islam nusantara

Journal for the Study of Islamic History and Culture

islam nusantara

Journal for the Study of Islamic History and Culture

islam nusantara

Table of Contents

Riwanto Tirtosudarmo

Managing Multicultural Society in Indonesia, with Jakarta as a Show Case National Research and Innovation Agency

tirtosudarmo@yahoo.com

Abstract:

This paper attempts to employ several concepts develop in the west to resolve social and political conflict in a multicultural society. The concept of interculturalism recently proposed as an alternative to the concept of multiculturalism and its related policy considered as a failure will be reviewed to get the perspective to view multicultural problems in Jakarta. In the wake of a recent local election, Jakarta has been rocked by a series of demonstration by Islamic groups against Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (Ahok) the Jakarta's mayor, a Chinese-Christian that accused to denigrate Islam in one of his speech. After a heated campaign from both sides, Basuki who run for the second term controversially lost in a small margin to Anis Baswedan, his rival, an Arabic descent and a Muslim. The election was highly contentious as the supporter of Anies aggressively using Islam as the rallying cry to defeat Ahok. The political development that shows the increasing political pressures from the Islamic groups alarmingly polarized the population into sectarian politics and breaking up the previously multi-cultural coexistence. The multi-cultural issues in Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia, a Muslim majority country, could provide a good case of problem in governing a culturally diverse country, in the non-Western society. What is the hindrance in employing the Western concept, particularly citizenship, given the different historical trajectory for such an urban multicultural society like Jakarta? The

paper would like to contribute into the debate on the problem of multicultural society from the experience of a non-Western country.

Keywords: multiculturalism, plural society, citizenship, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstrak

Tulisan ini mencoba menggunakan beberapa konsep yang berkembang di Barat untuk menyelesaikan konflik sosial dan politik dalam sebuah masyarakat multikultural. Konsep inter-kulturalisme yang baru-baru ini diajukan sebagai alternatif dari konsep multi-kulturalisme dan kebijakan terkaitnya --yang dianggap gagal--akan diulas untuk mendapatkan perspektif dalam melihat permasalahan multikultural di Jakarta. Setelah pemilihan kepala daerah baru-baru ini, Jakarta telah diguncang oleh serangkaian demonstrasi oleh kelompok-kelompok Islam terhadap Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (Ahok) Gubernur Jakarta, seorang Tionghoa-Kristen yang dituduh merendahkan Islam dalam salah satu pidatonya. Setelah kampanye panas dari kedua belah pihak, Basuki yang mencalonkan diri untuk masa jabatan kedua secara kontroversial kalah tipis dari Anis Baswedan, saingannya, seorang keturunan Arab dan seorang Muslim. Pemilihan itu sangat kontroversial karena pendukung Anies secara agresif menggunakan Islam sebagai seruan untuk mengalahkan Ahok. Perkembangan politik yang menunjukkan meningkatnya tekanan politik dari kelompok-kelompok Islam secara mengkhawatirkan membuat masyarakat terpolarisasi ke dalam politik sektarian dan memecah koeksistensi yang sebelumnya multikultural. Isu multikulturalisme di Jakarta, ibu kota negara Indonesia yang mayoritas penduduknya beragama Islam, dapat menjadi contoh kasus yang menarik terkait bagaimana mengatur negara yang beragam budayanya, dalam masyarakat non-Barat. Apa hambatan dalam menerapkan konsep Barat, khususnya kewarganegaraan, mengingat lintasan sejarah yang berbeda untuk masyarakat multikultural perkotaan seperti Jakarta? Tulisan ini ingin berkontribusi dalam perdebatan tentang masalah masyarakat multikultural dari pengalaman negara non-Barat.

Kata Kunci: Multikulturalisme, Masyarakat Majemuk, Kewarganegaraan, Jakarta, Indonesia

الملخص

يحاول هذا البحث استعمال عدّة المفاهيم الفكرية التي تتطوّر في الغرب لمعالجة الصراعات الإجتماعية والسياسية في مجتمع متعدد الثقافات. كان مفهوم التداخل بين الثقافات (-inter culturalism) الذي يطرح في هذه الآونة المتأخرة أصبح بديلا عن مفهوم التعددية الثقافية (multi-culturalism) التقليدية والقرارات التي تتعلق به – والتي باتت فاشلة التنفيذ. وسيكون هذا المفهوم الجديد محور دراسة هذا المقال، ليحصل على منظور جديد في البحث عن قضايا التعددية الثقافية في مجتمع مدينة جاكرتا. فعبد انتخابة رئيس بلدية جاكرتا في السنوات الماضية، واجهتْ جاكرتا موجات المظاهرات تقوم بها مجموعات من الإسلاميين المحافظين ضد

السيد باسوكي جاهجا فورناما الشهير باسم أخوق (رئيس بلدية جاكرتا سابقا)، والذي يرجع أصله من خلفية الأقلية المسيحية الصينية. وقد اتُّهم (أخوق) بقضية كراهية الإسلام والمساس بكرامته في احدى خطاباته. وفي موسم انتخابة رئيس بلدية جاكرتا العاصمة للفترة التالية، قام (أخوق) بترشيح نفسه للمرة الثانية، وهو يواجه منافسه في الجهة الأخرى، وهو السيد أنيس باسويدان ذو خلفية الأغلبية الإسلامية العربية. أصبحت أيام انتخابة رئيس بلدية جاكرتا العاصمة في جوّ ساخن متوتّر ومضطرب، حيث أن كلا الطرفين يشنّان حربا انتخابية ضريسة لم يشهد لها مثيل في التاريخ الإندونيسي. وأصبح الثاني (باسويدان) هو الفائز بفرق الأصوات البسيط. وقد انتهج مشجعو (باسويدان) سياسات الكراهية الدينية والعنصرية في حملاتهم الانتخابية، ليغلبوا على طرف (أخوق).

وهذه الحالة قد أثّرتْ تأثيرا عظيما في خريطة السياسة الوطنية الإندونيسية فيما بعد، حيث ارتفعتْ الضغوطات السياسية من قبل تيار الإسلاميين المحافظين، والتي قد تجرّ المجتمع الجاكرتاوي الى الاستقطاب الإجتماعي والسياسة الطائفية، بل تفكّ عروة الوحدة داخل التعددية الثقافية التي يتمسّك بها مجتمع جاكرتا من قبل، والتي أصبحتْ رمزا وهوية للمجتمع الجاكرتاوي. فقضية التعددية الثقافية عند مجتمع جاكرتا، التي هي عاصمة جمهورية إندونيسيا والتي كان أغلب سكانها مسلمين، تستطيع أن تصبح مثالا ونموذجا يتعلق بكيفية تدبير وإدارة الدولة ذات الثقافات المتعددة، في مجتمع خارج عالم الغرب. فما هي العوائق في تطبيق مفاهيم غربية، خصوصا المواطنة، نظرا للظروف التاريخية والإجتماعية المختلفة مع الغرب، خصوصا في مجتمع متعدد الثقافات مثل جاكرتا؟ فهذا البحث سيعطي إسهاما ملحوظا في قضية مجتمع متعدد الثقافات خارج سياق العالم الغربي.

