ACHIEVEMENT OF MONUMENTALITY INDICATORS AND PREFERENCES OF TWO GENERATIONS GROUPS ON HISTORICAL MONUMENTS IN JAKARTA

Aghastya Wiyoso[1], Wegig Murwonugroho[2] & Deddy Wahjudi[3]

[1]Fakultas Seni Rupa dan Desain, Universitas Tarumanagara Jakarta
Email: aghastyaa@fsrd.untar.ac.id
[2]Fakultas Seni Rupa dan Desain, Universitas Trisakti Jakarta
Email: wegig@trisakti.ac.id
[3]Fakultas Seni Rupa dan Desain, Institut Teknologi Bandung
Email: deddywahjudi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Monumentality is the quality of buildings and monuments, the achievements of which help shape the identity of the place they exist. As a landmark, the object is indicated monumental through several potentials it has. One historical monument in Jakarta, the National Monument (Monas), which have an important historical record in the development of Jakarta City during the Soekarno's era and has survived to this day, is significant to study how to fulfill their monumentality indicators not only to strengthen and build public perception of their monumental achievements but also to support strategic plans that can be carried out in the future. The research applies a combined method; qualitative and quantitative approaches. Qualitative research was carried out with theoretical testing regarding the fulfillment of the old and new monumentality indicators on this monument, strengthened through interviews with experts. Quantitative research was conducted to measure the preferences of respondents who were categorized as millennial and pre-millennial groups towards the object of research based on their recall potential or memorability. The potential for remembrance was chosen because it is the perennial essence of monumentality. The results of the study show that the achievement of indicators of monumentality and respondent's preference for the research object, the highest is occupied by Monas, surpasses the achievements of other monuments within the same category and is also well recognized by the Millenials, not much different from the older generation (premillenial). There are several points of monumentality indicators that have not been met, especially from the new paradigm, but looking at the facts of the overall achievements of Monas, it can be affirmed that the indications of devaluation of monuments that fail to respond to the needs of their time and society are not proven.

Keywords: monumentality, monumentality indicator, National Monument

ABSTRAK

Monumentalitas merupakan kualitas dari bangunan dan monumen, dimana capaiannya ditandai melalui pengingatan kolektif terhadap bangunan tadi dan apresiasi secara berkesinambungan dari masyarakatnya yang turut membentuk identitas tempat pelingkupnya. Sebagai penanda kawasan, objek terindikasi monumentalitasnya melalui sejumlah potensi yang dimilikinya. Salah satu monumen bersejarah di kota Jakarta, Monumen Nasional (Monas) yang memiliki catatan sejarah penting dalam pengembangan kota Jakarta era pemerintahan Soekarno dan bertahan kehadirannya hingga saat ini menjadi signifikan untuk diteliti bagaimana capaian indikator monumentalitasnya tidak saja untuk memperkuat dan membangun persepsi publik mengenai capaian monumentalitas karya tersebut namun juga mendukung rencana strategis yang dapat dilakukan di kemudian hari. Penelitian menerapkan metoda gabungan, kualitatif dan kuantitatif. Penelitian kualitatif dilakukan dengan pengujian teoritis mengenai capaian indikator monumentalitas baik dalam paradigma lama dan baru terhadap monumen, yang diperkuat melalui wawancara kepada para narasumber ahli. Penelitian kuantitatif dilakukan untuk mengukur preferensi responden yang terkelompokkan mewakili generasi milenial dan pra milenial terhadap objek penelitian berdasarkan potensi pengingatannya. Potensi pengingatan dipilih karena merupakan kata kunci mewakili aspek perenial atau hakikat dasar dari monumentalitas. Hasil penelitian memperlihatkan capaian indikator monumentalitas dan preferensi responden, yang signifikan dari

Monas; melampaui capaian dari beberapa monumen lain dalam kategorinya, dan juga terekognisi dengan baik oleh generasi milenial, tidak berbeda jauh dari generasi sebelumnya/ pra milenial. Terdapat beberapa butir dari indikator monumentalitas yang tidak terpenuhi, khususnya dalam paradigma baru, namun melihat fakta capaian keseluruhan dari Monumen Nasional dapat ditegaskan kembali bahwa sinyalemen devaluasi terhadap monumen yang gagal merespon kebutuhan zamannya tidak terbukti.

