Nationalism in Popular Culture:
Critical Discourse Studies on American and Indonesian Films

Herman Felani[a], Ida Rochani Adi[b], Ratno Lukito[c]

[a]*Doctoral Program of American Studies, Gadjah Mada University, herman.felani@mail.ugm.ac.id*
[b]*Professor of American Studies, Gadjah Mada University*
[c]*Professor of Law, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga*

Abstract

Many scholars have alarmed the rise of new extreme nationalism in many countries which is actively promoted by some important national and international leaders. This paper examines the discourses of nationalism in popular culture and compares them with the nationalism ideas as promoted by those political leaders. Assuming that popular culture represents the bedrock belief of the society, this study has investigated the ideology of nationalism in 10 American and 10 Indonesian films applying the discourse historical approach from Ruth Wodak and Martin Reisigl. This study has identified nine features of nationalism in American films, i.e. us against them, saving life of Americans versus taking life of enemies, individual versus institutional hero, hero as common people, anti war narratives, individual versus national interest, absence of governmental supports, white as the dominant, and superpower. While six main features of nationalism in Indonesian films are against poverty, against foreign power, against corruption, sacrifice and service for the nation, imagination as a nation, and developing the nation. This study concludes that the discourse of nationalism in American and Indonesian films do not in line with the nationalism ideas as proposed by the politicians or the government. While the politicians are campaigning new hostile nationalism, popular cultures are promoting nationalism with individual freedom and equality, striving for prosperity, and fighting poverty.

Keywords: Discourse-Historical Approach; nationalism; new nationalism; popular culture; American film; Indonesian film.

1. Introduction

The discourse of nationalism has again become a popular issue in today's global political world. Ehmsen & Scharenberg (2016) in a report for the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation in 2016 stated that "right-wing nationalist populism continues to rise throughout the Western world". One indication of the rise of new nationalism in international politics was Donald Trump's victory in the 2016 American presidential election using nationalism issue for his campaign (Bonikowski, 2019; Ehmsen & Scharenberg, 2016; Elving, 2018; Rachman, 2018; Whitehead, Perry & Baker, 2018). Another phenomena that show the growing wave of neo-nationalism are demonstrated by the leaders in Russia, Britain, Poland, India, Turkey, Philippines, China, Japan, and Hungary

(Detrow, 2016; Hirsh, 2016; Kolstø & Blakkisrud, 2016; Poonam, 2020; Postel-Vinay, 2017; Tenold, 2018). Detrow (2016) mentioned some leaders who clearly show statements and attitudes as neo-nationalists, including Nigel Farage, chair of the UK Independent Party, and Boris Johnson who led the Brexit movement; Marine Le Pen, leader of the French right-wing party, who supported restrictions of Muslim immigrants from Syria in France; and Viktor Orban, the Hungarian Prime Minister, who built a wall to restrict the entry of immigrants. Hirsh (2016) explained these global politics as 'the new nationalist are taking over', in which movement against globalization and internationalism in Europe and America using the pretext of strengthening national economy and restricting the flow of immigration.

The rise of new nationalism is also triggered by the global pandemic outbreak. The surprising spread of the corona virus disease (Covid-19), starting in Wuhan, China in November 2019, has affected more than 200 countries and territories. Legrain (2020) said that the Covid-19 outbreak was a 'gift' for 'nativist nationalists' and 'protectionists' who restricted the movement of people and goods in the form of travel bans, visa restrictions, and export and import restrictions which could ultimately lead to the death of globalization. At the time of the plague, various countries adopted policies to protect their respective countries and set aside international interests (Kirschbaum, King & Bernhard, 2020; Rudd, 2020; Vogel, 2020). Vogel (2020) stated that the worse impact of the epidemic is the loss of international philanthropy and the strengthening of nationalism which only thinks of the interests of each country. Mark Lawrence Schrad (in Politico, 2020) mentioned that Covid-19 pandemic has led to a new form of patriotism. Responding this global trend, Nigel Farage stated that 'we are all nationalist now' (Kirschbaum et al., 2020).