الكلمات الإرشادية: التعددية الثقافية، المجتمع المتعدد، المواطنة، جاكرتا، إندونيسيا

Introduction

Value laden concepts, such as democracy, citizenship and multiculturalism are the product of a Western social and political development. Those concepts are a product of particular history in the contexts of industrialization and post-industrialization society. In the aftermath of World War II, the decolonization process in Africa, Asia and Latin America produced independence states yet prove to be very slow and even stagnant development that is then called the Third World following the intensified rivalry between the Liberal-Capitalist countries or the First World and the Socialist-Communist countries or the Second World. The Cold War, between the First and the Second World, that eventually ended with the collapse of Socialist-Communist countries, mainly Soviet Union, leaving the Liberal-Capitalist countries alone in the apex of global power yet what is predicted by Francis Fukuyama (1992) as the end of history prove to be untrue. While another protagonist of the triumphant of Western democratic liberalism, Samuel Huntington (1996) propagated a new world order and a warning of clash of civilization, between the Western liberal democracy

and the non-Western civilization, such as Islam, Confucianism, Hinduism etc. The 9/11 terrorist attack on WTC in New York in 2001, some Huntingtonians argued the proof of what is predicted and the War on Terror began. Again, the world is then geopolitically divided into us and them, by the Western ideologists.

While globalization has been around long before, through, among others, Western colonization, following the World War II and the decolonization process, technological revolution in transportation and communication, has speed up the movement and flow of capital, information and people. Flow of people, documented or undocumented, began its momentum following the end of World War II, in which the creation of Refugee Convention in 1952 provide the legal basis for the signatory countries, mostly in Western Europe, to process the selection of dislocated people after the war and asylum seekers seeking refugees of political persecution from their unfriendly countries. The Western industrialized countries adhered into the liberal democracy and separation of state and religion growing prosperously while the post-colonial countries and many of the ex socialist-communist countries grappling with their new nation-states in many cases plagued with growing in population size and economically stagnant or slow in progress. Industrialization as occurred in the west mostly is non-existent, poverty is rampant and political corruption becomes impediment for political stability. The previous division between the Western and Eastern blocks is replaced by the north-rich-industrialized and the south-poor-underdeveloped countries. As globalization increasingly affected all corner of the world, the growing economic inequality between the north and the south provide another momentum for movement of people, economic migrants conspicuously mixture with political refugees; heading their flow into the Western and rich countries. Inside the countries in the south, movement of people occurred, also for economic and political reasons, created both internally displaced people (IDPs) as well economic migrants, flocking from rural into urban areas.

Against those backgrounds that occurred at the global levels, this paper is an attempt, to look into the Western created concepts of multiculturalism, interculturalism and citizenship; adopting and applying within the context of social and political development in Indonesia. In achieving the aim, this paper will be divided into four parts. After this introduction, the first part of the paper will review the concepts, by reading selected writings on multiculturalism, interculturalism and citizenships that are considered relevance for the Indonesian contexts. The second part exposes the challenges of managing Indonesia's multicultural society by looking at the political development of the country since its independence. In the third part, the case of Jakarta will be exposed to demonstrate the empirical situation in which a multicultural city, Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia, is almost tearing apart, as a result of increasing politics of identity, in the 2017 Gubernatorial Election. Jakarta is a show case of intricate politics of managing difference in a non-Western country that still grappling with economic development and political stability. A conclusion will be presented in the final part.

Multiculturalism, Interculturalism and Citizenship

Migration underlies the creation of multicultural societies in the Western countries. The constantly flow of people heading towards the rich-industrialized countries, in Europe, North America, East Asia, Australia and New Zealand; motivated by various economic,

political and social reasons, throughout different historical trajectories have formed multicultural societies. The experiences of multicultural societies as primarily resulted from in-migration as occurred in the rich industrialized countries constituted a major different with many countries in the south and economically poorer countries, such as India and Indonesia, just to mention two demographically big countries. In India and Indonesia, in-migration from other countries, with the exception perhaps of the Assam region in India, is insignificant in the creation of a multicultural society. Multicultural society, in India and Indonesia, is a result of the creation of a nation-state following the decolonization process after the World War II. The different ethnicities were brought together by the British, in the case of India, and by the Dutch, in the case of Indonesia; into a single nation-state after their declaration of independence from the long European colonialism. The different historical trajectories in the creation of current multicultural society between India and Indonesia on the one hand and the rich industrialized countries resulted in the different social and political contexts that might have implicated in the appropriateness of translating various concepts that are related in the effort to manage a multicultural society.

According to Tariq Modood (in Antonsich, 2016) citizenship is the core concept in any discussion about ideological principles in governing or managing the society. Citizenship, according to Modood, is a form of membership, a relationship between people or individual, which has to be expressed or articulated within an ethical, principled framework, which is informed by key ideas such as liberty, equality, fraternity or unity and democracy. He further argued that in liberal theories, citizenship is principally understood in terms of the relationship between the individual and the state. So, citizenship is primarily thought as rights against the state. However, he noted, there are more republican conceptions of citizenship, as well as of multicultural citizenship, in which a vertical relation between an individual and the state is complemented by a horizontal relation between citizens. Citizenship, Modood concluded, therefore, is the ethic of civility, the ethics of how we relate to each other as citizens and not just rights against the state. Crucial concept implying within our understanding of the concept of citizenship, according to Modood, is the concept of equality. This scholar found the deficit in the idea of equal citizenship as the ideological principle in liberalism when it comes to the notion of diversity. Multiculturalism, according to him, found the problem inequality in the basic concept of equality, and multiculturalism responds to that equality deficit by arguing that we need a supplementary concept of equality in order to properly have equal citizenship in the context of diversity. Moodod (in Antonsich, 2016: 481) further noted:

> *This secondary concept of equality is not to replace the first, but rather to supplement it. It may be understood as the right to have one's difference recognized and supported in both the public and private spheres. So no group, no minority for instance, can be told we will tolerate your difference; but please do not bring it into the public space, do it in your own space somewhere; do it at the weekend, do it in your community, but do not make demands on mainstream public institutions. The multicultural response is that this is not equality. Equality is that minorities can make a comparable demand to share the public space as the majority does. So, whilst classical liberalism is about the first concept of equality, multiculturalism is about two concepts of equality, because it is supplemented by the second. It follows then that multicultural equality is more than individual*

rights and more than what we might call colour-blind equality, equality as sameness. Let me emphasise – because so many people take multiculturalism to be saying the opposite – nothing I have said is about separatism or primacy of ethnic identity. It is certainly about the inclusion of ethnic identity, but it is not about which identity is primary or secondary. Rather, we should understand these two concepts of equality in terms of what is unreasonable or unjust in the treatment of minorities.[1]