Kata Kunci: monumentalitas, indikator monumentalitas, Monumen Nasional.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

The monument, according to renowned architectural historian Sigfried Giedion, as cited by Abyussa (2019) is a landmark, containing symbols related to the ideas, goals, and activities of the people it represents. Monuments can capture a particular historical moment and period, presenting a valuable legacy to the next generation. Monuments link the past with the future.   Monument objects include city monuments, expressing the highest cultural needs of human beings, so that their existence in an area and city becomes significant, beyond its role as a marker of place to the cultural markers that surround it, both local and national.

In the city of Jakarta, an important moment for the presence of city monuments occurred during the reign of the first president, Soekarno, especially in the period 1957-1962, which Yuke Ardhiati (2010) mentioned in *Edhi Sunarso Seniman Pejuang* as the aesthetic moment of the city of Jakarta. The moment that marked the construction of several monuments and monumental buildings at strategic points of the city of Jakarta, including the National Monument (Monas) complex in the cross of the city center, the "Selamat Datang" (means "Welcoming") Monument Statue at the Hotel Indonesia roundabout, the Statue of the "Pembebasan Irian Barat" (means "West Papua Liberation") Monument in Lapangan Banteng, the "Dirgantara" (means "Aerospace") Monument Statue in the Pancoran area, South Jakarta. In addition to monuments, several monumental buildings also began to be built, such as Hotel Indonesia, Conefo Building (now MPR / DPR-RI building), and Gelora Bung Karno Stadium (GBK) which in general the construction of these objects was in line with the national mental & character building policy from Soekarno.; raise the spirit of the newly liberated Indonesian people from the shackles of colonialism. These monumental objects symbolically represented the value of struggle and the collective character of the People and the Nation of Indonesia (Wiyoso, 2015).

Reading the explanation in the first paragraph, regarding the purpose of perpetuating the spirit and values instilled at some time in the monument, always impressed the attention of observers of historical buildings including monuments to the existence of monuments around it; who questioned the effectiveness of the achievement of the goal of the perpetuation earlier. Giedion himself explained the indication of devalued monuments into "empty shells" in the modern era because they are no longer contextual objects to the demands of their physical, social and cultural environment (Abyussa, 2019). So often some monuments lose their monumentality. The signal was one of the strong reasons for the research on one of the historical monuments in the city of Jakarta, which was designed and built during the Soekarno administration: National Monument, commonly known as Monas. Monas was phenomenal at the time of its creation with original ideas and construction phase initiated by Soekarno but has undergone changes during the 6th-decade journey that accompanied it. Changes indicated in this monument, ranging from its physical existence to the condition of the monument surrounding, the diversity of public appreciation of the historical monuments, and the presence of various public facilities that are no less attractive as "competitors" in the post-millennium era. This indication encourages research on the achievement

of indicators on historical monuments in Jakarta, one of the purposes of which is to confirm whether or not the devaluation of the monuments mentioned above occurs.

Research Questions
Changes as described in the background, based on initial observations made, include changes in its surrounding urban landscape, related to local and central government policies, educational dynamics to public attitudes and appreciation. The fact of the change raises the fundamental question of how exactly the object's resilience to the potential devaluation of its monumentality achievements, at this time, amid the situation of change that occurred. The research activity responds to this fundamental question by involving the process of measuring the research object with the parameters of monumentality that apply during its launch and development and with valid in the present context. In addition, the direct response from the community as a monument appreciator is also involved in the research to complete the fact of achievement of the monumentality indicators of this monument. Furthermore, the formulation of the proposed research questions are: 1) How is the achievement of monumentality indicators on National Monuments in the city of Jakarta that has a historical value, both in the old and new paradigm of monumentality? 2) How is the preference of pre-millennial and millennial groups towards the National Monument among other historical monuments, based on its potential for remembrance which touches the strongest memory in their subconscious mind?

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The research conducted applies mixed research methods, in this case, the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative research is a theoretical justification for the object of research, namely National Monuments, in terms of the achievement of its monumentality based on established indicators, representing the old and the new paradigm. The fulfillment of the points of monumentality indicators of this monument is then percentage to obtain an overview: how the significance of the achievements of the indicators, as well as how the indications of the resilience of the monument concerned to the threat of devaluation of its monumentality. The fact of achievement of the indicator was strengthened through interviews with expert speakers, representing planning practitioners and artists, cultural activists to college teaching staff.

