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ABSTRACT

Gorang-Gareng during the Dutch East Indies period was one of the districts in Magetan Regency, Madiun Residency. This district was known as a robbery area (Het Rampok Gebied) after the riots of robbery in 1934. The aims of this study are (1) to explain the culture of the Gorang-Gareng people; (2) to explain the turmoil of the robbery in Gorang-Gareng in 1934, (3) to analyze the coverage of colonial newspapers in Gorang-Gareng in 1934. The method used in this research is the historical method, namely heuristics, criticism, interpretation, and historiography. The results show (1) Gorang-Gareng has a Mataraman culture which contains the principle of manunggal (oneness) and the principle was shaken, (2) colonial newspapers have been diligent in reporting the turmoil of robbery since August 1934 where the Samin gang and the Koeslan gang became the topic of discussion quite a lot (3) Colonial newspaper coverage tends to show subjectivity and tends to see natives as a source of problems. The significance of this research is as a reminder of the history of Gorang-Gareng because in 1948 Gorang-Gareng became the center of the largest PKI’s assassination. The PKI movement in 1948 was related to the robbers. So it is lesson.
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INTRODUCTION

Robbery is a phenomenon that has been encountered since ancient times. Usually, robberies are carried out by bandits, both structured and unstructured. In the history of Java, there are various stories of bandits, which are historical stories but mixed with myths, from Ken Arok to Si Pitung. During the Dutch East Indies era, colonial reports usually helped to examine the phenomenon of robbery and banditry, including the mentality of the indigenous people in viewing a phenomenon that for them was extraordinary, such as bandits that were difficult to catch.

The year 1934 was a tiring year for the Dutch East Indies security forces in the Madiun Residency. The turmoil of robbery colored the events that occurred during the months of July to October of that year. Magetan became the most severe robbery area with the robbery center located in Gorang-Gareng¹. Administratively, Gorang-Gareng was one of the three districts in the Magetan district, the other two districts were Magetan and Maospati.

The robbery turmoil in Gorang-Gareng in 1934-1936 included a major robbery turmoil.

¹ Het Nieuws Van Den Dag Voor Nederlandsch-Indie (27 February 1935) stated “het rampok gebied Gorang-Gareng” (daerah perampokan)
According to a report in the newspaper Het Nieuws van Den Dag Voor Nederlandsch-Indie dated September 11, 1934, it is known that a robbery also occurred in Nganjuk with the perpetrators from Gorang-Gareng, there were even concerns that it would spread to Rembang. Thus, it can be said that Gorang-Gareng during July-October was a robbery-producing area which was quite worrying for the stability of the Dutch East Indies government, especially in the Madiun Residency area and the surrounding areas.

Several debates did arise regarding the turmoil of this robbery, both from contemporary sources and from historical interpretations. The strongest robber gangs were the gangs led by Samin and the gangs led by Koeslan, both of whom once controlled majority politics in villages in the Gorang-Gareng District, including Bogem Village, Kerik Village, and Kepokredjo Village. Although the emergence of these robber gangs was seen as something negative for colonial newspapers, the information obtained from these newspapers it could be interpreted as a form of subjectivity that was quite visible. The natives were seen as problematic while the colonial newspapers tried to avoid criticism of the Binnenland Bestuur government. Therefore, unbalanced reporting is a problem that occurs in covering the turmoil of the robbery in Gorang-Gareng. One thing that is quite interesting is the concern of Dutch officials about the myths that live in the Gorang-Gareng community, which in the end, if the myth develops, will increase the difficulty of eradicating robber gangs. A phenomenon that proves that colonial thinking in the 1930s did not change.

The method used is the historical method, The first, heuristic, it is collecting primary sources in the form of colonial newspapers in www.delpher.nl and then collecting secondary sources such as books and journals. The second, criticism is selecting information obtained from primary sources. The third, interpretation is interpreting the contents of primary sources that have received criticism and then combining them with the author's analysis. The fourth is historiography, or the final stage of historical research.