Following Tariq Moodod arguments, we then understand that the idea or concept of multiculturalism, and then interculturalism, is created in the Western liberal democracies, in relation to the increasing tension between majority and minority group of people, within a particular nation-state. We could trace back the literatures on multiculturalism in various Western industrialized countries, as each country increasingly confronted by realities of the existence of minority groups. The respected nation-state has to accommodate, under the ethical principles of their liberal democracy the justified demand of these minority groups. The idea of multiculturalism, as noted by Ted Cantle (in Antonsich, 2016) has begun to be introduced since the 1960s and 1970s in the West, and translated into various forms of multicultural policies. He argued that multiculturalism as an idea and as a policy are proved to be failed in accommodating the different cultural identities, as we are now living in a completely different world, in which the dynamics of diversity and personal and collective identities have fundamentally changed. Cantle (in Antonsich, 2016: 472) further argued that:

> Academic multicultural texts over many decades have failed to recognize the modern realities in a number of respects. Firstly, difference no longer revolves around the interface between minority(ies) and the majority community. Of course this 'difference' is still a significant factor, but difference is now also defined internationally: by diasporas, by social media, by business and commercial forces and by a whole range of other transnational influences that simply were not accessible to the same degree, nor were they in the public sphere decades ago. And of course, difference is no longer defined by 'race'. Whilst this remains very salient for many people, multiculturalists have often completely ignored all other forms of diversity: gender, disability, sexual orientation, sectarian and faith differences, mental health, age and intergenerational conflict. It just saw difference as defined by the dominant race (and class) agenda, defined by the 1960s and 1970s. Multiculturalists did discuss one other important 'difference', that of nationality, but generally only in terms of how the majority in any country had to adapt to incoming minorities. And again, this remains an important dialectic process, but there has been a failure to see the majority identity itself as developmental and constantly changing as a result of a range of influences. Multicultural theory has, for example, rarely considered the fundamental challenge posed to majority identities as a result of de-industrialisation and globalisation and

---

1   Antonsich, M. (2016). 'Interculturalism versus multiculturalism – The Cantle-Modood debate'. *Ethnicities, 16* (3), 470-493. doi: 10.1177/1468796815604558.

other international processes, and has tended to reinforce the notion that it is under threat from internal pressures, particularly as a result of immigration.[2]

Cantle (in Antonsich, 2016) then argued that the idea of multiculturalism and its related policies no longer able to respond the new challenges of what is called, following Vertovec (2007) as "super diversity" that threatened majority identities. Ted Cantle and other scholars began to introduce what is described as interculturalism as an alternative for multiculturalism that is perceived as a failure. Cantle argued that plurality and difference that eventually will become the norm and change the majority-minority dynamics should be seen not as threat. According to Cantle (2016) the problem is how to break the barrier and segregation to provide opportunities for people to recognize commonalities. Cantle (in Antonsich, 2016: 277) argued that what we need is:

> Creating shared spaces, where people can encounter people who are different from themselves does change attitudes: it can disconfirm stereotypes, undermine prejudice and actually ensure that people are much more comfortable with diversity. This has never been recognised by multiculturalists who generally ignored evidence from other disciplines and 'contact theory' and other models of interpersonal and inter-communal dialogue has been almost completely absent from the debate about multiculturalism and difference, whereas it is central to interculturalism.

As discussed in this part, the concept of multiculturalism has been criticized by scholars for no longer being able to respond the rapid changes in the society, particularly due to the de-industrialisation and globalisation. In order to answer the challenges of "multiculturalism", particularly to strengthen equality in citizenship, Modood proposed "the second equality concept" emphasizing the inclusion of ethnic identity without arguing which identity is primary or secondary. Meanwhile, Cantle suggested "interculturalism" creating shared spaces enabling different people to encounter. While this part discusses the multiculturalism and those relevance concepts in the Western context, the next part will describe it from the experiences of Indonesian multicultural society.

Indonesia's Challenging Multicultural Society

Indonesia - an archipelago with its geography approximately the size of the whole of Western Europe and the world's fourth largest country in terms of population – is constantly challenged by problems of political integration and the striking of a balance between territorial boundaries, ethnicities and religions. Conflicts over territory, ethnicity and religion have intensified in the beginning of *Reformasi* (at the end of 1990s) as the country enters a transitional period, in which decentralization and regional autonomy have together become the major contentious political issues. Regional and local assertions and counter claims over territorial boundaries in the name of ethnic and other collective cultural identities have emerged in response to the political and economic opportunities surfacing with the implementation of new decentralization policies.

---

2   Antonsich, M. (2016). 'Interculturalism versus multiculturalism – The Cantle-Modood debate'. *Ethnicities, 16* (3), 470-493. doi: 10.1177/1468796815604558.

The challenge of managing a multi-ethnic society can be traced back to the origin of Indonesia as a nation-state. The Indonesian state was created in an emergency situation. The days prior to the declaration of Independence on 17th of August, 1945 were very tense. The abrupt changes after the Japanese military surrendered to the allies created a brief political vacuum that provided the opportunity for a group of young radical nationalists to press their older nationalist leaders to declare the independence. Several months before this, under the auspices of a Japanese military general, the nationalist leaders - representing different political factions - conducted a series of meetings to prepare the state constitution of their imagined nation. The meetings were high-strung and the debate on the state's philosophical foundation touched on the most contentious issues. As the Japanese surrendered, the meetings ended before reaching their final conclusions.

After Independence, the content of the first Constitution was, therefore, adopted mostly from the results of the pre-Independence meetings.[3] The five principles (*Pancasila*): (1) Belief in one God; (2) A just and civilized humanity; (3) National unity; (4) People's rule through consultation and representation; and (5) Social justice were agreed on to provide the philosophical foundation of the state. The Constitution opens with a Preamble that is a slight elaboration on the five principles, in which the notion of *persatuan* rather than *kesatuan* is incorporated. Both words derive from the Indonesian *satu,* meaning 'one', but while *persatuan* means, roughly, the process of becoming one, *kesatuan* means the condition of being one. Put another way, *persatuan* emphasizes the process of unification from diversity, whereas *kesatuan* stresses on homogeneity. While *persatuan* implies the importance of differences and heterogeneity, *kesatuan* emphasizes the concepts of oneness and uniformity. The strong engagement of the first generation of nationalist leaders with civic nationalism rather than ethnic nationalism constitutes their commitment to the enhancement of political diversity more than just uniformity. Such nationalist feelings imply an appreciation of the 'federal idea' as the basis for state formation despite the unitary structures.[4]

Although the Dutch failed to establish a federal state in 1947-1949, it triggered off a strong reaction from the masses and stimulated strong opinions about unity and unitarism. This was the beginning of a prevailing perception that Indonesia has to be formatted as a unitary state. A fragile political agreement between the strong nationalist group (the republicans) and those promoting federalism was temporarily formed. On the 17th of August, 1950, the deal between the republicans and the so called federalists ended as the nationalist leaders decided to form a unitary state as opposed to following the federal idea. However, the idea of *persatuan* implicated in the Preamble to the Constitution since then shifted towards the idea of *kesatuan* in which the notion of unity is advocated while differences should be avoided. The format of the Indonesian state shifted from the Republic of Indonesia (1945-1946) to the Federal State of Indonesia (1947-1949) and finally to the Unitary State of Indonesia (1950-present).

