kind of situation which accepting the false consciousness that they are segregated and only a phantom in politics.
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Since the end of the New Order’s authoritarian government regime, Indonesia has entered into a transitional democracy nation. For almost two decades since choosing the political system of democracy, the dynamics of contemporary Indonesian politics are colored by various upheavals that have led to the disintegration of the nation. Social conflicts continue to occur, ranging from interethnic conflicts in Ambon, Poso, Kalimantan, and several other areas related to different sentiments, religions, and also races. When ethnic-based horizontal conflicts began to recede, in the last ten years, the conflict with the background of the issue of religious differences became stronger following political moments such as the Choice of the Governor and even the Choice of the President and Vice President.

Even though the current phase of the development of these conflicts has not led to the disintegration of the nation which led to the breakup of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, the potential social and political direction is still potential. Based on Benedick Anderson’s thesis, Indonesia is a public project of various solidarity groups and will get a serious challenge. Solidarity groups based on ethnic, religious, racial, and other identity differences continue to prove the strengthening of identity debated in the nation’s integration from within. Furthermore, the solidarity group that bases on one of the Islamic religious sects, that obsess in realizing the integration of religion and the state, continues to carry out various political, economic, social and cultural activities that result in internal disintegration.

This paper will try to analyze the existence and socio-political activities of various solidarity groups in the dynamics of contemporary Indonesian politics and what the subject positions in these groups are in discussions with the discourse of establishing an Indonesian identity. Various theories of ethnicity and identity will be used as provisions to analyze in depth the various solidarity groups, to find out and identify potential and risks related to the disintegration and integration of the nation.

**BACKGROUND**

Sociological facts show that heterogeneity has become a well-established and strong characteristic in society in Indonesia. From religious, ethnic group, historical experience, and geographical conditions backgrounds, there are large variations seen in various population groups, and each has the potential to develop into a particularistic identity. Meanwhile, historical facts also show that what is referred to as cultural solidarity groups, also known as a sect, continues to color the history of the archipelago.

Realizing the sociological facts and historical facts, the founders of the nation have conducted political experiments several times to solve particularistic problems in the framework of developing nations. One of them was a political consensus initiated by all the pioneering figures of independence, known as the 1928 Youth Oath. However, on the next trip it remained less
effective in neutralizing the attractiveness of flow-based political interests. The process continues to this day, each still trying to practice group identity affirmation.

The strengthening of the symptoms of particularistic identity affirmation then led to the occurrence of identity conflicts, especially after the New Order. As it is known, after the New Order era, Indonesia entered as a country experiencing a democratic transition after more than 30 years in the situation of an authoritarian political system under the control of the military regime. Precisely towards the end of President Soeharto's administration, May 1998, Indonesia then entered an era agreed upon as a reform era, a different era diametrically with the previous era. If previously the state’s control over the power of civil society was so strong, then in this reform era the political situation was so loose and therefore opened the space for all the forces of civil society to express their existence and articulate their interests.

Various political forces contradict each other over power both through formal political channels such as general elections, as well as through informal channels as manifested in various social and cultural spaces in living in society. This tendency then continues to show symptoms of potential inter-community conflicts based on primordialistic sentiments, such as ethnicity, religion, and even race.

Various incidents of riots with religious backgrounds such as in Ambon Maluku, Poso Sulawesi at the beginning of the reform era, and later followed by several other precarious areas such as mass amok in Cikeusik, Pandeglang, Banten which killed 3 Ahmadis; and then in Temanggung, which burned and damaged 3 churches a few years ago, showing that there is still the power of groups that deny diversity as an Indonesian identity. Likewise, ethnic background conflicts such as between the Dayak and Madura tribes in Sampit, Sanggau-Ledau Kalimantan in 2000 are evidence of a strong identity conflict.

Such primordialistic conflicts in the last twenty years have continued to fluctuate according to the dynamics of contemporary Indonesian politics. Moreover, after the enactment of Regional Autonomy in 2001, various ethnic and interfaith conflicts continued to color in the dynamics of local politics, especially at political moments such as the Regional Head General Elections (Pilkada). The sentiments of essentialistic identity conflicts such as the prominence of differences in male sons and immigrants continue to be exploited by the local elite for power struggles in the political contestation of the elections.