GORANG-GARENG COMMUNITY CULTURE

During the Dutch East Indies period, Gorang-Gareng was administratively located in Magetan Regency with the status of a district. Magetan Regency was administratively under the Residency of Madiun. So that the cultural locality is included in the Mataraman cultural family which is one of the cultural areas in East Java besides the cultural areas of Arek, Pandalungan, and Madura. Chalik (2011) stated "Culturally, Mataraman is an identification of the Javanese people who are under the rule of Islamic Mataram". The remnants of Mataram culture were preserved, even though politically the Sultanate of Mataram collapsed. After the Giyanti Agreement in 1755, Magetan was under the Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat Sultanate or the Yogyakarta Sultanate until it became the Dutch East Indies region in 1830 through the Sepreh Agreement.

Mataraman culture is firmly entrenched in Magetan. The names of regents usually use the titles of nobility as befits areas with a strong influence from the Javanese court. Like most of the agrarian areas in Java, which have remnants of the palace's strong influence in the past, traditional Feudalism such as the Mataram era still thrives in Gorang-Gareng. Although the era of the reign of the Sultanate of Yogyakarta has ended in Gorang-Gareng, on the other hand, the Javanese culture of the palace is still strong enough to remain in the attitudes of the pangreh prajas who
continue to preserve Mataram culture. Likewise, the lower class people still respect the existence of the pangreh praja as they respect the Javanese palace elites of the past.

In knowing the Gorang-Gareng culture which is the Mataraman culture in more depth, it is necessary to know the basic attitude of the Mataraman cultural community. The basic attitude of people with Mataraman culture is based on the principle of unity as a value (Sapto, 2012). So there is a concept of unity in Mataraman culture. Moertono (in Sapto, 2012) stated "The source of the value of manunggala can be returned to Javanese mysticism, manunggaling kawula-gusti or jumbuhing kawula-gusti (union of master and servant) or dependence between the ruler and the ruled".

The concept of power in Mataraman culture, namely unity, follows the pattern of power in Javanese culture. Anderson (in Sapto, 2015) stated "The Javanese political view sees power as something homogeneous, constant, and does not question its legitimacy". So that it can be seen the positive and negative sides of the concept of unity. Positively, the union can reduce political turmoil. While negatively, it can lead to pangreh praja who can extort their people arbitrarily without any resistance from the lower people because they are bound by a strict hierarchical structure of society accompanied by a strongly embedded culture, in which obedience to the leader is the main principle of the culture.

In Gorang-Gareng, precisely in Takeran, there was a boarding school led by K.H. Imam Muttaqien, which was founded in 1880. Meanwhile, the community in Tladan Village showed a different situation. The people of Tladan Village were more distant from Islam. Onghokham (2018) stated “Even today, Islamic school students (called santri) are prohibited from living in Tladan Village, Gorang-Gareng area”. It shows that in Gorang-Gareng the kejawen culture was strong. Especially in Tladan Village, kejawen is completely separated from Islamic teachings. Perhaps the case in Tladan Village shows the difference with other areas where kejawen can still be in line with the teachings of Islam.

In Gorang-Gareng there was a Redjosarie Sugar Factory. The existence of the Redjosarie Sugar Factory is a testament to the existence of a modern economy in Gorang-Gareng. The economy was more complex with the emergence of the workers, in addition to the peasants. Although in terms of capacity, the number of workers was less than the peasants.

The existence of the Redjosarie Sugar Factory was inseparable from the Dutch East Indies economy that relied on the sugar plantation sector. Onghokham (2019) stated "Until 1930, sugar was the largest export material for Java and made the economy of the colonial economic rulers victorious. From this point of view, sugar was de kurk waarop Java drift (the cork where the island of Java floats on the sea)". Although it had a positive impact on the existence of a modern economy, as was generally the case with the implementation of colonial policies that were capitalist in nature, there was a negative side to the existence of the Redjosarie Sugar Factory especially for people who were in the lower stratification. Onghokham (2019) stated "Land for plantations was obtained by force through the village head or regent from the hands of the farmers around the factory, then the farmers were employed with little wages until there was the term 'the farmers buy money' ".

As it is known that Gorang-Gareng is a Mataraman area using the principle of manunggal (oneness). So that if there was an oppression of farmers or laborers who came from the lower classes, it would be tough to raise upfront resistance, apart from political, social, and economic powerlessness. Cultural powerlessness made resistance a difficult thing to do. Submission to
Mataraman culture contains the principle of manunggal made obedience to natives who were in the upper social strata unavoidable.