---

3   For a concise description of the tense and rapidly changing political situations in the days surrounding the declaration of Independence, see Ricklefs (1981), especially Chapter 16 and 17.

4   The term 'federal idea' is borrowed from Bob Rae's paper 'Federal Idea and Secession' given at the Bandaranaike Peace Institute, Colombo, Sri Lanka, on 27 July 2003. He argues that the 'federal idea' provides more room for discussion while the 'ism' in federalism has a way of limiting debate and understanding.

In 1955, a decade after the abrupt declaration of Independence, Indonesia's first general election was conducted to choose the peoples' representatives in the parliament. The long process of political debate and deliberation among the members of parliament to draft a new Constitution on the one hand, and the increasing regional rebellions on the other, created a feeling of distrust among the military elites towards the politicians. This, in turn, pushed the President to decree in 1959 the abolishment of the Parliament and return to the first Constitution of Indonesia.[5] Indonesia then entered a long period of authoritarian government, in which the military influence over the nation has been pivotal in Indonesian politics. The tensions between the military and the Communist Party that resulted in the 1965 tragic loss of life forced Sukarno into a corner and elevated Suharto to become the new President, facilitating the authoritarian regime under the first Constitution, to continue. The Suharto period of government strongly based on a centralist (Javanese?) bureaucratic polity, economic technocracy and military leadership, deepened the mysticizing of the unitary state format.[6] In 1998, almost four decades after the Presidential Decree to return to the first Constitution (5 July, 1959), a second set of revisions of the Constitution began, following the end of Suharto's authoritarian regime, which was triggered off by the economic crisis and strong political opposition coinciding with waves of student demonstrations.

One major issue that quickly emerged in the public discourse after the stepping down of Suharto on 21 May, 1998, was the political demand to reformat the structural relationship between the central and regional governments. The long existing unequal relationships between these divisions of the state is regarded as the root cause of vertical as well as horizontal political and economic inequalities (Lay, 2003). While the need to reformat the institutional arrangements between the central and regional governments was tangible, it could not be accomplished without revising the Constitution. The state Constitution only broadly mentioned and inadequately specified matters concerning the role and authority of the local governments *vis a vis* the national government. In the public discussion, interestingly, the long suppressed idea of federalism and the federalist state - that since the early1950s had been perceived by political elites as taboo, emerged as one of the alternative political formats. At the state level, in response to the growing demand to reformat the structure of the relationship between the central and regional governments, President B J Habibie in 1998 established a team consisting mostly of academics (political scientists) to formulate the new laws on regional government that could provide the legal basis for the restructuring process.

One of the issues arising in the discussion among academics on implementing the idea of federalism concerned the question of whether or not Indonesia should take the formal structure of a federal state or just adopt its substance.[7] Adopting only the substance of

---

5   Ricklefs (1981), especially Chapter 18.

6   For a discussion on the mysticizing of the unitary state, see Tirtosudarmo (2005a, 2005b).

7   In August 1998 an international conference under the theme 'Toward Structural Reforms for Democratization in Indonesia: Problems and Prospects' was organized by *LIPI* and the Ford Foundation in Jakarta. The conference that brought together the most prominent foreign political scientists, such as Juan J Linz and Donald L Horowitz, was intended to contribute knowledge to the debate among the academics and intellectuals prior to the first post Suharto parliamentary election in 1999 (Liddle, 2001). On 2 November 1998, also in Jakarta, a seminar on federalism (*Federalisme, Mungkinkah bagi Indonesia?* or Federalism, is it possible for Indonesia?) was conducted. The seminar was sponsored by the national newspaper *Kompas* and the *FES (Friedrich Ebert Stiftung)*. The proceedings of this seminar were then published as a book in August 1999 by *Kompas* under the title *'Federalisme*

federalism meant that Indonesia should not necessarily change its current unitary state format while the content could be federal. The debate on federalism can be classified into two broad views: (a) Emphasizing the importance of rearranging the fiscal balance between the national and regional governments incorporating the substance of the federal idea; and (b) Stressing the full adoption of a federal state format to replace the current unitary state format perceived to be the root cause of centralism, political injustice and economic inequalities. Proponents of the second view were clearly more radical in their political aspirations, while those supporting the former were more consensual and gradual in their approach to reform the nation-state format. The negative images and the strong opposition to the federal idea quickly called for the strengthening of the unitary state.[8]

The devolution of power from the national government to the autonomous administrative territories in the regions has always been problematic. While the second highest level of government under the national government in Indonesia has traditionally been provincial, the national laws concerning regional autonomy designated powers to the district level of government, which falls administratively under the provincial government. The implementation of the decentralization laws, Laws 22 and 25 of 1999 that began in January 2001, under the Abdurrahman Wahid government, provided an unprecedented level of power and authority to the district level governments. This has proved to be very controversial as provincial government authority has been drastically reduced in favour of the district governments. On 15 October 2004, under the Megawati administration, Law 22, 1999, was rescinded and replaced by Law 32, 2004, giving back some authority to the provincial governments. It is clearly stated in the consideration (or preamble) that the removal of Law 22, 1999, is because: *It is not suitable for the state's development and the demand for the arrangement of regional autonomy.*[9]

The context of citizenship in the Indonesian multicultural society greatly differs from the Western society. The Indonesian multicultural society consists of various ethnic groups and religions from the early time, which was then formed into a nation-state after colonialism. Meanwhile, the Western society mostly experiences the tension between the locals and the international migrants. As illustrated in this part, Indonesia faces a great challenge to arrange the plural society from a period of time to other time. The political shift in 1998 actually provided opportunities to change the centralized format and to redesign the structure of local government *vis a vis* the central government in order to ensure equality for all. What is beyond the thinking of the newly decentralization law is the role of the ethnic entrepreneurs, mostly the local political elites, that immediately perceived the potential of economic benefit by creating new provinces and especially new districts that

---

untuk Indonesia' (Federalism for Indonesia). In the preface of this book, Daniel Dhakidae argues that federalism was implemented during the short period of British Interregnum (1811-1816). Under the British, the Dutch territory was divided into four regions: Java, Fort Marlborough (Bengkulu and its dependencies), Penang and its dependencies, and the Moluccas. Among the strong proponents for federalism in contemporary Indonesia is Mangunwijaya, writer and Catholic priest, see Mangunwijaya (1998). The idea of federalism – especially its fiscal arrangements - was also advocated briefly by the newly established, but promising political party at the time – PAN (*Partai Amanat Nasional*). This new party was created by a coalition of pro-democracy intellectuals and activists – led by a political scientist, university professor, and the head of Indonesia's largest Muslim organization, Muhammadiyah – Amin Rais. At the beginning of the *PAN* political campaign, federalism was mentioned in its political platform, although it was later revoked as it was deemed to potentially trigger off public controversies.