Nationalism has actually been predicted to be diminished and declining by most experts (Armstrong, 1982; Gellner, 1983; Hobsbawm, 2000; Kedouri, 1961; Kedouri, 1970; Smith, 1999; Tamir, 1993) and would be replaced by liberalism and globalization (Fukuyama, 1992; Ohmae, 1995; Tamir, 1993). Calhoun (1997) stated that nationalism has been declared as the past and only attracts the attention of the world when conflicts occur between nations. From the point of view of Marxism, the future is "to be nationless as was classless and religionless" (Gellner, 1983). In relation to this projection, Harari argued that the future of the world is a globalized empire ruled by elites from multiple ethnicities. Europe, which was the birthplace of a nation-state in the late 18th century, at the end of the 21st century has become the 'cemetery' of the nation-states (Brubaker, 2009).

However, the facts show that the end of nationalism is still far at sight. Formulations and predictions which propose that nationalism has or will weaken in the modern and global contexts need to be reviewed problematically. Instead of weakening and disappearing, nationalism continues to show extraordinary power. Nationalism seems to be the most successful political ideology in human history and the most powerful political force (Calhoun, 1997).

Some questions may rise from this new awakening of nationalism. Does nationalism really promote hostility of a nation against other? Is xenophobia a main feature of nationalism? Does the discourse of nationalism from the politicians represent or reflect the spirit of nationalism of the communities or laypersons of the nation? This paper is dealing with the discourse of nationalism from particular nations, namely Indonesia and America, as represented in the popular texts, especially films. In doing so, this paper applies critical perspectives, especially from the theory of ideology, trying to look at the discourse of nationalism as a very

important ideological arena of the nation-state. Film could be considered as the most sophisticated cultural product that can develop and spread very quickly (Celli, 2011). Turner (2006: 3) argued that "film is a social practice for its makers and its audience; in its narratives and meanings we can locate evidence of the ways in which our culture makes sense of itself".

This paper defines ideology from the cultural perspective. In this perspective, popular culture should be considered as representing the zeitgeist of our contemporary epoch. According to Storey (2015), "popular culture is simply culture that is widely favored or well-liked by many people". Meanwhile, van Dijk (2006) stated that: "Ideologies have both social and cognitive properties which need to be accounted for in integrated theory. Cognitively, ideologies are a special kind of social belief systems, stored in long-term memory. socially as well as cognitively, these ideological belief systems are socially shared by the members of specific social groups, or ideological communities". Those definitions show the association of popular culture with the ideology of the given society, both are shared by the community and have broad social and cultural influences. Nachbar & Lause (1992: 21) with their concept of 'house of popular culture' stated that human daily life is actually based on basic beliefs that are relatively constant, fixed, and stable. Popular culture can influence the mindset and shape the tastes of the society, which can reflect peoples' basic values and beliefs. Thus, popular culture is rooted in the bedrock beliefs and values that are relatively stable and long-lasting.

2. Methods

This study has applied the Discourse-Historical Approach from Wodak and Reisigl (Wodak, 2015; Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl & Liebhart, 2009). Wodak (2015) has dissected populist nationalism from right-wing politicians in Europe using the CDS approach. Reisigl (in Flowerdew & Richardson, 2018: 47) stated that the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) considers discourse analysis not just to be a method of language analysis, but also a multidimensional project incorporating theories and methods, methodology and empirically based research practices that yield concrete social applications. The Discourse-Historical Approach does not just look at the historical dimensions of discourses, but is more extensively concerned with the particular areas of discourse studies such as discourse and discrimination, discourse and politics, discourse and identity, discourse and history, etc.

In critical discourse analysis, film is considered as text. In this notion, text analysis is related to the meaning and form of the given text. Fairclough (1995: 58) argued: "Analysis of text needs to be multisemiotic analysis in the case of the press and television, including analysis of photographic images, layout and overall visual organization of pages, and analysis of film and sound effects. A key issue is how these other semiotic modalities interact with language in producing meanings, and how such interactions define different aesthetics for different media". Thus, in analyzing films using critical discourse analysis, it is necessary to do a multi-modal analysis to see the dynamic multi modalities and their interactions in producing meaning (Bateman & Schmidt, 2013).

Taking samples of 10 American films and 10 Indonesian films with the theme of nationalism, this research has examined the film as text to conceal the ideology in the popular culture and reveal the bedrock belief of the society. The 10 American films that have been analyzed are: Saving Private Ryan (1998), Forrest Gump (1994), The Patriot (2000), Independence Day (1996), American Sniper (2014), Born on the Fourth of July (1989), Captain America (2011), Rocky IV (1985), Team America (2004), and Argo (2012). While the 10 Indonesian films

are: Habibie & Ainun (2012), Garuda di Dadaku (2009), Naga Bonar Jadi 2 (2007), Sang Pencerah (2010), Soekarno (2013), Di Balik 98 (2015), Soegija (2012), Tanah Air Beta (2010), Garuda di Dadaku 2 (2011), and Gie (2004). These 20 films were chosen based on their popularity and polling from the viewers on Internet Movie Data Base (IMDB.Com).