In addition to qualitative research, quantitative and empirical research activities are also carried out to obtain an overview of the public's response to the object of the National Monument in terms of the achievement of monumentality, especially the potential for its reminder as to the core or essence of monumentality. Quantitative research was conducted to measure respondents' preferences for monuments, in terms of their potential reminders. Respondents in this study are a population of lecturers and students who are members of the studio learning activities of the Interior Design Final Project, Faculty of Fine Arts and Design, Trisakti University, for the even semester of 2014/2015, as many as 40 people, who at the same time represent the millennial generation (represented by voters from among students and young lecturers, with birth years between 1981-1994, or a maximum of 35 years old at the time of data collection) and the pre-millennial generation (represented by young and senior lecturers with birth years before 1981 or over the age of 35). To achieve the final result of a completely homogeneous calculation, it also directs the selection of groups of respondents from one class (Final Project) representing design higher education institutions. The existence of this institution that houses this class also assures the sufficient delivery and deposition of knowledge that helps build the mind that underlies decision-making at the time of voting.

Of the population of 40 people for this Final Project studio, exactly 20 people represent the millennial generation, while the remaining 20 people represent the millennial generation. The classification of *voter* groups into two generations is carried out to facilitate analysis by reducing the fact of generational diversity of the population. Faced then the millennial generation who at the time of data retrieval is a representation of the last generation of voter groups, who at the same time have the same spirit (spirit) with the new paradigm of monumentality. While the previous generation was gathered in the category of the pre-millennial generation, which consists of x-generation and *baby boomers;* with the potential for greater ideological or ideological alignment of the old paradigm of monumentality. One thing that also marks a significant difference between these two groups of generations is in terms of spatial experiences and daily reality phenomena colored by the achievements of digital technology that is quite dominant for millennials than the previous generation (Zis, 2021). The opening of access from monuments to the spatial experience of observers through digital simulation imagery also determines the generation of positive responses from millennials as well as the potential to strengthen the image of monumentality.

The quantitative data analysis method used is the BORDA method. Borda Method is a method of collecting the opinions of all *voter* members in a group against several alternative options given (Sugiartawan, 2019); in this case, are three objects of monuments then ranked by each voter based on the potential or strength of the reminder. In other words*, voters* are asked to rank the monument object from the most reminiscent or *memorable* (to be placed in order 1) to the one that is not too reminiscent of the next 2 to 3 sequences. The ratings given by each voter for each monument object are combined in the table. The selected object that ranks at the top is given the highest score, while the following rank below it is given a lower value, consecutively to the lowest rank that obtains a value of 0 (blank). The highest value given for the top selection is n-1, the value n-2 for the next option alternative to the value of 0 for the last choice. The object of choice with the highest value, which meets the best criteria; in this case, represents the most reminiscent or reminiscing objects of the monument.

3.   RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS
Meaning and Forming Phase of Monumentality
The terminology of monumentality as a condition or *state* that is often attached to the object of the monument or any object with the character of the monument has been revealed several times in the Introduction in advance, in this section it is necessary to affirm its perennial and etymological meaning (derived from the Latin word "monere"); that is, everything "that is always reminiscent." Felix Levenson reinforced this aspect of remembrance as a memory that must be fixed, as a fixed structure, space, and place in the monumental sphere. (2019, p.32) The achievement of conditions that always remind or remember earlier, from the designed object or creation as a monument, is characterized by the achievement of several indicators. Indicators of monumentality are distributed in their 4 forming phases in creating the existence of monument objects: the phase of the idea, expression, communication, appreciation, and discourse development.

Monumentality Indicator
Indicators of monumentality can be traced according to each phase of its formation, based on the paradigm underlying it. For the old paradigm; in the idea phase, the indicators are: authentic and contain novelty, essential and universal, having the concept of "partly for the whole" and imaged a dominating political force. In the expression phase, the indicators are: towering, gigantic and volumetric, appearing dominant in a region, simplicity and total cohesion of elements, intense creation process, optimal quality of shape expression, and strong axis image and symmetry. In the

communication phase, several indicators include memorable, sublime, uplifting, and breeding, involving rich spatial experiences and involving multi-sensory experiences. There are several indicators in the appreciation and planning phase: an important role in the public, a long and continuous life cycle, and incommensurable/unmatched in its category. (Murwonugroho, 2020).'
.