Religious and even racial nuances also color the dynamics of local and national politics as reflected in the 2014 Presidential Election (Pilpres) and the DKI Jakarta Provincial Election 2017. The 2014 presidential election was marked by a clear division between the Jokowi-JK and Prabowo-Hatta pairs using religious issues and race. Joko Widodo has always been rumored by Prabowo's stronghold as an ethnic Chinese and Christian. The nuances of the conflict by using essentialistic identity politics like that then continued to color the 2019 Presidential Election, and even felt stronger and more explosive.

Moreover, when the 2017 DKI Regional Election, the nuances of the conflict are openly racialistic. Basuki Tjahaya Purnama, popularly known as Ahok, received a racial political stigma which is expressly referred to as China. It did not stop at the title of China, but then the racist discourse was continuously produced by its political opponents as an instrument to bring it down. Ahok was accused of being a leader who harassed the religion of Islam, and later confirmed the identity of
his insults, the political contestation in the 2017 DKI Regional Election became an indicator of the strengthening of essentialistic identity politics.

Meanwhile, conflicts with primordialistic nuances that exploit religious differences also continue to occur in social and cultural life. In 2018 there were also many instances of intolerance, such as suicide bombings at the Santa Maria Church in Surabaya. Quoting information from the East Java Regional Police Head of Public Relations, Kombes Barung Mangera, the bomb blast killed two people (Kompas.com, 05-13/2018). Meanwhile, there was also an event of intolerance towards local beliefs, namely the sea alms ceremony on the coast of New Bantul, Jogjakarta, which was damaged by mobs riding alongside motorbikes. The mob had done damage to the residents and committee who were busy preparing for the sea charity event to become frantic and traumatized (Kompas.com, 10/15/2018).

Post New Order has brought far more loose political changes, so that various elements of civil society with ideological, religious, ethnic, racial and cultural backgrounds have had the opportunity to express themselves. However, the loosening of the socio-political system further opened up the possibility of interfaith, ethnic, racial, and clash of cultural values. It all indicates the existence of a process of internal disintegration which if it does not get serious attention could threaten the existence of Indonesia as a unitary state.

Therefore, this paper will analyze the internal disintegration process using constructivistic perspectives and some are also critical. Some key concepts will be used to understand identity conflicts originating from the theories of ethnicity, identity, and also identity politics.

THEORETICAL BASIS

There are various theoretical perspectives that attempt to explain ethnicity and ethnicity. Starting from a theoretical perspective that refers to an essentialistic to anti-essentialistic view such as a constructive and critical perspective. Even more radical new theories that are anti-identity develop as well as the assumptions of queer theory, for example. In an essentialistic view, ethnicity and identity are something natural and permanent, and therefore ethnicity is often identified with body characteristics.

Also developing theoretical views, namely what can be called a defensive party. Here the logic of the state and the state system starts from the problem of claims by certain ethnic groups. Historically countries have been broadly defined in the territorial terms they occupy and the sources and populations they control. Therefore, the state needs strict boundaries between one country and another. In the meantime, the state must sensibly show a specific identity as a state and group which, if seen as a nation, is different from the others. Here, then there is a process of politicization of identity groups or the emergence of problems of ethnicity and ethnic conflict as an effort to defend themselves.

In the culturalist view it provides two enessentialist and anti-essentialist perspectives. In an essentialist view, ethnicity is a cultural concept centered on the sharing of norms, values, beliefs, cultural symbols and practices. The formation of "ethnic groups" relies on shared cultural signifiers which have developed under specific historical, social and political contexts and which encourage a sense of belonging based, at least in part, on a common mythological ancestry. However, following anti-essentialist arguments, it is clear that ethnic groups are not based on primordial ties or universal cultural characteristics possessed by specific groups but are formed through
discursive practices. Ethnicity is formed by the way we speak of group identities and identify with signs and symbols which constitute ethnicity (Barker, 2000: 1995).