THE TURMOIL OF ROBBERY IN GORANG-GARENG

The riot of robbery in Gorang-Gareng from 1934 could be said to have been led by usually a Jago. Regarding the Jago, Onghokham (2019) stated "the role of the rogue (robber or rogue) has been important since the era of the traditional Javanese kingdoms, even being appointed kings such as Ken Arok and Senapati, citing Soemarsaid Moertono that if he cannot conquer the Jago, he will be made a regent for collect taxes."

Onghokham (2019) also revealed the number of experts in the Madiun Residency as stated in the Madiun Resident report, namely 4000 experts. According to Onghokham (2019), the number is "more than the number of pangreh praja and police." Indeed, Onghokham revealed that the data came from 1900, but the number of 4000 experts was enough to prove that the presence of experts in the Residency of Madiun was not surprising. Although Onghokham did not specifically mention which areas in the Residency of Madiun were many Jago. Proof of the existence of these Jago exploded in 1934 in Gorang-Gareng.

Various difficulties occurred in eradicating the turmoil of the robbery. Bloembergen (2012) stated, "At the same time, the number of police stationed in Madiun rose from forty-five to fifty-five, and the number in Magetan increased from twenty-five to thirty-two." Indeed, according to Bloembergen's (2012) analysis, he was somewhat observant in seeing this robbery phenomenon and at the same time strongly criticized the small number of police officers stationed by the government in Magetan, which was only 25 and later increased to 32. Of course, in this case, the 32 police personnel could not reach the entire Magetan area with its three districts, namely Magetan District, Gorang-Gareng District, and Maospati District. The condition of the number of police personnel, according to Bloembergen, was only 32 police officers. Imagine that 32 police officers were divided into three districts. In this case, Gorang-Gareng would receive a small portion because the infrastructure was less in number than the other two districts.

The robbery in Gorang-Gareng can be traced back to 1933. De Locomotief's report dated November 24th, 1933, shows the arrest of 3 robbers by the Police Mantri in Gorang-Gareng cost a lurah 300 Gulden. However, the robbery incident occurred in Ngawi, and he was caught in Gorang-Gareng. Then the colonial newspapers and magazines began regularly report robbery incidents since August 20th, 1934. On that date, the magazine Algemeen Handelsblad voor Nederlandsch-Indië reported the robbery of a pilgrim in Bendo and a sugar factory foreman named Resodikromo (possibly the foreman of the Redjosarie Sugar Factory) in Mangoenredjo. In the report, the robbers targeted their target when they robbed a pilgrim in Bendo. Fifteen masked robbers smashed the house's door with an ax, shattered the cupboard and grobog (rice storage area), and then tortured the pilgrim and his wife and son-in-law until they were injured in the head. Meanwhile, the robbery at the Resodikromo foreman's house located in the village of Mangoenredjo managed to take 40 guilders. The robbers also managed to injure Resodikromo for resisting. The next day Resodikromo died after being taken to the Madiun hospital.

The situation in Gorang-Gareng, which was considered worrisome, prompted the Governor of East Java to send 20 field police personnel (veldpolitie) and plan to visit Madioen to discuss the
robery terror in Gorang-Gareng. However, the following report written by Dagblad van Noord-Brabant newspaper on September 14th, 1934, reported that the terror of robbery continued to spread. Even though the Governor of East Java had taken steps and the robbery-partijen (the term used by the Dutch newspaper to refer to a radical robbery event) was still taking place in Gorang-Gareng. It was also reported that the police succeeded in arresting a gang of robbers led by Pandjang in Denkok Village (Pingkuk) that killed people on August 21, 1934. This statement is reinforced by the De Indische Courant report dated September 14, 1934, which states that the gang of robbers led by Pandjang on September 14, 1934, August 21, 1934, killed two village police officers. The number of the gang was about six people because the report stated that six people were caught.