3. Discourse of Nationalism in American Films

This study finds nine main features of nationalism in American films, namely: us against them; saving life of Americans versus taking life of enemies; individual/informal hero versus institutional/formal hero; hero as common, young, simple and honest people; anti war narratives; individual interest versus national interest; absence of government and institutional supports; acknowledging differences, but white is still the dominant; and superpower.

Us against them

America is depicted as always having the enemy that is considered evil. The relation is posited as 'us against them' and bringing threat to the freedom and liberty of the people. The first representation of 'us against them' is 'independence vs colonialism' as reflected in the struggle of the colonies to fight against the British for the independence as portrayed in The Patriot, where Ben Martins and his militia join the war to fight the British. The second representation of 'us against them' is 'democracy vs fascism' as illustrated by the fight between American soldiers in Normandy in the Second World War against the German (Nazi) in Saving Private Ryan and the war of the American superhero, Captain America against Hydra which is described as part of the fascist Germany. The third representation of 'us against them' is 'democracy vs communism' as reflected in the American involvement in Vietnam in

Born on the Fourth of July and Forrest Gump, also American fight against Soviet in Rocky. The war is not only displayed in the war field, but also in the sport arena such as Gump defeating Chinese athlete in China and Rocky defeating Drago the Russian Boxer in Moscow.

In a more recent setting of American films, 'us against them' is represented with the clash between America as the 'West' versus its enemy in the 'East', such as American soldiers in Iraq in American Sniper, American vs Iranian during the Iran Revolution in Argo, and American vs middle eastern terrorist and North Korea in Team America. The 'us against them' is also represented with 'security vs terrorism' which is seen as a latent enemy of America and the whole world. In this kind of representation, America is portrayed having a responsibility to police the world as parodied by Team America. Based on the historical analysis, it can be seen that most of the enemies of America represented in the movies were 'the real enemy' of at least the US Government, if it does not represent the whole American, during the American Revolution, World War II, Cold War, and more recently wars after 9/11. However, the 'us against them' is interestingly also represented with 'superpower vs unknown superpower'. In Independence Day, the United States of America and the world were unpreparedly and shockingly under alien attack with advanced technology that even can defeat the nuclear bomb as the ultimate military weapon of the US.

Saving life of Americans versus taking life of enemies

The study finds that in most of the American films, when it comes to nationalism and patriotism, there are only two options left, i.e. 'saving life of Americans' or 'taking life of the enemy'. In Saving Private Ryan, Captain Miller and his small team were sent to rescue one life of Private Ryan even if they had to

sacrifice many other life. Gump was also depicted saving life of Lieutenant Dan, his best friend Bubba, and other soldiers during the war in Vietnam. 'Saving life of American' is heroically represented by CIA Agent Tony Mendez, who ran clandestine operation to save the life of six American embassy staffs during the Iran Revolution after hundreds of days of waiting. When dealing with nationalism, 'saving life of Americans' is confronted with 'taking life of enemy'. In The Patriot, Ben Martins as a father had to kill many British soldiers who are threatening the life of his children and family. In order to stay alive, Ron Kovic and other soldiers killed many civilians, including children and women during the Vietnam War. Chris Kyle as American Sniper had to be killing machine during the operation in Iraq in order to save the life of other American soldiers. Steve Rogers who were than transformed to be Captain America had to fight Hydra in order to save his best friend, Bucky, the Winter Soldier. However, when it comes to terrorism issue, Team America parodied America as the world police that wrongly killed civilians and bringing damage to other countries during the hunt of terrorist.