8   Hans Antlov 'In Indonesia: Disentangling the Confusion about Federalism'. *The Jakarta Post*, June 3 1999.

9   The quotation is originally from Law 32, 2004.

will be granted the political autonomy. The dynamics of local politics since then become very much influenced by the mobilization of culturally based identities, mostly ethnicity and religion.

Managing Difference: Jakarta as a Show Case

As previously illustrated, the historical context of multicultural society in Indonesia, including Jakarta, is a product of a nation-state aftermath the decolonization rather than in-migration from the less developed to developed countries. The 'difference' as the core concept of multiculturalism becomes one of the greatest challenges for Indonesian people. Based on the Population Census 2010, the number of Indonesian ethnic groups is over 300, in which 15 ethnic groups cover 84.89% of 236.7 million Indonesian citizens.[10] (Ananta, Arifin, Hasbullah, Handayani, & Pramono, 2015). Those are the Javanese, Sundanese, Malay, Batak, Madurese, Betawi, Minangkabau, Buginese, Bantenese, Banjarese, Balinese, Acehnese, Dayak, Sasak and Chinese. Five of them are even originated from the Island of Java, namely the Javanese (the largest), Sundanese (the 2nd largest), Madurese (the 5th), Betawi (the 6th) and Bantenese (the 9th), which constitute around 60% of Indonesian citizens. The differences are not only in terms of race (ethnic groups and their cultures), but also religion with six acknowledged ones, namely Islam, Christian, Catholic, Hindu, Buddha and Confucianism. Managing difference in Indonesia, therefore, is problematic. Incorporating the concepts of multiculturalism, interculturalism and citizenship that have been previously explored, this part will discuss the empirical situation of multicultural society with Jakarta as the capital city of Indonesia as a show case.

Following Modood (in Antonsich, 2016), we agree that citizenship play a significant role in governing society. We argue that citizenship is a way beyond the assumption of rights. With a more practical definition, Bellamy (2008: 17 with emphasis from the authors) explains citizenship as "a condition of **civic equality**. It consists of membership of a political community where all citizens can determine the terms of social cooperation on equal basis. This status not only secures equal rights to the enjoyment of the collective goods provided by the political association but also involves equal duties to promote and sustain them – including the good of democratic citizenship itself". From this definition, we believe that citizenship includes at least three dimensions, namely rights, belonging and participation, which might overlap but do not necessarily go together (e.g. Bellamy, 2008; Bloemraad, 2015). Our question is to what extend citizenship is employed in a multicultural society like Jakarta and what is the impediment in utilizing such Western concept in a country with the different historical backgrounds.

The ethnic composition of Jakarta is almost similar with those of Indonesia in general. Indonesia, particularly Jakarta, has indeed two main foreign migrants from East and South Asia due to the colonialization. At that time, the Dutch implemented a racial policy dividing the community into the Europeans, the foreign orientals (e.g. the Chinese and the Arabic), and the natives (Colombijn, 2010). In the postcolonial period, the migrants still living in Indonesia, are mostly the Chinese and the Arabic, in which their descendants has remained growing. As the capital city and the centre of Indonesia economic development,

---

10   Ananta, A., Arifin, E. N., Hasbullah, M. S., Handayani, N. B. and Pramono, A. *Demography of Indonesia's Ethnicity*, (Singapore: ISEAS Publishing, 2015).

Jakarta has continuously attracted and hosted migrants from various ethnic groups in the Archipelago. Javanese, Betawi, Sundanese, Chinese and Batak cover the five main ethnic groups in Jakarta.

Table 1 Ethnic Composition of Jakarta

| Ethnic Group | Population Census | | | | | |
| | 1961 | | 2000 | | 2010 | |
	Number	(%)	Number	(%)	Number	(%)
Javanese & Madurese	737,700	25.4				
Javanese	-	-	2,927,340	35.16	3,452,168	36.16
Betawi	655,400	22.9	2,301,582	27.65	2,700,722	28.29
Sundanese	952,500	32.8	1,271,531	15.27	1,395,240	14.61
Chinese	294,000	10.1	460,002	5.53	632,372	6.62
Batak	28,900	1.0	300,562	3.61	326,645	3.42
Minangkabau	60,100	2.1	264,639	3.18	272,018	2.85

Source: Castles (1967: 185); Suryadinata, Arifin & Ananta (2003: 19); and Ananta, Arifin, Hasbullah, Handayani & Pramono (2015: 106) (Originally published in Hadi & Tirtosudarmo, 2016)

We assume that citizenship is historically developing in Jakarta within a dynamic political context rather than a simply linear process. After the independence, citizenship was just started to be exercised at the elite level. Jakarta was built to be the capital city of Indonesia with various markers, such as National Monument, Indonesian Hotel and Aerospace Monument with elite capital contributions, including from the former President Soekarno. During this regime, diversity was highly accommodated in terms of ethnic groups (e.g. Javanese, Padang, Minahasa) and religions (e.g. Muslim and Christian), which was reflected by the representation of Jakarta local leaders (Hadi & Tirtosudarmo, 2016; Tirtosudarmo & Hadi, in press). In one side, the government successfully developed various infrastructures symbolizing the honour of the Jakartans, as a modern plural city as well as the capital city of Indonesia, which was in line with the spirit of Indonesian nationalism. On the other hand, the government failed to provide equal economic development indicated with a denomination and economic crisis generating the citizens to live in a poverty.

Suharto regime or known as the New Order replaced the Soekarno regime through September 30, 1965 coup. Being controversial about the mastermind, this affair involved bloodily conflicts between the Indonesian Communist Party members/sympathizers and religious/nationalist groups. The authoritarian regime with centrality and military as their main power in controlling the citizens appointed all the Governors of Jakarta for instance from the armed forces (Hadi & Tirtosudarmo, 2016; Tirtosudarmo & Hadi, in press). In general, the Jakartans as the urban citizens had the benefits of various basic services, such as education and health. In fact, this regime was recognized as being brutal in terms of the human rights opression. Public participation was limited (if not prohibited) and the power was mostly distributed to the military. Malapetaka 15 January 1974 (Malari 1974) was the first greatest civic unrest in Jakarta during the New Order opposing the abundant

investment of Japan to Indonesia and urging three calls, namely (a) disbanding the presidencial personal assistant; (b) decreasing the prices of daily needs; and (c) eradicating the corruption, which was ended with violent crowd and protestors detained.[11] This regime controlled the society by manipulating identity, including the polarisation of *pribumi* (the natives) and *non-pribumi* (effectively the Chinese) terms. Since the Chinese could serve, both colonial capitalism and the New Order cronies, they are able to grow their financial advantage and increase tensions vis-á-vis the majority natives (Tsai, 2011). The Chinese were perceived as the rich or even business tycoons widening the gap between them and the natives; therefore, most of them suffered as the main targets of racial civil unrest experiencing material loss, rapes and killings during the fall of the New Order in 1998.