Two massive bands of robbers finally emerged, known as the Samin Gang and the Koeslan Gang. The gang's name was from the name of its leader. Bloembergen (2012) explains that Samin's charisma is slightly known as a robber. Like other heroes in general, Samin's popularity is accompanied by a myth in the form of an immune body. The growing myth of a figure considered popular as Samin in Javanese society is not surprising. These two gangs are influential in village politics in Gorang-Gareng. In this case, in Bogem Village and Kerik Village. The newspaper report Het Nieuws Van Den Dag Voor Nederlandsch-Indie dated September 15, 1934, reported the complicated political situation in the village of Bogem. The report explained that Bogem's head village had been fired on suspicion of colluding with the robber gang, the Samin gang. Then a new village head was elected, but no one ran for office, and the entire population reportedly agreed that no one in the village had run for office in the head village election. In the end, the dismissed village head was re-nominated in the head village election. After the wedana of Gorang-Gareng found out about this, the wedana said that it was impossible. But the residents answered that the government should appoint their people and the entire village council would resign because only the sacked head village could make the village safe for his close relationship with Samin. Due to the failure of the first village head election, a second village election was held 14 days later according to the regulations. As a middle ground, the old head village was willing not to be re-elected and recommended Djagabojo (head of village security affairs) that nominated himself as the sole candidate in the election of the head village. The old head village who was fired then guaranteed that Samin would not appear there. However, the newspaper continued that the words of the sacked head village cannot be trusted because Samin already has a house in Bogem Village with the help of the fired village head.

Het Nieuws Van Den Dag Voor Nederlandsch-Indie then continued his report in different villages, namely Kerik village and Kepokredjo village (Kepuhrejo). In Kerik Village, it was reported that the old head village was fired for his links to a robber gang. Finally, the head village election was held. But the residents who nominated the head village always received threats from the robber gang. They were demanded to withdraw four days before the election time from their candidacy so that Samin's relatives could be elected as the head village. Meanwhile, in the village of Kepokredjo, the village head was also fired on the same charges as the village heads of Bogem and Kerik of having links to a robber gang. The difference is that the robber gang in Kerik Village is the Koeslan gang. After the dismissal of the head village, a new head village was elected under
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the threat of the Koeslan gang. Finally, the son of the dismissed head village was chosen as the new village head. The situation was declared unchanged because Koeslan had several women in the village and was under the protection of the sacked head village.

The three villages were examples of the Samin gang and the Koeslan gang that had great influence in the political field. Regarding the two gangs, Samin and Koeslan were not in competition because Koeslan is Samin's brother-in-law who came from Banjoemas. These two people were unruly for the indigenous government and Binnenland Bestuur. The Soerabaiasch Handelsblad newspaper dated September 12th, 1934, stated that Samin and Koeslan had taken control of the Gorang-Gareng District by describing the map of the Samin and Koeslan gangs' power as follows:

The territory of Koeslan and Samin (shaded) in Gorang-Gareng. Image source: Soerabaiasch Handelsblad newspaper (September 12th, 1934).

The government was afraid that the robbery would spread to the north, namely to Ngandjoek and Rembang, especially after it was discovered that the robbers in Ngandjoek were from Gorang-Gareng. The guard line was then extended to the north. Another effort made by the government to stop the riots of robberies reported by Soerabaiasch Handelsblad dated September 11th, 1934, was deployed field police for 24 hours. Establishing private security services throughout the village wherein each division around ten people were armed with spears, iron,
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sword, and mace during curfew. In this case, the government is trying to narrow the space for the gangs to move.

The widespread influence of Koeslan and Samin was a concern for the government. In the Het Nieuws Van Den Daag report dated September 12, 1934, it was stated that the regent of Magetan, namely R.M.A.A Hadiwinoto was also facing a difficult situation because the robbery in Gorang-Gareng was used politically to overthrow him because he asked the residents to reduce safety and cultural festivals due to difficult economic conditions. In the report, there were only five head village and village councils loyal to the government, and the rest were said to be corrupt and collaborated with garbage (robbers). Then in this unfavorable situation, Binnenland Bestuur's intervention is irrefutably needed. In this case, the Resident of Madioen, Lucien Adam, and the Governor of East Java. The deteriorating situation caused the Governor of East Java to step in to tackle the robbery by increasing the number of field police.