Individual/informal hero versus institutional/formal hero

Most American films represent hero as informal and individual, not as institutional or formally appointed hero. Most of the hero come as volunteer such as Kovic in Born on the Fourth of July; Captain Hiller, David, and the drunken pilot in Independence Day; Ben Martins and his militia; Steve Rogers who then become the lone Captain America; Chris Kyle as the American Sniper; Rocky and Apollo in Rocky IV. Ben Martins fights with his militia on voluntary basis with much more effective strategies in attacking the British soldiers. David Levinson as 'a genius Jewish' offered his brilliance in computer science to attack the alien ship together with Captain Steven Hiller, an African American pilot who has been dreaming

to work for NASA in The Independence Day. Despite frequent rejections while enrolling as American soldier in the war, Steve Rogers in Captain America insisted that he will keep fighting for his own nation by saying the famous line 'I can do this all day'.

Hero as common, young, simple, and honest people

Hero is represented to be common people who are simple, young, talk less, and sometimes impulsive. Most of the protagonists in the films are young such as Ron Kovic who are 18 years old when he enlisted to join Marine after high school, Steve Rogers frequently rejected to enroll as American soldier when he was 25 years old, Captain Hiller was 31 years old when he served as the pilot of US Marine, and President Whitmore was 43 years old when he served as the President of USA who also served as pilot in the Gulf War in Independence Day. Ben Martin's oldest son, Gabriel Martin, was also very young and died at 18 when he joined the army to fight the British in The Patriot. Captain Hiller and Gabriel Martin were illustrated as impulsive young man who mostly just act without thinking. Gump who, was 23 years old when he joined the army to fight in Vietnam, was portrayed as a placid and naive 'child-like' character who just do something without thinking too long.

Anti-war narrative

Interestingly, most movies with nationalism or patriotism theme in this research are war movies. However, some of the movies, instead of triumphing the war campaign, they are actually delivering the message and narrative of anti-war. Kovic after returning from Vietnam, together with his childhood friend Donna, running the campaign against the Vietnam War in Born on the Fourth of July. In fact, the movie is inspired by a true story, as the director of the film, Oliver Stone, adopted the story from a biography of 'Ron Kovic' under the same title.

The actual Ron Kovic in the real life is an antiwar activist with veteran background. Following is Kovic's statement in the opening of his biography:

> I wanted people to know about the hospitals and the enema room, about why I had become opposed to the war, why I had grown more and more committed to peace and nonviolence. I had been beaten by the police and arrested twelve times for protesting the war, and I had spent many nights in jail in my wheelchair. I had been called a Communist and a traitor, simply for trying to tell the truth about what had happened in that war, but I refused to be intimidated. (Kovic, 2012)

In Forrest Gump, after returning from Vietnam, Gump met Jenny in Washington DC who was attending a demonstration against Vietnam war led by Abbie Hoffman. Gump delivered a speech in front of the mass to share his experience in the war. Although the crowd could not really hear what Gump said but the mass cheered him as a soldier opposing the war. Besides the anti-war protest, diplomacy is also another option to avoid the war. President Whitmore in Independence Day try to talk to the alien as a diplomacy to make peace with alien in order to save the life of his citizens. In Rocky IV, Rocky chose sport as his battlefield to fight Soviet's sportsman with military background. Before establishing his own militia, Benjamin Martin in The Patriot is actually opposing the war against British. As a peaceful farmer living with his children, he only decided to go war after his son was killed by the British and his oldest son, Gabriel, was captured as war prisoner. Even, the character who has returned from war and became veteran, like Chris Kyle in American Sniper, experience the war trauma. Just like Kovic, Chris Kyle's story was based on his autobiography. Kyle in his book mentioned that:

> They were protesting the wrong people. We didn't vote in Congress; we didn't vote to go to war. I signed up to protect this country. I do not choose the wars. It happens that I love to fight. But I do not choose which battles I go to. Y'all send me to them. I had to wonder why these people weren't protesting at their congressional offices or in Washington. Protesting the people who were ordered to protect them – let's just say it put a bad taste in my mouth. (Kyle, McEwen & DeFelice, 2011)

Chris decided to deal with his war trauma and helping veterans to get back to their life, although Chris himself was murdered by a mentally ill veteran he has been helping. Option other than war or military operation was chosen by Antonio 'Tony' Mendez, a CIA agent who was assigned to rescue six American diplomats from Tehran during Iranian Revolution. Tony was against the military operation and chose clandestine operation. The real character of Tony Mendez, who has published his story in a book entitled Argo: How the CIA and Hollywood Pulled Off the Most Audacious Rescue in History (2012), mentioned his disagreement to military operation:

> By late November the Pentagon had come up with a complex rescue operation called Eagle Claw. The plan called for a small group of Delta Force commandos and Army Rangers to be flown by helicopter to a remote site in the Iranian desert known as Desert One… With so many moving parts, many of us within the intelligence community felt that the plan's chances for success were low. (Mendez & Baglio, 2012: 41)

In the parody of Team America as the world police, Gary, a Hollywood actor recruited by Agent Spotswood to join the force to fight terrorist, at first throw a refusal to the proposal to join the team. After having a detour to some national monuments in Washington DC, such as Lincoln's giant statue, Capitol Hill and War Museum, Gary finally decided to join Team America and after one operation, he decided to resign and quit. Besides Gary, the war and policing act of America in Team America were also opposed by Hollywood Film Actors Guild led by the character of Alec Baldwin.

Individual interest versus national interest

Despite the common belief that nationalism is placing national interest above

private interest, most American films discussed in this research implied the other way around. Many characters in the movie commit their action for personal interest rather than public or national interest. Captain Miller and his team in Saving Private Ryan were sent to save Private Ryan because of the order from the War Department to save the only surviving child from four member of Ryan's family enlisted in the war.

In Independence Day, Captain Stephen Hiller voluntarily offer himself to fly the alien ship as a payoff for his unfulfilled dream to work for NASA as an astronaut for his own pride. While his partner, the genius Jewish, David Levinson, joined the mission to send computer virus in the alien ship in order to get back to his wife who worked for the president. Whereas, President Whitmore decided to fly the jetfighter to fight the alien as a revenge of his wife's death. In Rocky IV, Apollo voluntarily challenged Drago from Soviet for a match for his own pride. After Apollo's death, Rocky then challenge Drago to fight in Moscow as a revenge for Apollo's death. Another act driven by the willing for revenge was Ben Martin who fought the British soldier that killed his sons, Gabriel and Thomas. Captain Steve Rogers also went into the war to fight Hydra in order to save his best friend, James Barnes from infantry 107. In short, most of the heroic acts were actually driven by personal or individual interest, not a public or national interest.

Absence of government and institutional supports

Some of the main characters in the films analyzed in this research did not get any supports from government or formal institutions. Tony's mission to bring the 6 American diplomats out from Tehran was cancelled suddenly when he was almost finishing his duty. Without support from White House, his colleague in CIA and Hollywood manage to help him accomplish his mission successfully. Captain Miller and his team were fighting a great battle in his mission to save Private Ryan without adequate back up from the headquarter. In Rocky IV, Rocky went to Moscow and conduct the fight without any official supports from the government or American Boxing Federation. Captain America also managed to save the remaining members of infantry 107, including his best friend Bucky, without official support from his superior. In The Patriot, Ben Martin and his militia fight against the British without adequate supports from the regular military of the United States. He formed his own militia and he even used his sons' toys to make his own bullet. In short, most of the protagonists were fighting by their own without supports from the formal or institutional authority.

Acknowledging differences, but white is still the dominant one

In terms of multiracialism and multiculturalism, most of the American films examined in this research had tried to acknowledge different races and religions who fight together for the common purpose. Besides the white Anglo Saxon American, the films also include African American, Jewish American, Chinese American, French American, and other races and backgrounds to fight together with the protagonist. However, most of the main protagonists are still the white Anglo-Saxon American. In Saving Private Ryan, all eight personnel in Captain Miller's team are white American. In Born on the Fourth of July, Ron Kovic's friends at home and in the battle fields are also all white Americans. The Team America members are also all white Americans. Black Americans take role in Independence Day, The Patriot, Forrest Gump, Captain America, and Rocky IV, but they only play minor role or died during the fight. In The Patriot, the black people who joined the war against the British are the slaves who are not able to read and do not know

what will happen to them after the war. In Forrest Gump, Bubba, the black soldier, died in the battle before he can achieve his dream on doing business of shrimp. In Rocky IV, Apollo died in the boxing ring after fighting Drago from the Soviet. In short, although the films have tried to include Americans from various backgrounds, the white Americans with Anglo Saxon background still dominate the key roles. Other races and ethnicities only become a sort of decorative elements in the movie to give the touch of multiculturalism.

Superpower

The last feature of nationalism in American films observed in this research is American superpower. Surprisingly, Rocky who is fighting a Russian boxer with military background in Moscow as the capital of Soviet got support from all Russian people and politicians who were attending the 'live or dead' match. Rocky won and letting Drago to stay alive although his best friend, Apollo were killed by Drago. Considering that this film was made in 1985 before the fall of Soviet, this narrative can be seen as a statement of American superpower against Soviet rivalry during the Cold War.