The public succesfully overthrew the authoritarian regime during 1998 *Reform* through a series of protests with Jakarta as the movement centre. After being oppressed for more than 3 decades, the citizens experience a greater freedom, including participating in various forms of civic politics (e.g. the Voices of Concerned Mothers (*Suara Ibu Peduli*) aiming to relieve women from everyday life burdens after the 1998 economic crisis and Jakarta Citizens' Forum (FAKTA) focusing on the Jakarta urban poor) and voting their local leaders directly under the Law No. 32 Year 2004 on Regional Autonomy. The well educated middle class of Jakarta highly use their voting rights with participation level reaching 65%, 66% and 77% consecutively in the 2007, 2012 and 2017 Jakarta Gubernatorial Election (Aria, 2017).[12] We assume that the Jakartans are hybrid with blurred ethnic and religious identity from the first generation migrant into cosmopolitan one. These are indicated from the 2007 and 2012 election, in which Fauzi "Foke" Bowo (a Betawi Muslim) and Joko "Jokowi" Widodo (a Javanese Muslim) consecutively won the first and the second Jakarta Gubernatorial Elections. Like their counterparts around the world, the Jakartans were also atrracted to vote a promising leader offering societal changes and beyond traditional a political institution amidst the corruption and government's inability or so called political populism (Hamid, 2014).

As demonstrated in the above story the citizenship has indeed developed in Jakarta. The citizens of Jakarta enjoy their rights, although not all of those rights has been fully fulfilled. In the public space, they put their multicultural identity above their primordial identity as they fell belongs to Jakarta. Consequently, they show a high political engagement, including high participation in various forms of civic politics and election. In line with Modood (in Antonsich, 2016) citizenship is proved to be effective for governing the society, particularly for managing the difference. According to Modood (2013), citizenship in a multicultural society is not about the disappearance of 'difference', but multiple forms of integration. Furthermore, he provides an alert for us about the danger of ideology for multicultural citizenship.

The 2017 Jakarta Gubernatorial Election shows the ways ideology having threaten the multicultural society. The hybrid and cosmopolitan Jakartans were suddenly dichotomized

11 Abdulsalam, H. (2018). Malari 1974: Protes mahasiswa yang ditunggangi para jenderal (*Tirto,* 15 Januari). Retrieved from https://tirto.id/malari-1974-protes-mahasiswa-yang -ditunggangi-para-jenderal-cDe9 on June 1, 2018.

12 Aria, P. (2017). Pilkada Jakarta catatkan partisipasi tertinggi sepanjang sejarah (*Katadata*, 17 Februari). Retrieved from https://katadata.co.id/berita/2017/02/17/pilkada-dki- mencatatkan-angka-partisipasi-tertinggi-sepanjang-sejarah on June 1, 2018.

due to ideology manipulated during the election. The incumbent, Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (Ahok), a Chinese-Christian incumbent was accused to denigrate Islam in one of his speech. The election was highly contentious as the supporter of Anies Baswedan, his rival, an Arabic descent and a Muslim, aggressively using Islam as the rallying cry to defeat Ahok. The political development that shows the increasing political pressures from the Islamic groups alarmingly polarized the population into sectarian politics and breaking up the previously multi-cultural coexistence. Those candidates apparently divided the Jakartans into two main camps, both in the digital media and in urban space (Tirtosudarmo & Hadi, in press). While the digital media were utilized to disseminate various political narratives, including the hate speech, the movement was made apparent in urban space, including Istiqlal Mosque and National Monument (Monas) Square to claim the power. It was not about Islam and Christian as religion, but about religious ideology. Regrettably, in his inauguration speech Anies Baswedan once again distinguished the citizens either to *pribumi* or *non-pribumi*.

From our observation, we argue that inequality, patronage and ideology are the hindrances in employing citizenship in the urban multicultural society like Jakarta. The government failed to ensure the civic equality for all citizens. The development is still addressed for certain social class. Jokowi and Ahok for instance, successfully raised the labour minimum wage and built comfortable public transportation infrastructures. Nevertheless, Ahok was criticized as the "enemy" of the urban poor because of displacing the poor in the name of development. These certainly indicate that the government could not deliver equality among the citizens. Patronage still dominates most of the elites that encourages them to gain self or group-benefit. They mostly oppose Jokowi and Ahok, who are popular due to their performance, including "clean" from corruption. The patronage or what so called the "clientilistic exchange relations" (Berenschot, Nordholt & Bakker 2016), which mostly happens in the postcolonial countries, inhibits the citizenship since it allows the elites to collude, to dominate the networks and to distribute large sums of money in exchange for loyalty from their clients. The ideology impend the multiculturalism as it potentially splits the society into two main camps. Following Hall and Laclau, Modood (2013) suggests to reject any ideology pressing an 'either/or' and demanding 'both/and'.

Conclusion

Indonesia is a multicultural society, yet as this paper has demonstrated, constituted a very different historical trajectory in its social and political development, compared to the western-rich-industrialized countries. Multiculturality in the case of Indonesia, perhaps comparable to India, is developed endogenously, as the people from different ethnic and racial backgrounds are united under a newly created a nation-state. The different historical trajectory with the west, in which in-migration become a critical component in the creation of a multicultural society, affected the problem of translating various concepts that are originated from the west. As a newly created nation-state, Indonesian government as a representation of the people constantly challenges by the potential of disintegration, regional rebellion, separatism and communal conflicts. Different governmental regimes adopted different strategy and policy in responding to the challenges emanating from social and political differences. In the aftermath of a long authoritarian New Order government, however, a new political disjuncture open the Pandora box, where in which, ethnicity and

religion easily mobilized by the political elites and ethnic entrepreneurs in the guise of local politics. The post New Order political regimes that adopted direct election for local government leaders, and the granted of autonomy to the district government, have become a new political arena, in which cultural based identities, ethnicity and religion in particular, have been rampantly manipulated and played out.

The challenges of governing differences, as developed in the West and resulted in the creation of concepts, such as multiculturalism and interculturalism, provide an important lesson for Indonesia. As a plural society, Indonesia is in fact has been successful in providing the basic platform in the form of *Pancasila* as the national ideology that recognizing the equality all citizens. The political developments since independence, however, have clearly shown the constant problem in managing the plural society. Again, attempts to adopt various concepts, such as multiculturalism and interculturalism, which currently hotly debated in the West, into the Indonesian contexts, posing several translation issues. While in the West the challenges arriving from the need to accommodate the minorities and immigrant groups, in the case of Indonesia the threat are originating from maintaining the balance between the centre and the regions. The concentration of power in the national government constantly challenge by the regions as shown by the collapse of the New Order authoritarian government in 1998. Yet as the post New Order political development have shown the new decentralization policy that is granted autonomy to regions eventually create a new challenges as it is apparently opening a Pandora box: the revival of ethnic politics. As the case of Jakarta is demonstrated, while the previous political regimes indicated Jakarta as a relatively peaceful and harmonious multicultural society; only in the last two or three years, it is increasingly divided by differences in political aspirations based on ethnicity and religion. The direct election of regional leaders, like governor and district heads, is marred by the mobilization of cultural based identities, primarily ethnicity and religion.