For a new paradigm; in the idea phase, the indicators are: opening contemporary ideas with the involvement of new technologies, more aspirational to the public interest, and opening new perspectives in responding to phenomena after seeking a new counterweight to the hegemony of previous ideas. In the expression phase, the indicators are horizontal, complicated, image real or illusory motion, time and space continuum, contrast accompanied by harmony with the external environment and forms beyond the provisions of dimensions, and comparison between common parts. In the communication phase, several indicators include strong reminders, inviting intense and reflective reminders, and evoking positive, imaginative responses to inner reflection. In the appreciation and planning phase, there are several indicators, namely: continuous in its significant role in the community, continuous the intensity of discussions and publications, and expanding intersection with the public and its involvement widely, more inviting and familiar. (Wiyoso, 2015)

Analysis of The Achievement of National Monument Monumentality Indicators
Based on the exposure of the above indicators, a search of the achievement of monumentality indicators was carried out from one of the objects of study in this study, namely the National Monument (Monas); whose marking can be seen in the fill and checklist table below for its old paradigm:

Table 1
Achievement of the monumentality of National Monuments (old paradigm)

Indicators of the old paradigm of monumentality							
Idea Phase		**Expression phase**		**Communication Phase**		**Appreciation/Discourse Phase**	
1. Authentic and containing novelty	✔	**5.** Towering, gigantic, volumetric	✔	11. *Memorable*	✔	16. Important role in the public	✔
2. Essential and universal	✔	**6.** Appear dominant on an area	✔	12. Sublime	✔		
3. Concept " partly for the whole"	✔	**7.** Simplicity and total cohesion of elements	✔	13. Raising spirits and glorifying	✔	17. Long continuous life cycle	✔
4. Image political power	✔	**8.** Intense creation process	✔	14. Engages rich spatial experience	✔		
		9. Optimum quality of expression from material	✔	15. Involves multisensory experiences	✔	18. *Incommensurable/* unmatched in its category	✔
		10. Strong image of axis and symmetry	✔				

In the table above, for the idea/idea phase, indicators of authenticity and novelty are met. The peculiarities and innovativeness of the monas structure have been created at the time of its formation, with the establishment of two gender entities in the symbolic modern approach thrown by President Soekarno, which has never been equivalent to the achievement of its form before.

This at the same time confirms the fulfillment of the points of both indicators, in terms of the idea of unification of both genders in the form of fertility myths that are very essential in the national mind. The cultural idea then shows the fulfillment of the 4th indicator, when the idea was raised into a political strategy Soekarno to lift the confidence of the Indonesian people out of the clutches of colonialism while strengthening national ties in anticipation of indications of divisions that began to appear during the monument removal. While the role of the monument that reveals the chronicle of the historical journey of the Indonesian nation can be described as a micro entity of a dot in the form of the central area of the capital that represents symbolically and narratively a larger entity: the indonesianness of the past to the present; confirms the achievement of the third indicator.

Entering the expression phase, the impression of the dimensions of the towering Monas monument is maintained, regardless of the growing urban landscape around it; due to the environmental isolation factor, it maintains (achievement of indicators 5 & 6). Purification of visual characteristics down to the most unpretentious shape of the monument successfully links each component of the monument coherently and produces strong compactness of the shape (indicator 7). Each element of monuments, cups, and *amphitheaters* demonstrates the best application of materials, joining the potential of the monument layout supported by crosspoints and strategic pivots in the spatial order of cities and regions, which confirms the fulfillment of indicators 8 and 9.

Entering the communication phase, the gesture of the monument with the straightforwardness, simplicity, and strength of the contours of the building structure builds visual perception effectively and the recognition of the whole figure is easily achieved by anyone who has observed it directly or not, so it will always be *memorable* (indicator 10). On the other hand, the entire visual stimulant, auditive (including the national anthem plays in the amphitheater), tactile to kinesthetic partially or simultaneously on the monument can be felt like an interesting, evocative, thrilling experience for visitors (indicators 11,12,13,14).

