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Violent conflicts become reoccurrence phenomenon in the post colonial history of Indonesia. However, the pattern of the conflicts are different in different periods and different regime of power and so do the approaches to take measure coping with it. Both state and non-state agencies initiated peace making activities to bring the conflicted groups into peace process. The most common model to reduce the violence so far use the security approach in which the government made chase fire and sponsored peace accord between the conflicted parties. As to follow up the program, they deployed military and state apparatuses to facilitate soio economic recovery for the communities affected by the conflict. To some extent, ethnic and religious leaders, social workers, academician and NGO activists also developed peace and initiated reconciliation in different level of societies. Since there were sometimes no coordination among the peace initiators, their works seem overlap one to another. This paper describes the violent conflicts and efforts to develop peace and reconciliation in Indonesia in order to search for anthropological perspective on conflict resolution. This paper is divided in three sections before it comes up to conclusion. First is to review the violent conflicts in the post colonial history of Indonesia with the special attention to ethno-religious violence and its peace process. Secondly I examine peace making activities in some area of Indonesia. I will highlight the peace efforts initiated by both state and non state actors. Then I will take into account the common problems arising from the previous approach of peace making and search for appropriate model to prevent the humanitarian tragedy reoccurring in the future.
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Whilst Indonesia was founded on the principle of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, the politics of difference has not prevailed as the governing principle in law, society and polity. Instead domination of the powerful has claimed of assuming the right to govern. During the Suharto’s New Order, the military dictatorship dominated Indonesia for more than three decades with complete impunity whereas in the post-reformasi era, majority-minority paradigm seems to rule the country. In both contexts, the rule of law has never been the top priority. Rather, the state of exception, as Carl Schmitt coins, governs and even condones the majority-minority paradigm. As result the Indonesia’s diversity in ethnicity, religion and class has been subjected to the domination of the majority and its narrative. The element of class and its vested interests, however, has been overlooked in the discussion of politics of difference in Indonesia. Inspired by Christian Fuchs who delves into the nexus between class and social movement, this panel will rethink the power
struggle between ethnicity, religion and class that underpins the politics of difference. The panel is interested in addressing the following questions: • To what extent the class background of power players plays a key role in the political contests that have used ethnicity and religions to support their claim for domination? • How does the power struggle between ethnicity, religion and class shape and re-shape the politics of difference in Indonesia’s future? • Does economic deprivation remain the main source of public protests and social mobilization? To what extent does it pose threats to the politics of difference? • To what extent is the relevance of Fuchs’ assumption about “the emergence of ‘post material’ values [such as peace, gender inequality, ecological sustainability, sexuality, race and right-wing extremism, etc.] as well as the emergence of an ‘immaterial labour class’ in relation to the changing patterns of protest?
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BACKGROUND
Since the 2014 presidential election, Indonesian political landscape has increasingly been characterised as a battleground for competing identity-based groups. In particular Islam has become the most prominent marker of a popular collective identity, driving a wedge between the muslim and non-muslim electorate in the process. The 2017 Jakarta gubernatorial election and the 2019 presidential election confirmed this worry. Many popular groups were formed or reinvented around Islamic slogans and narratives. The incumbents in both executive elections were described as not Islamic enough, enemies of Islam or even communists.

This political development has troubled many pro-democracy activists and scholars alike. Those who oppose the trend were quick to organise rallies, workshops, seminars and press conferences condemning the so-called “politisation of religion.” In its place, they promoted the notion of Indonesia as a rainbow nation comprising of various ethnicities, languages, and religions. This campaign was centred around the promotion of the Bhinneka identity (deriving from the state’s official slogan Bhinneka Tunggal Ika or Unity in Diversity) in contrast to the religious (Islamic) one.

In academia many scholars and observers quickly jumped to the conclusion that identity is indeed an important category to explain Indonesian politics. Loyalty to one’s religion or ethnicity seems to be taken as an important, if not the main, explanation for political and economic behaviours, which transcends class differences. Much of the focus of their research is on the formation of those identities and how they are translated into people’s choices and actions in the public realm.

The popularity of identity as a political category seems to ignore a long-standing source of division in Indonesian society, i.e. material inequality. As a deeply unequal society (Winters 2013) Indonesia is vulnerable to conflicts that potentially arise from the grievances of the marginalised and the struggles over resources among various groups. Indeed, in the early years of Reformasi a number of scholars identified similar structural inequalities at the root of the supposedly identity-based conflicts in the Moluccas (van Klinken 2001; Wilson 2005) and Poso, Central Sulawesi (Aragon 2001). It seems now that the focus has shifted almost exclusively to identity, particularly the religious one.