Furthermore, Barker said of the course, to suggest that ethnicity is not about pre‐given cultural differences but a process of boundary formation and maintenance that is not contingent around signifiers which do universal conversations, territory and purity, for example metaphors of blood, kinship and homeland. A culturalist conception of ethnicity is an attempt to escape racial implication which is inherently in historically forged concept of race.

In the meantime, it became clear that ethnicity was not understood as something natural or taken for granted as constructed by groups who wanted to dominate and give social stigma. This presupposes that ethnicity is something that has the character of being, proceeding, discursive, because everything is historical and contextual. There is nothing fixed and moreover natural by referring to physical characteristics.

Such a view was also expressed by Hall. If the black subject is not historically stable, then it should be constructed historically, culturally and politically - the concept which refers to this is 'ethnicity'. The term ethnicity acknowledgment of the place of history, language and culture in the construction of subjectivity and identity, as well as knowledge (Hall, 1996: 466).

The concept of ethnicity from a culturalist perspective is more critical, not only open and inclusive, but also politically characterized so that it is related to power. Meanwhile, if the essentialist perspective is more often used by the dominant group in its efforts to establish power, while the anti‐essentialist perspective is actually trying to shake the establishment. This critical anti‐essentialist view is useful for strengthening political democratization as well as efforts to build community citizenship.

In this case a discussion of identity theory can also use the essentialism and anti‐essentialism scheme, or a concept that says that identity is something permanent and natural; while also developing a more constructivistic view that identity is a dynamic, fluid, and discursive concept.

The Western search for identity is premised on the idea that there is such a ‘thing’ to be found, that identity exists as a universal and timeless core of the self which we all possess. We might say that persons have an ‘essence’ of the self which we call identity. Such esentialism assumes that descriptions of ourselves reflect an essential underlying identity. By this token there would be affixed essence of femininity, masculinity, Asians, teenagers and all other social categories. In contrast, is has been argued here that identity is cultural ‘all the way down’, being specific to particular times and places. This suggests that forms of identity are changeable and ralted to definite social and cultural conjunctures. The idea that identity is plastic is underpinned by arguments referred to as anti‐essentialism. Here word is not taken as haning refers with essential or universal qualities, for language ‘makes’ rather than ‘finds’. Identity is not a thing but a description in language identities are discursive constructions which change their meanings according to time, place, and usage (Barker, 2000: 196).

Some identity theories that are in line with anti‐essentialist assumptions, among others, were put forward by Anthony Giddens who said that the self‐identity as project. Identity of attempts to interpret the critical questions: "What to do? How to act? Who to be? "The individual attempts to construct a coherent identity narrative by which the self forms a trajectory of development from the past to anticipated future (1991: 53). This means that self‐identity is not something that has been made, but is a process that becomes dynamic.
Such an assumption of self-identity as a project is also used by Giddens in conceptualizing social identities, as he said as follows:

\[
\text{Social identities ... are associated with normative rights, obligations and sanctions which, within specific collectives, form roles. The use of standardized markers, especially to do with the bodily attributes of age and gender, is fundamental in all societies, notwithstanding large cross-cultural variations which can be noted (Giddens, 1984: 282).}
\]

Meanwhile, Stuart Hall in his article entitled The Question of Cultural Identity, identified three different ways of conceptualizing identity, namely (a) the subject of enlightenment; (b) the subject of sociology, and (c) the subject of postmodernism.

In the perspective of the enlightenment era the idea was that the person was seen as a unique agent of unity and allied to Enlightenment. Hall said:

\[
\text{The enlightenment subject was based on conception of the human person as a fully centred, unified individual, endowed with the capacities of reason, consciousness and action, whose ‘centre’ consisted of an inner core .... The essensial centre of the self was a person’s identity (Hall, 1992: 275).}
\]

In the subject's perspective as a sociological symptom, identity is not a self-generating or internal situation about self, but it is entirely a culture because it is formed through a process of acculturation. As a social self and the subject of sociology, self is not formed automatically through processes that occur in people, but self is formed in relation to others. In the process of interaction, the values, meanings, and symbols are internalized, and this is culture. The process of interaction with others first occurs in a family environment, such as learning starting from the price, punishment, imitation and language, how to enter into social life. The basic assumption of the subject of sociology is that the subject is a social creator where social and individual have their differences.