In the appreciation and discourse phase, the achievement of monumentality indicators is maintained through several policy decisions regarding the function, and the existence of the management of monuments, plus the ever-high appreciation from the community who also perpetuate and maintain their significant role among the citizens of the capital (indicators16 and 17). While the absolute advantage in its field (*incommensurable*) can be fulfilled considering monas to be the only monument as a marker of national-scale history that is in the most strategic position in the capital (indicator 18)

Complementing the analysis of the achievements of previous indicators within the scope of the old paradigm, the following are the achievements of the indicators within the scope of the new paradigm:

Table 2

Achievement of new paradigm monumentality indicators of National Monuments

Indicators of the new paradigm of monumentality			
Idea phase	**Expression phase**	**Communication phase**	**Appreciation & discourse phase**
1. Opening contemporary ideas with the involvement of new technologies.	5. Horizontal, spacious, moving/space-time continuum	8. Strong reminder ✔	11. Continuous in its significant role in the community ✔
2. More aspirational towards the representation of society ✔	6. Contrast accompanied by harmony with external conditions	9. Invite intense & reflective reminders	12 . Continuous in the intensity of the publication and ✔
3. Open a new perspective in response to phenomena	7. Forms go beyond the terms of dimensions and comparisons between common section	10. Leverage positive responses, imagination, to inner contemplation ✔	13. Expanding its entry point to the public & its involvement which is broad, more "inviting" and "familiar"
4. Looking for a counterweight to the hegemony of previous ideas.			

In the table above, it can be seen that not all indicators of monumentality achievements are fulfilled. For items 1,3 and 4 occurred its fulfillment in the early days of its formation and development, only entering the development of the next phase of history, no longer fulfilled the fulfillment of these items; both in aspects of technological innovation, the paradigm of generality to the approach of design ideas to overcome the dominance of ideology that is currently prevailing. In terms of expression, the monas monument structure interpreted by the architect Soedarsono is indeed sought to be able to respond to president Soekarno's criteria regarding the monument as "eternally silent as well as moving". This is visually described on the outline of the monument building that displays the dynamics; starting from the base level seems straight horizontal with the rhythm of the steps of the stairs, continuing on the parabolic curve of the contours of the cup wall, to then hit again before finally moving plenary vertically, ending at the peak component; flame. But the overall presentation of the dynamics of movement has not followed the rules of time and space compaction typical of modern architecture, which still represents the spirit of the times (*zeitgeist*) in the era of the establishment of Monas.

Another aspect that is not fulfilled by Monas is the openness of access for the public to its open spaces, which seem temporary and the moment of occupation of public spaces is still dominated by the power of groups or communities in acquiring public spaces. This in itself reduces the opportunity for widespread access for the community and instead of displaying more inviting and familiar services, what comes to the fore is the image of the managing power with strict territorial control of its monuments.

On the other hand, several indicators such as aspirational to the representation of society as a nation, strong reminders, generation of positive responses, imagination and inner contemplation

of the community, the continuity of the significant role of monuments in the community, the continuity of the intensity of discussion and publication were successfully fulfilled by Monas.

Completing qualitative analysis through theoretical justification related to the evaluation of the achievement of monumentality indicators from the object of analysis in the form of National Monuments, the following is displayed the results of calculations using the Borda method, in the form of a percentage of preferences of two groups of respondents representing millennials and pre-millennials to national monuments in terms of potential reminders compared to other monuments in the scope of their categories in the city of Jakarta. As explained in the method section above, according to the borda analysis approach used, respondents as voters are asked to rank the objects of choice, in this case, three monuments include Monas and two other monuments: Pancasila Sakti Monument and Proclamation Monument, based on the potential reminder. From the data obtained through the filling of questionnaires, then analyzed the percentage of preferences, the results for the pre-millennial group are as follows:

Table 3
Respondents' preference for pre-millennial groups toward monuments in the city of Jakarta based on their potential remembrance

Object to be ranked	1st Rank	2nd Rank	3rd Rank	Point	Percentage
National Monument	16 voters	2 voters	2 voters	**34**	**0.85**
Pancasila Sakti Monument	1 voter	2 voters	17 voters	**4**	**0.1**
Proklamasi Monument	0 voters	2 voters	18 voters	**2**	**0.05**
Values	2	1	0		