Bloembergen (2012) studies the analysis of Prabowo or Soebianto in a pamphlet supported by the Pangreh Praja Member Union (Vereeniging van Ambtenaren Bij den Inlandschen Bestuursdienst, V AIB) which looked anti-feudal and acts as an opposition to the power of the Magetan regent R.M.A.A. Hadiwinoto and accused the regent of oppressing the population through various strict paternalistic rules and regulating all aspects of people's lives, from wayang to alms of the earth. Soebianto in this case looks subjective and tends to blame all the blame on the regent. However, on closer inspection, it makes sense that many village heads supported the Samin and Koeslan gangs because of their dislike of the regent R.M.AA. Hadiwinoto though, of course, is not just a matter of feudalism.

The colonial government mobilized the police to arrest Samin and Koeslan. Soerabaijasch Handelsblad in his report on 10 October 1934 reported that the police ambushed a meeting held at Koeslan's house in Boelahan Village. The plan was that there would be around 4 people, namely Samin, Koeslan, and two others. Samin was caught by the police with a shoulder wound, while the De Indische Courant dated October 12, 1934, reported the arrest of Koeslan in Kepokredjo village without a fight.

COLONIAL NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINE COVERAGE OF GORANG-GARENG ROBBERY INCIDENT

There are quite a few newspapers and magazines that report the robbery in Gorang-Gareng. These include Algemeen handelsblad voor Nederlandsch-Indië, De Indische Courant, Het Nieuws Van Den Dag Voor Nederlandsch-Indie, Soerabaiasch Handelsblad, and so on. Most magazines and newspapers that reported on the robbery in Gorang-Gareng tended to side with the Dutch colonial government or Binnenland Bestuur. Meanwhile, all problems and mistakes regarding the robbery in Gorang-Gareng were addressed to the indigenous government (regents to village heads). This subjective perspective of journalists is influenced by the colonial perspective to maintain the legitimacy of the colonial government. Journalism is used to solve problems that occur in indigenous communities. Evaluation of the performance of Binnenland Bestuur and criticism of the performance of Binnenland Bestuur are not shown. In the case of the robbery in Gorang-Gareng in 1934 that was covered, it was the fault of the Magetan regent, namely RMAA Hadiwinoto as shown by De Locomotief from 19-21 December 1934 which summarized
Soebianto's statement that the fault lay with RMAA Hadiwinoto who was considered feudalistic for using the principle of the regent's office for generations and oppression of the population in the form of banning routine cultural events. The error that was inflicted on R.M.A.A Hadiwinoto is quite strange because the principle of heredity is common among the Javanese regents, and there is no explanation for the existence of a group of intellectuals from the national movement involved in the regent's opposition. In addition, Mataraman culture which emphasizes stability or Manunggal is the main principle in the culture in Gorang-Gareng so that rebellion against the regent is difficult to achieve unless certain figures can mobilize the opposition if there is one. Samin and Koeslan are not opposition figures because they are not pangreh praja but only leaders of a robber gang. The colonial newspapers were also unable to prove that opposition figures intended to bring down R.M.A.A Hadiwinoto through robbery. Soebianto may have been part of the opposition, but his position as assistant wedana was not strong enough, especially when the robbery took place.

Then the colonial newspapers did not use comparative sources, for example correcting possible errors from the Binnenland Bestuur government such as the Resident of Madiun, Lucien Adam. Bloembergen is probably right that the blame lies with the police being too weak. The imbalance in the news made the indigenous government unable to defend itself.

Then the use of cultural comparisons to describe the conditions of indigenous peoples with Dutch society. Soerabaijasch Handelsblad in his report on 12 September 1934 described the point of view of Dutch officials, namely that they were worried about the perception of the people of Gorang-Gareng that if Koeslan had not been arrested, the people would consider him under the protection of Sunan Lawu and would eventually be difficult to catch. Sunan Lawu is a myth that developed in the Magetan community that King Brawijaya V of Majapahit fled from the center of the Majapahit kingdom to Mount Lawu and eventually moksa and earned the nickname Sunan Lawu. Indirectly, this news is a criticism of the government which has not succeeded in arresting Koeslan. In the end, this assumption can be used as a tool to get the police to immediately arrest Koeslan. It is not explained why only Koeslan is considered dangerous, while Samin escapes this concern. Koeslan may be considered more dangerous than Samin. Here the colonial newspapers were less able to explain the reason and tended to forget about Samin. Soerabaijasch Handelsblad also explained that there were plans to use non-Muslim military originating from Manado and Ambon that are free from these myths. In contrast to the critical view of natives, sources from Dutch officials are almost non-existent from newspaper criticism. This means that here the Dutch officials in Binnenland Bestuur do not trust the police in Magetan, meaning that there is a possibility that the police in Magetan are also influenced by this myth. There is no criticism written here regarding the failure of the Dutch colonial government to free the police, which is filled with indigenous members, from the myths that still plague the Gorang-Gareng community. However, the Dutch government