Bibliography

Abdulsalam, H. (2018). Malari 1974: Protes mahasiswa yang ditunggangi para jenderal (*Tirto,* 15 Januari). Retrieved from https://tirto.id/malari-1974-protes-mahasiswa-yang -ditunggangi-para-jenderal-cDe9 on June 1, 2018.

Ananta, A., Arifin, E. N., Hasbullah, M. S., Handayani, N. B. and Pramono, A. (2015). *Demography of Indonesia's Ethnicity.* Singapore: ISEAS Publishing.

Antlov, H. (1999). 'In Indonesia: Disentagling the Confusion about Federalism'. *The Jakarta Post*, June 3.

Antonsich, M. (2016). 'Interculturalism versus multiculturalism – The Cantle-Modood debate'. *Ethnicities, 16* (3), 470-493. doi: 10.1177/1468796815604558.

Aria, P. (2017). Pilkada Jakarta catatkan partisipasi tertinggi sepanjang sejarah (*Katadata*, 17 Februari). Retrieved from https://katadata.co.id/berita/2017/02/17/pilkada-dki-mencatatkan-angka-partisipasi-tertinggi-sepanjang-sejarah on June 1, 2018.

Bellamy, R. (2008). *Citizenship: A Very Short Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Berenschot, W., Nordholt, H. S. and Bakker, L. (2016). 'Introduction: Citizenship and democratization in postcolonial Southeast Asia' in Berenschot, W., Nordholt, H.S. and Bakker, L. (Eds.), *Citizenship and Democratization in Southeast Asia* (pp. 1-30). Leiden: Brill.

Bloemraad, I. (2015). Theorizing and Analyzing Citizenship in a Multicultural Society. *The Sociological Quarterly, 56* (4), 591-606.

Castles, L. (1967). 'The Ethnic Profile of Djakarta', *Indonesia*, *23*, pp. 153-204.

Colombijn, F. (with the assistance of Martine Barwegen). (2010). *Under Construction: The Politics of Urban Space and Housing during the decolonization of Indonesia, 1930-1960.* Leiden: KITLV Press.

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man.* New York: Avon Books Inc.

Hadi, A. & Tirtosudarmo, R. (2016). Migration, ethnicity and local politics: The case of Jakarta, Indonesia. *Populasi, 24* (2), pp. 23-36.

Hefner, R. W. (2005). 'Muslim democrats and Islamist violence in Post-Soeharto Indonesia' in Hefner, R. W. (Ed.), *Remaking Muslim Politics: Pluralism, Contestation, Democratization* (pp.273-301). New Jersey & Woodstock: Princeton University Press.

Hamid, A. (2014). 'Jokowi's populism in the 2012 Jakarta gubernatorial election', *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, *33* (1), pp. 85–109.

Huntington, S. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kanumoyoso, B. (2007). 'Pengantar: Perubahan Identitas Penduduk Jakarta', in Lance

Castles, *Profil Etnik Jakarta* (pp. xi-xxxi). Jakarta: Masup.

Lay, C. (2003). 'Otonomi Daerah dan Keindonesiaan', in A.G. Karim (Ed.), *Kompleksitas Persoalan Otonomi Daerah di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar & JIP-UGM.

Liddle, W.R. (2001). 'Introduction: Crafting Indonesia Democracy'. in W.R. Liddle (Ed.). *Crafting Indonesia Democracy* (pp.1-9). Jakarta: Mizan.

Lim, M. (2014) 'Seeing spatially: People, networks and movements in digital and urban spaces', *International Development Planning Review*, 36(1), pp. 51-72.

_____. (2017) 'Freedom to hate: Social media, algorithmic enclaves, and the rise of tribal nationalism in Indonesia', *Critical Asian Studies, 49* (3), pp. 411-27.

Modood, T. (2013). *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea 2nd Edition*. Cambridge & Malden: Polity Press.

Padawangi, R. (2014) 'Reform, resistance and empowerment: Constructing the public city from the grassroots in Jakarta, Indonesia', *International Development Planning Review*, 36(1), pp. 33-50.

Panitia Penulisan Gubernur Jakarta. (2011). *Kepala Pemerintahan Daerah Jakarta*.

Rae, B. (2003). 'Federal Idea and Secession'. Paper presented at the Bandaranaike Peace Institute, Colombo, Sri Lanka, on 27 July.

Ramadhani, N. F. (2017) 'Anies's 'pribumi' speech sparks debate, 'racist' comments on social media', *The Jakarta Post* [online] 17 October. Available at: http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2017/10/17/aniess-pribumi-speech-sparks-debate-racist-comments-on-social-media.html [Accessed 18 October 2017].

Ricklefs, M.C. (1981). *A History of Modern Indonesia since c. 1300 2nd Edition*. California: Standford University Press.

Schiller, A.A. (1955). *The Formation of Federal Indonesia: 1945-1949*. The Hague: W. van Hoeve Ltd.

Suryadinata, L., Arifin, E. N. & Ananta, A. (2003). *Indonesia's Population: Ethnicity and Religion in a Changing Political Landscape*. Singapore: ISEAS.

Tirtosudarmo, R. (2005a). 'Demography and Conflict: The failure of Indonesia's nation-building project?' in D.F. Anwar et.al. (eds.). *Violent Internal Conflicts in Asia Pacific: Histories, Political Economies and Policies*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia, LIPI, Lasema-CNRS and KITLV-Jakarta.

Tirtosudarmo, R. (2005b). 'Migration-Development-Security Nexus: In search of new perspectives in the changing East Asia Context' in D.F. Anwar (Ed.) Development, Migration and Security in East Asia: People's Movements and Non-Traditional Security Challenges in Changing East Asia. Jakarta: The Habibie Center.

Tirtosudarmo, R. & Hadi, A. (in press). Jakarta, on the brink of being a divided city? Ethnicity, media and social transformation. In T. Caponio, P. Scholten, R.Z. Barrero. London: Routledge.

Tsai, Yen-Ling. (2011). 'Spaces of exclusion, Walls of intimacy: Rethinking "Chinese exclusivity" in Indonesia', *Indonesia, 92*, pp. 125-55.

Vertovec, S. (2007). 'Super-diversity and its implications'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30* (6), pp. 1024-1054. doi: 10.1080/01419870701599465.

Author Guideline

Islam Nusantara Journal for the Study of Islamic History and Culture facilitates publication of article and book review on study of Islam, Muslim culture, social and politics in Southeast Asia (Nusantara) and beyond. It is published twice a year and written in Indonesia, English and Arabic. It aims to present academic insight of social and cultural complexity of Muslim world in Southeast Asia under the frame of dialectic between Islam and local culture or cultural realities.