The incoming questionnaire data shows the number of voters for each monument that is asked for their response regarding their respective rankings. Then the calculation is carried out for the acquisition of points from each selection of monuments; with the determination in advance of the weights for rank 1 = 2 (n-1), rank 2 = 1 (n-2) and rank 3 = 0 (n-3), so that the calculation of points gain for Monas is: (16 x 2) + (2 x 1) + (2 x 0) = **34** , for Pancasila Sakti Monument : (1 x 2) + (2 x 1) + (17 x 0) = **4** , for the Proclamation Monument: (0 x 2) + (2 x 1) +(18 x 0) = **2**. The percentage for Monas is 34/40 = **0.85** or **85%**, Pancasila Sakti Monument is 4/40 = **0.1** or **10%** Proclamation Monument is 2/40 = **0.05** or **5%**

As for the millennial group, the analysis of the percentage of preferences is:

Table 4
Respondents' preference for millennial groups towards monuments in the city of Jakarta based on their potential remembrance

Object to be ranked	1st Rank	2nd Rank	3rd Rank	Point	Percentage
Monas	14 voters	4 voters	2 voters	**32**	**0.80**
M Pancasila Sakti	2 voters	2 voters	16 voters	**6**	**0.15**
M Proklamasi	0 voters	2 voters	18 voters	**2**	**0.05**
Values	2	1	0		

Input the initial data of the questionnaire is seen above, describing the number of voters for each monument requested by the millennial group, regarding their respective rankings. Then the calculation is carried out for the acquisition of points from each selection of monuments; with the weight amount for rank 1 = 2 (n-1), rank 2 = 1 (n-2) and rank 3 = 0 (n-3), so the calculation of points gain for Monas is: (14 x 2) + (4 x 1) + (2 x 0) = **32** , for Pancasila Sakti Monument : (2 x 2) + (2 x 1) + (17 x 0) = **6** , for the Proclamation Monument: (0 x 2) + (2 x 1) +(18 x 0) = **2**. The percentage for Monas is 32/40 = **0.80** or **80 %**, Pancasila Sakti Monument is 6/40 = **0.15** or **15 %** Proclamation Monument is 2/40 = **0.05** or **5%**

After obtaining the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data above, a conclusive review of the entire data was carried out in the table below.

Figure 5
Summary of analysis of the achievement of monumentality indicators from Monas

Object of Research	Achievement of monumentality indicators		Responses from two groups of respondents		Inputs from Experts sources
The National Monument	Old Paradigm	Meets the entire 18 items of the old paradigm indicator of monumentality **(100 %)**	Preferential Analysis	**Pre Millennial** As many as **85%** chose Monas over other monuments in terms of potential reminders.	Old Paradigm The formal aspects are still distinctive with the syntax that is still strongly maintained. Similarly the complexity of the space experience in it . There is a continuity of role after the Soekarno era
	New Paradigm	Meets 5 of the 13 items of the new paradigm indiicator of monumentality **(40 %)**		**Millennial** As many as **80%** choose Monas over other monuments in terms of potential reminders	New Paradigm There are various new roles of monuments that open access for participation & public interpretation to support various events with the involvement of new technologies and media.

In the summary table above, you can see the achievement of the old paradigm monumentality indicator from Monas by 100% or fulfilled the entire 18 indicators, while the new paradigm fulfilled 5 of the 13 indicator items or obtained a percentage of 40%. When combined with old and new paradigms, the percentage of indicator fulfillment is 74%. For input from the source, the most significant thing that is summarized is the strength of the aspects of the shape of the monument, with the straightforwardness and simplicity of its structure and the continuity of dissemination of visual images through various media that greatly facilitate the process of recognition of monuments from the community. Likewise, the guarding of the internal environment of the monument along with the support of the axis, spatial shafts, and crosspoints of monument locations also maintain the contrast of the monument figure. The fact of continuity of these two aspects is in line with the determination of monumentality in one of his classical theories, namely *the primordial monumentality* of Yoshinobu Ashihara, as quoted in his postulate by Lo Angela Irena (2018, p.92). In addition, the continuity of the role of Monas is also an achievement of significant monumentality indicators, starting from the operational period of Soekarno's government era monuments to pass 6 decades as one of the important historical markers, as a means of education, city parks and open spaces for various public activities. This last aspect then also opens up a new,