In Independence Day, before leading the international military operation to fight against the alien, President Whitmore as the President of USA delivered a monumental speech to represent all nations and to reiterate the American superpower:

> Good morning. In less than an hour, aircraft from here will join others from around the world, and you will be launching the largest aerial battle in the history of mankind. Mankind. That word should have new meaning for all of us today. We can't be consumed by our petty differences anymore. We will be united in our common interests. Perhaps it's fate that today is the Fourth of July, and you will once again be fighting for our freedom. Not from tyranny, oppression, or persecution… but from annihilation. We're fighting for our right to live. To exist. And should we win the day, the Fourth of July will

no longer be known as an American holiday, but as the day when the world declared in one voice: We will not go quietly into the night! We will not vanish without a fight! We're going to live on! We're going to survive! Today we celebrate our Independence Day!

4. Discourse of Nationalism in Indonesian Films

From the 10 Indonesian films, this study finds six main features of nationalism, i.e. against poverty, against foreign power, against corruption, sacrifice and service for the nation, imagination as a nation, and developing the nation.

Against Poverty

Almost all Indonesian films discussed in this article bring up the poverty problems into the screen. We can see the problem of poverty from the situation of Tatiana as a teacher and other villagers living near the border of Indonesia and Timor Leste in Tanah Air Beta, the poor becak driver in Bandung and monetary crisis in the end of 1990s from Ainun and Habibie, hunger and poverty in 1960's Indonesia in Gie, the poor girl who lived in the cemetery in Garuda di Dadaku, poor village near Naga's house in Naga Bonar Jadi 2, and the scenes of the disabled scavenger and his son in Di Balik 98. Interestingly, the poor societies are also shown in the historical-background films, such as poverty of the people living in Kauman and Kraton areas in Yogyakarta in the end of 1880s in Sang Pencerah, and poverty in Dutch and Japanese colonial eras in Soekarno and Soegija. Poverty has been the common enemy highlighted in most Indonesian films examined in this research. Even the narration of fighting against poverty is stronger than the common belief that the main threat to Indonesian freedom is the foreign domination.

Against foreign power

The second discourse of nationalism in Indonesian films is the fight against foreign countries. Classic texts on Indonesian nationalism always perceive that the main threat to Indonesian freedom is the foreign domination and colonialism. However, from the 10 films examined in this research, this framing only portrayed in the films with colonial settings such as Soekarno and Soegija. In Naga Bonar Jadi 2, the old Naga Bonar asking his son to cancel the deal with the Japanese businessman because of his past memory about Japanese occupation in Indonesia. Whereas, Gie, Sang Pencerah, Di Balik 98, Tanah Air Beta, and Garuda Di Dadaku deal more with national issues and conflict between the elites and the people. However, the sentiment against foreign power is also expressed using sport competition in Garuda di Dadaku 2.

Against corruption

Besides the poverty, corruption is also framed as an important issue in most Indonesian films discussed in this article. The corrupt administration of Soekarno in 1960s was highlighted in Gie, while the corrupt New Order government was portrayed in Di Balik 98. Frequently, the corporates were also depicted as the corrupt parties, such as the businessman who tried to bribe Habibie with money and women in Habibie dan Ainun, Naga's college who tried to do bribery to smoothen his business in Naga Bonar Jadi 2, and the corrupt football management board in Garuda di Dadaku and its sequel Garuda di Dadaku 2.

Sacrifice and service for the nation

Most narratives of nationalism in Indonesian film put personal interest below the public or common interest. This is contradictory with the findings in the American films. Most of the protagonists made sacrifice and put aside their personal interest for the sake of many people and national interest. The national figures and heroes like Soekarno, Soegija, Ahmad Dahlan, Habibie, Soe Hok Gie depicted in the films of living uncomfortably and sometimes away from their family for the sake of the country. Ordinary people like Tatiana as a teacher in poor area, the soldier in Di Balik 98 who need to face his own sister during Reformation demonstration, and Naga Bonar as a war veteran, tried to give their contributions to the nation through certain roles that they can play from their social status.