Colonial newspapers also tended to use language that seemed subjective to mention parties who joined the robbers, as written by Het Nieuws Van Den Daag dated September 12, 1934, which wrote that there were only at most 5 village heads and loyal village councils, while the rest are corrupt and collaborate with trash. The language which is quite subjective by accusing the village head who collaborates with trash (robber gang) as a corrupt village head can be questioned because loyal village heads may also be corrupt because at that time supervision was low and the
Binnenland Bestuur government did not care about this. While conditions were orderly and safe and the village heads were considered loyal to the Dutch East Indies government. But it seems that collaborating with "garbage" or "het gespuis" to refer to gangs of robbery seems to make the subjectivity of the news look so subjective and shows the perspective of the Dutch people that did not change in 1934.

Then in the administrative writing of village names, errors and contradictions were also found between newspapers, such as those written by Koran Dagblad van Noord-Brabant dated September 14, 1934, and Koran De Indische Courant dated September 14, 1934. In mentioning the name of the village which is now called Pingkuk, Koran Dagblad van Noord -Brabant called it "Denkok" and the newspaper De Indische Courant dated September 14, 1934 called it "Pengkok". In the Dagblad van Noord-Brabant newspaper, it was explained by the murder of two village policemen in the village of "Denkok" by robbers from the Pandjang gang on August 21, 1934, while the De Indische Courant newspaper reported the arrest of the perpetrators of the murder of the two policemen. village on August 21, 1934 in “Pengkok” (Bendo, Gorang-Gareng). It means that “Denkok” and “Pengkok” are the same to say the name of the village “Pingkuk” now. There are two possibilities, the writing of the government administration is problematic, and or the journalists were indeed lacking in knowledge and only hear about it from oral sources.

Then later in the colonial newspapers reporting about the robbery turmoil in Gorang-Gareng, there was nothing to link it to the Redjosarie Sugar Factory which is the only Sugar Factory in Gorang-Gareng District. As it is known that in 1930 there was a world economic crisis called the Malaise which hit the sugarcane industry. "The crisis caused frustration and anger for factory workers whose economy was also hit by a 90% reduction in wages which was manifested in the intensity of burning sugarcane fields which increased from 3.5% to 8% in the 1930s" (Wulan and Trilaksana, 2020). On the other hand, a report in the colonial magazine Algemeen Handelsblad voor Nederlandsch-Indië dated 20 August 1934 reported the murder of the foreman of a sugar factory without mentioning the name of the factory. There may be a legitimate effort to prevent the robbery from being linked to the problem of a government-owned sugar factory. So that the coverage of colonial newspapers is subjective.

CONCLUSION

The upheaval of robbery in Gorang-Gareng in 1934 is one of the major upheavals in East Java Province. The robbery was not only a criminal robbery in the Gorang-Gareng District but also caused political turmoil at both the village and district levels. When viewed through colonial newspapers, it will be seen that the turmoil of the robbery was an internal problem of the natives. However, colonial newspapers did look subjective in reporting the turmoil of this robbery by avoiding the blame on the Binnenland Bestuur government, starting with a tendency to blame the natives as the source of the problem, not reflecting criticism and evaluation of the Binnenland Bestuur government apparatus, mentioning words that tend to be subjective and have a subjective point of view in viewing parties who are against the government, are less careful in mentioning indigenous terms such as village names, and tend to avoid reporting which causes the government to accuse Binnenland Bestuur of being one of the causes of the robbery. This situation benefited
the government of Binnenland Bestuur because in the 1930s the majority of the national movement was cooperative with the government.

In 1948, Gorang-Gareng obtained a strong PKI influence even as the center of the PKI’s assassination in Magetan where the robbers participated in the PKI’s action. This proves that the Indonesian government in 1948 did not learn from the historical events of 1934 about the turmoil of robbery in Gorang-Gareng.
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