wider role of monuments, as well as including factors that support the achievement of monumentality for the new paradigm, including the involvement of digital technology (*video mapping* and virtual simulations for performances, digital applications for clues for monument and museum visitors) which some things seem to be more familiar to millennials but the rest remain easily appreciated in general. for the community. This is also by the affirmation of the role of information technology and technology in accelerating the process of transforming the "closed" character indicated by the practice of isolation, inspection, and discipline in the operation of monuments to be more "open;" which offers social openness, a buffer for the diversity of aspirations and expressions of society, negotiation, and collectivity; as revealed by Tanju in an article written by Ahu Sokmenoglu (2009, p.836)

The results of the analysis of two different generation groups about their preference for monuments based on their potential reminders showed the significant numbers and percentages achieved by National Monuments compared to the other two monuments. The preference of the pre-millennial group towards Monas whose percentage is quite large (85%) was almost matched by the achievement of preferences from the millennial group (80%) which confirmed the high level of reminder from most millennial respondents about the figure of Monas. The historical knowledge and experience gap related to the existence of Monas (some pre-millennial respondents, including *baby boomers* and generation x absorbing the historical aspects of monuments more intensely than millennials) is not a barrier to obtaining significant preference achievements from millennials.

4.   CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the results of the analysis that has been conveyed above, the achievement of monumentality indicators from the object of study in this study, namely national monuments, is significant, including all indicators of the old monumentality paradigm and some important points of new monumentality indicators. While the positive response to the National Monument is also represented by the preferences of two response groups representing two generations that reach 80 and 85 percent, the achievements are equally high and not far adrift between the two. Equipped with input from research sources, it can also be affirmed if the devaluation signal against monuments that fail to respond to the needs of the times, as stated by Sigfried Giedion in the citation in section 1 above, is not proven.

Observing the results of research, there is a curiosity to see and test the specific relationship between the achievement of monumentality indicators that have been obtained with the tendency of preferences that have been analyzed in further research, where these aspects are developed into variables that are tested for causality research.

REFERENCES

Abyussa, A.F., & Aly, C. S. (2019). Lawang sewu's monumentality architecture. *RISA (Riset Arsitektur), 3*(2), 105-120. https://doi.org/10.26593/risa.v3i02.3274.105-120.

Irena, L. A., & Fauzy, B. (2018). The monumentality of modern architecture as observed in Jakarta's pola building. *RISA (Riset Arsitektur), 2*(1), 89-107. https://doi.org/10.26593/risa.v2i01.2933.89-107.

Levenson, Felix (ed). (2019) *Size matters: Understanding monumentality across ancient civilization*. Majuskel Medienproduktion.

Murwonugroho, W., & Wiyoso, A. (2020). Monumentalitas seni instalasi bambu "getah getih." *Mudra Jurnal Seni Budaya, 35*(3), 273-282. https://doi.org/10.31091/mudra.v35i3.1036.

Sökmenoğlu, A., & Türkkan, S. (2009). Digital monumentality in/for public spaces. *The New Realm Of Architectural Design*, 835.

Sugiartawan, P. & Prakoso, I.P. (2019). Sistem pendukung kelompok promosi jabatan dengan metode ahp dan borda. *Jurnal Sistem Informasi dan Komputer Terapan Indonesia, 1*(4), 185-194. https://doi.org/10.33173/jsikti.40 .

Susanto, M. (2010). *Edhi sunarso Seniman Pejuang*. PT. Hasta Kreatifa Manunggal.

Wiyoso, A. (2015). *Perubahan nilai monumentalitas pada karya monumental era pemerintahan soekarno di kota Jakarta*. Institut Teknologi Bandung.

Zis, S.F., Effendi, N. & Roem, E.R. (2021). Perubahan perilaku komunikasi generasi milenial & generasi z di era digital. *Jurnal Satwika : Kajian Ilmu Budaya dan Perubahan Sosial. 5*(1), 70-86. https://doi.org/10.22219/satwika.v5i1.15550.