Imagination as a nation

As stated by Ben Anderson that Indonesia is one of the best example of imagined community. The narratives of Indonesian's imagination of being one nation can be seen in the films discussed in this article. It is hard to see the similarities of all the films due to the diversity of the stories, backgrounds and histories of each film. What is common to all films in framing the nationalism is expressed in symbolic forms such as in the flag, national anthem and songs. In Garuda di Dadaku 2, the flag and song enlighten the nationalism spirit during the football match versus the team from another country. The flag and national songs can be found in almost all films to echo the spirit of nationalism.

Developing the nation

The last framing of nationalism in Indonesian films is the message of development. Education is highlighted to be the main weapon to give the freedom to the people. Tanah Air Beta, Habibie dan Ainun, Soekarno, and Sang Pencerah put the teaching scene in the films to emphasize the importance of education. While Naga Bonar Jadi 2 and Garuda di Dadaku framed the importance of sport, especially football, for building a strong nation. Di Balik 98 and Gie pointed out the importance of higher education to be the critical institution to ensure the development is free from corrupt government.

5. Conclusion

We can highlight the differences between the nationalism discourses in American and Indonesian films which are distinctive in five aspects, namely the enemy, happiness to be achieved, the goal of the nation, and the unity of the nation. The enemy in American films are always something that may threat liberty freedom such as fascism, communism, terrorism, and the unknown represented as something 'alien' for the American people. Whereas in Indonesian films, the enemies are consistently perceived as poverty, illiteracy, corruption, and foreign domination. In American films, individual interest should be placed at the top priority. Thus, personal and family need will always come first. However, Indonesian films framed the value of nationalism should be based on personal sacrifice and collective interest. The last difference is related with how American and Indonesian films perceived the unity of the nation. Americans acknowledge the diversity and multiculturalism in the nation, but it turned out that most of the American films still put the white Anglo Saxon and English-Speaking American as the main protagonist, while other ethnicities are in the auxiliary position. However, Indonesians are still imagining themselves as one nation, the imagined Indonesia.

This study concludes that the discourse of nationalism in American and Indonesian films do not in line with the nationalism ideas as proposed by the politicians or the government. In America, the current right-wing politicians, such as Donald Trump, use the discourse of nationalism to legitimize the identity-based political and social policy making that prioritizes the interests of particular groups that are considered more superior, in this case the groups included in the White, Anglo-Saxon, and Protestant (WASP). The argument to save the interests and safety of the people in the country first becomes the justification of isolationism policy of nationalist. The politicians from the right wing do not take side on the globalist meaning that America will prioritize the domestic affair above the world outside America. This discourse of nationalism from the politicians is contrary to the basic values of democracy and the founding principles of America.

The discourse of nationalism from the politician is not the same with what framed in the popular culture, especially in American films. Individualism becomes the main and basic values of American nationalism where personal interest and freedom should be on the top of the priority list. Everything that threat the freedom and liberty such as fascism, communism, terrorism, and others will be the enemy of America. Although diversity is acknowledged by the Americans, the white and Anglo-Saxon people still hold dominant roles in the society. Instead of demanding more to the government, it is framed in American films that the people are more self-reliant.

In Indonesia, politicians frame nationalism as a threat to foreign powers that threaten the sovereignty, honor, and wealth of the nation. They are offering economic nationalism as the solution to distort people from criticizing the economic and political failures from the colonial era to the present. However, this framing of nationalism was critically challenged by popular media such as Indonesian films with their discourses of nationalism that highlight the problem of poverty, corruption, and issues of development. This research recommends further studies to examine why the discourse of nationalism in politics is not in line with the nationalism in popular culture. Future research may take primary data directly from the citizens to obtain social discourse of nationalism within the people.

References

Armstrong, J.A. (1982). Nations Before Nationalism. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Bateman, J.A. & Schmidt, K.H. (2013). Multimodal Film Analysis: How Films Mean. New York: Routledge.

Bonikowski, B. (2019). Trump's populism: the mobilization of nationalist cleavages and the future of U.S. democracy. In K. Weyland & R. Madrid (Eds.), When Democracy Trumps Populism: Lessons from Europe & Latin America (11–131). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brubaker, R. (2009). Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calhoun, C. (1997). Nationalism. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Celli, C. (2011). National Identity in Global Cinema: How Movies Explain the World. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Detrow, S. (2016). From "Brexit" to Trump, nationalist movements gain momentum around world. National Public Radio, https://www.npr.org/2016/06/25/483400958/from-brexit-to-trump-nationalist-movements-gain-momentum-around-world.

