengetahuan Berparadigma Ganda* (Translated; Alimandan, Ed.). Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Rusmanto, J. (2013). *Gerakan Sosial: Sejarah Perkembangan Teori antara Kekuatan dan Kelemahannya*. Sidoarjo: Zifatama Publishing.
- Sasongko, S. (2013). Diplomasi Insurjensi dalam Peperangan Asimetrik. *Jurnal Defendonesia*, 1(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.54755/defendonesia.v1i1.1>
- Setyadi, F. W. (2021). Camus & Sartre: Polemik Dua Pemikir. *Basis*, 32–38. <http://repo.driyarkara.ac.id/280/1/wawanbasis.pdf>
- Sopanudin. (2016). *Reaksi Organisasi Islam terhadap Kebijakan Politik Jepang di Indonesia (1942-1945)*. UIN Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta.
- Supriyatno, M., & Ali, Y. (2018). *Pengantar Manajemen Pertahanan*. Bogor: Unhan Press.
- Suriyatun. (2009). *Pemberontakan PETA di Blitar (1942-1945)*. Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta.
- Suryanegara, A. M. (1996). *Pemberontakan Tentara Peta di Cileunca, Pangalengan, Bandung Selatan*. Jakarta: Yayasan Wira Patria Mandiri.
- Suwondo, P. S. (1996). *PETA = Tentara Sukarela Pembela Tanah Air di Jawa dan Sumatera 1942-1945*. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
- Tamburaka, R. E. (1999). *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah: Teori Filsafat Sejarah, Sejarah Filsafat dan IPTEK*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

- Taufiq, T. T. (2021). Kontribusi Filsafat Perdamaian Eric Weil bagi Resolusi Konflik dalam Bingkai Masyarakat Majemuk. *Living Islam: Journal of Islamic Discourses*, 4(1), 77–93. <https://doi.org/10.14421/lijid.v4i1.2780>
- The House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia. (2003). *Naskah Akademik Rancangan Undang-Undang Perubahan Undang-Undang Nomor 15 Tahun 2003 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Terorisme*.
- Tilly, C., & Wood, L. J. (2020). Social Movements, 1768-2008. In *Social Movements, 1768-2008*. New York: Routledge.
- Tippe, S. (2016). *Ilmu Pertahanan: Sejarah, Konsep, Teori dan Implementasi*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.
- Ulya. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Tafsir*. Kudus: Nora Media Enterprise.
- Welianto, A. (2020, January 9). PETA: Sejarah Berdirinya, Tugas, dan Tujuan. Retrieved August 1, 2023, from <https://www.kompas.com/skola/read/2020/01/09/080000869/peta-sejarah-berdirinya-tugas-dan-tujuan>
- Widiastuti, N., Rokiyah, Melavenic, S. D., Rahman, S., & Al-Barbasy, M. M. (2022). Sikap Muhammadiyah atas Kebijakan Nipponisasi pada Era Kependudukan Jepang di Hindia Belanda: Tinjauan Normatif Kingdon. *Journal of Innovation Research and Knowledge*, 1(9), 1083–1094. <https://www.bajangjournal.com/index.php/jirk/article/view/1451>