While the conception of identity in the view of postmodernism in principle corrects the determinist view, that the self does not always remain a separate entity separate from the social environment as Cartesian assumptions, or self formed by the social environment as sociological culturalist assumptions. However, according to the subject of postmodernism, subjects are seen as having self-core (core self) capable of coordinating themselves reflexively into unity. According to Hall, self-decentralization or self-postmodernism includes subjects that continue to shift, split, and have multiple identities. The person is formed by not only one, but by several identities that are sometimes conflicting. Furthermore, Hall said:

\[
\text{The subject assumes different identities at different times, identities which are not unified around a coherent ‘self’. Within us are contradictory identities, pulling in different directions, so that our identifications are continually being shifted about. If we feel that we have a unified identity from birth to death, it is only because we construct a comforting story or ‘narrative’ of the self’ about ourselves (Hall, 1992: 277).}
\]

Hall also suggested that understanding the concept of cultural identity is also closely related to assumptions that developed in the flow of essentialism and anti-essentialism of culture. In the view of the essentialists, that individuals have the essence of self called identity. Essentialism assumes that our self-description reflects the essence based on identity. Thus it will be able to establish what is the essence of femininity, masculinity, Asians, adolescents and all other social categories. On the contrary, there is also the view that identity is entirely a culture, formed based on space and time. This is the view of the anti-essentialism which explains that forms of identity
are constantly changing and related to social and cultural conditions. Identity is constructions that are not interrelated, their meanings always change according to space and time, and their use.

This concept of identity, especially after the cold war, gave rise to the theory of identity politics which is gaining wide attention in cultural studies. Agnes Heller took the definition of identity politics as a concept and a political movement whose focus was difference as a major political category. After the failure of the grand narrative, the idea of difference has promised freedom, freedom and freedom of play, even though new threats emerge. Politics of difference becomes a new name for identity politics; race thinking, biofeminism, and ethnic disputes occupy a forbidden place by old big ideas. Various new forms of intolerance, violent practices, also emerged (Heller, 1995: ix).

Klaus Von Beyme (1996) analyzes the development of identity political movements in several stages, ranging from the modern to postmodern stages. The first stage was the modern political movement. Fundamental divisions, tribal groups, and nationalities gave rise to a comprehensive social political movement. In this case mobilization is ideologically initiated by leaders. The aim is seizure and the struggle for power from one ruler to the new ruler. In the modern stage, the movement emerged with the existence of a conditional approach, fragmentation requiring resources to be mobilized. There is a balance of mobilization from above and participation from below, the role of the leader is no longer dominant and the ultimate goal is the division of power. Then, at the postmodern stage, the emergence of the movement came from its own dynamics, protests arose over a variety of individual opportunities, there was no single dominant group or fraction. The pattern of actions and activities is based on autonomous self-awareness as the final goal (Abdillah, 2002: 17).

The rise of resistance symptoms from the small, local, and periphery to the big narrative, then encouraged social science to provide an explanation for the phenomenon as formulated in the theories of social movements. All social movements in various levels are products of culture. Various studies that have been conducted by academics show that the social movement process is carried out by individuals and groups who come together to fight for social change in the situation of establishment.

DISCUSSION

Referring to several theories of ethnicity, identity, and identity politics as described earlier, then if it is then used to analyze various disintegration phenomena from within as happened in post-New Order Indonesia, there are some interesting thoughts. In general, it could be said that various social conflicts, politics, and cultural conflicts in the dynamics of people's lives indicate that essentialistic understanding has a significant contribution to the disintegration process from within.