Ehmsen, S. & Scharenberg, A. (Eds.). (2016). Trump and The Rise of The Nationalist: Examining How Trump Won the US Presidency. www.rosalux-nyc.org.

Elving, R. (2018). What is a nationalist in the age Of Trump? NPR, https://www.npr.org/2018/10/24/660042653/what-is-a-nationalist-in-the-age-of-trump.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Media Discourse. Wiltshire: Arnold.

Flowerdew, J. & Richardson, J.E. (Eds.). (2018). The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies. Oxford: Routledge.

Fukuyama, F. (1992). The End of History and the Last Man. New York: Free Press.

Gellner, E. (1983). Nation and Nationalism: New Perspectives on the Past. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Ltd.

Hirsh, M. (2016). Why the new nationalists are taking over. Politico, 1.8. https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/06/nationalism-donald-…boris-johnson-brexit-foreign-policy-xenophobia-isolationism-213995.

Hobsbawm, E.J. (2000). Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality. Cambridge University Press.

Kedouri, E. (1961). Nationalism. London: Hutchinson University Library.

Kedouri, E. (Ed.). (1970). Nationalism in Asia and Africa. London: Frank Cass.

Kirschbaum, E., King, L. & Bernhard, M. (2020). Nationalism rears its head as Europe battles coronavirus with border controls. https://www.latimes.com/world-nation/story/2020-03-19/nationalism-could-rear-its-head-as-europe-battles-coronavirus.

Kolstø, P. & Blakkisrud, H. (Eds.) (2016). The New Russian Nationalism: Imperialism, Ethnicity and Authoritarianism 2000-2015. Edinburg University Press.

Kovic, R. (2012). Born on the Fourth of July. Akashic Books.

Kyle, C., McEwen, S. & DeFelice, J. (2011). American Sniper. www.AmericanSniperBook.com

Legrain, P. (2020). The coronavirus is killing globalization as we know it. Foreign Policy, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/03/12/coronavirus-killing-globalization-nationalism-protectionism-trump/

Mendez, A. & Baglio, M. (2012). Argo: How the CIA and Hollywood Pulled Off the Most Audacious Rescue in History. Rio de Janeiro: Intrinseca.

Nachbar, J. & Lause, K. (Eds.). (1992). Popular Culture: An Introductory Text. Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press.

Ohmae, K. (1996). The End of the Nation State: the Rise of Regional Economies. New York: Free Press.

Politico. (2020). Coronavirus will change the world permanently, here's how. Politico, https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2020/03/19/coronavirus-effect-economy-life-society-analysis-covid-135579.

Poonam, S. (2020). The 3 most polarizing words in India. Foreign Policy, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/02/13/jai-shri-ram-india-hindi/

Postel-Vinay, K. (2017). How neo-nationalism went global. The Conversation, https://theconversation.com/how-neo-nationalism-went-global-74095.

Rachman, G. (2018). Donald Trump leads a global revival of nationalism. Financial Times, https://www.ft.com/content/59a37a38-7857-11e8-8e67-1e1a0846c475.

Rudd, K. (2020). COVID-19 Trumps nationalism. Project Syndicate, https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/coronavirus-nationalist-response-fails-by-kevin-rudd-2020-03.

Smith, A.D. (1999). Myths and Memories of the Nation. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Storey, J. (2015). Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: An Introduction. London & New York: Routledge.

Tamir, Y. (1993). Liberal Nationalism. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tenold, V. (2018). Everything You Love will Burn: Inside the Rebirth of White Nationalism in America. New York: Nation Books.

Turner, G. (2006). Film as Social Practice (3rd ed.). Routledge.

van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Politics, ideology and discourse. Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics (728–740). https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00722-7.

Vogel, P. (2020). Nationalism: the even greater risk of the Covid-19 crisis. https://www.imd.org/research-knowledge/articles/Nationalism-the-even-greater-risk-of-the-COVID-19-crisis/

Whitehead, A.L., Perry, S.L. & Baker, J.O. (2018). Make America Christian again: Christian nationalism and voting for Donald Trump in the 2016 Presidential Election. Sociology of Religion, 79(2), 147–171. https://doi.org/10.1093/socrel/srx070.

Wodak, R. (2015). The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean. London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. & Liebhart, K. (2009). The Discursive Construction of National Identity (2nd ed.). Edinburg University Press.