The journal invites scholars and experts working in various disciplines in the Islamic studies, humanities and social sciences. Articles should be original, research-based, unpublished and not under review for possible publication in other journals. All submitted papers are subject to review of the editors, editorial board, and blind reviewers.

Papers submitted for publication must conform to the following guidelines:

1. Papers must be typed in one-half spaced on A4-paper size;
2. Papers' length is about 8,000-10,000 words;
3. All submission must include a 200-300 word abstract;
4. Full name(s) of the author(s) must be stated, along with his/her/their institution and complete e-mail address;
5. All submission should be in Microsoft Word, RTF, or WordPerfect document file format;
6. Arabic words should be transliterated according to the style of 'Islam Nusantara Studies';
7. Bibliographical reference must be noted in footnote and bibliography according to 'Islam Nusantara Studies' style.ain.

Examples of footnote style:

[1]Ryan Sugiarto, *Psikologi Raos: Saintifikasi Kawruh Jiwa Ki Ageng Suryomentaram,* (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Ifada, 2015), p. 139.

[2]Nur Syam, *Tarekat Petani: Fenomena Tarekat Syattariyah Lokal,* (Yogyakarta: LkiS, 2013), p. 164.

[3]Syam, *Tarekat Petani*, p. 173.

[4]Ubaidillah Achmad dan Yuliyatun Tajuddin, *Suluk Kiai Cebolek Dalam Konflik Keberagamaan dan Kearifan Lokal,* (Jakarta: Prenada, 2014), p. 140.

[5]Nur Syam, *Tarekat Petani,* p. 99.

[6]M. Quraish Shihab, *Tafsir Al-Misbah*, vol. 14 (Bandung: Lentera Hati, 2013), p. 167.

[7]Deny Hamdani, "Cultural System of Cirebonese People: Tradition of Maulidan in the Kanoman Kraton," *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences 4,* no. 1 (January-June 2012): p.12.

[8]Hamdani, "Cultural System of Cirebonese People," p. 14.

[9]Deny Hamdani, "Raison de'etre of Islam Nusantara," *The Jakarta Post,* 06 Agustus 2015, p. 5.

[10]Azyumardi Azra, "Islam di "Negeri Bawah Angin" dalam Masa Perdagangan," *Studia Islamika 3,* no. 2 (1996): h. 191-221, review buku Anthony Reid, *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

Example of Bibliography

Suaedy, Ahmad. *Gus Dur, Islam Nusantara dan Kewarganegaraan Bineka: Penyelesaian Konflik Aceh dan Papua 1999-2001*. Jakarta: Gramedia, 2018.

Madjid, M. Dien dan Wahyudi, Johan. *Ilmu Sejarah: Sebuah Pengantar*. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group, 2014.

Banawiratma, JB. dkk., *Dialog Antarumat Beragama: Gagasan dan Praktik di Indonesia*. Bandung: Mizan Media Utama, 2010.

Sejarah Melayu/Malay Annals. Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press, 1970.

Tim Forza Pesantren. *Ijtihad Politik Islam Nusantara:Membumikan Fiqih Siyasah Melalui Pendekatan Maqasid asy-Syari'ah.* Kediri, Lirboyo Press, 2015.

Mastuki dan El-Saha, M. Ishom, ed. *Intelektualisme Pesantren: Potret Tokoh dan Cakrawala Pemikiran di Era Pertumbuhan Pesantren*. Jakarta: Diva Pustaka, 2003.

Suriasumantri, Jujun S. *Ilmu Dalam Perspektif: Sebuah Kumpulan Karangan Tentang Hakekat Ilmu*, Cet. XII. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia, 2012.

Simuh. *Sufisme Jawa: transformasi tasawuf Islam ke mistik Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan Bentang Budaya, 1995. Reprint, Yogyakarta: Narasi, 2016.

Muhajir, Afifuddin, "Islam Nusantara untuk Peradaban Indonesia dan Dunia." Dalam Akhmad Sahal dan Munawir Aziz, ed. *Islam Nusantara: Dari Ushul Fiqh Hingga Konsep Historis*. Bandung: Mizan Pustaka, 2015.

Islam, Adib Misbahul. "Nazam Tarekat: Perlawanan Kiai Ahmad ar-Rifa'i terhadap Birokrasi." Dalam Islam Nusantara Past and Present:Proceeding of International Conference on Islam Nusantara (ICON) *2014*. Jakarta: Pusmabit, 2014: h. 55-73.

Affan, Heyder. "Polemik di balik istiIah 'Islam Nusantara." Artikel diakses pada 22 Juni 2015 dari http://www.bbc.com/indonesia/berita_indonesia/2015/06/150614_indonesia_islam_nusantara

Malikov, Azim. "Islam: Saints and Sacred Geographies." Dalam Suad Joseph, ed. *Encyclopedia of Women and Islamic Cultures*, vol. V. Leiden: Brill, 2007: h. 223-225.

Hamdani, Deny. "Raison de'etre of Islam Nusantara." *The Jakarta Post*, 06 Agustus 2015.

"Batunaga, Bagian dari situs lebih luas," *Pikiran Rakyat*, 16 Mei 2014.

Hamdani, Deny. "Cultural System of Cirebonese People: Tradition of Maulidan in the Kanoman Kraton." *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences* 4, no. 1 (January-June 2012): h.12.

Hosen, Nadirsyah. "Islam Nusantara: Islam Lokal yang Menuju Islam Global?" *Gatra*, 2 Maret 2016, h. 60.

El-Mawa, Mahrus. "Syattariyah wa Muhammadiyah: Suntingan Teks, Terjemahan dan Analisis Karakteristik Syatariyah di Keraton Kaprabonan Cirebon Pada Akhir Abad ke-19." Disertasi S3 Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya, Universitas Indonesia, 2015.

Azra, Azyumardi. "Islam di "Negeri Bawah Angin" dalam Masa Perdagangan." *Studia Islamika 3*, no. 2 (1996): h. 191-221. Review buku Anthony Reid, Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Taimiyya, Ibnu. *Minhaj as-Sunnah an-Nabawi*y. T.tp.: Darul Urubiyya, 1962.

Dawud, Abu. *Sunan.* Kairo: T.pn., 1951.

Bajuri, Ibrahim. *Hasyiah al-Bajuri 'ala Matn al-Burdah*. Bandung: Darul Ma'arif, t.t.

Guidelines for Book Reviews

Please include, at the beginning of the review:

1. Author, Title, Place, Publisher, Date, number of pages, ISBN E.g., Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations. Sixth edition. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1996. 308 + ix pp. ISBN: 0-226-81627-3.

2. The review should begin with a brief overall description of the book.

3. Matters that may be considered in the body of the review include:

4. The average review should be about 1500 words long. The name, affiliation and email address of the reviewer should appear at the end of the review.

   The strengths and weaknesses of the book.

   Comments on the author's style and presentation.

   Whether or not the author's aims have been met.

   Errors (typographical or other) and usefulness of indices.

   Who would the book be useful to?

   Would you recommend it for purchase?

5. The preferred format for submissions is MS-Word.