The phenomenon of ethnic background conflicts between Dayak and Madura in Sampit and Sanggau Kalimantan, for example, indicates that understanding ethnicity is still essentialistic. Dayak and also Madurese understand that tribes are still natural, permanent, and of course refer to the characteristics of the body. Referring to the tribal character permanently like that then they construct their identity by exploiting differently through body characteristics. When each of them affirms the differences constantly like that, even in social life they become exclusive and assert that each is different. The result is the principle of we and others, if it does not have the same characteristics of the body it is considered not the group.
This situation becomes increasingly tense when it comes to economic issues, such as injustice and poverty. For example, the conflict in Sampit, the Madure tribe which was constructed as a migrant, is economically quite successful when compared to the Dayak tribe. At the same time, the stereo type view of the Madurese tribe that they were less willing to regulate, as they wished, lacked respect for Dayak customs, were rude, and other characteristics that were considered permanent became increasingly increasing the feeling that they were indeed different. On the contrary, the Madurese also had the same view of the Dayak tribe, which was constructed in a fixed manner, having the basic characteristics of being lazy, wasting time, primitive, and animistic.

Such a risk process takes place continuously in everyday social interactions, so that the feeling that they are indeed different from one another continues to settle. Such a situation is just waiting for the trigger to arise explosive conflict. The tension between the two tribes during the New Order could indeed be suppressed without massive and explosive conflict, because the state was able to effectively control all elements of civil society at any potential conflict. But when the New Order ended, the situation became out of control and immediately all negative prejudices towards each tribe gained momentum to be shed in open conflict.

The same situation also occurs in identity conflicts in Papua for example. Some conflicts that occurred during the post-New Order era also felt an essentialistic nuance. It is still developing in people’s perceptions that ethnic Papuans are still constructed by their identity with reference to body characteristics and type stereo views. Papuans are constructed characterized by curly hair, black skin, stupid, lazy and drunk. Identity construction is involving self, other, and social structures that are relational in nature, namely the problem of how other people value themselves and on the basis of other people’s judgments that he then judges himself. So when Papuans are constructed by others based on these essentialistic views, they also construct their identity as well as the construction of others.

The situation continues continuously, and therefore different feelings also continue to be maintained. The result is understandable if Papuans feel differentiated by other people and national-scale social structures so that feelings emerge differently on a regular basis. This practice of differentiation through the essentialistic concept of ethnicity and identity then led to a situation of socio-political relations engulfed by prejudice. Papuans then excluded themselves both territorially and culturally that they were indeed different, so the term indigenous Papuans appeared based on territorial dominance and body characteristics. Meanwhile those who are considered to be non-indigenous are referred to as immigrants.

Such an essentialistic construction of identity until the development phase is now still coloring in the dynamics of social and political life in Papua. The social conflicts that have occurred so far are also still in the scheme of essentialistic identity politics. Although the conflict is still sporadic, incidental, and localized, the potential for conflict towards internal disintegration remains strong and detrimental in terms of the unitary state. This situation also occurs in the Aceh Province region, which is politically potential for conflict and separatist potential as much as what happened in Papua.

The essentialistic understanding of the concept of ethnism and identity is often also reflected in the political moment of the elections and the Presidential Election. In various regions local elites affirmed identity based on ethnic equality to gain support in seizing power through regional elections. By exploiting ethnic differences essentially, the elites claim that there are indigenous people and immigrants. Therefore, during the implementation of regional autonomy, the political process in almost all regions was colored by ethnic sentiments. This is why the configuration of
government leaders in the regions is always nuanced by the practice of identity politics that emphasizes tribal factors. In that case, the Javanese tribe always benefited because it was the largest tribe and spread to various regions. In some regions of Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, NTT, and Papua there are not a few Javanese tribes who are deputy regents / mayors and deputy governors. There are even Javanese tribes who are governors like in North Sumatra, while it is almost impossible if a tribe other than Java can become a governor in a province in Java.

The same situation also occurs in the Presidential Election process, although it is often avoided but the tribal factor still feels its manifestation. After the New Order not one president in Indonesia came from a tribe other than Java. President BJ Habibei was indeed a president from a tribe other than Java, but the process did not go through direct election. During the Presidential Election carried out directly by the people, it is very unlikely that tribes other than Javanese could become president in Indonesia. This indicates that ethnic factors are still very dominant in the process of national leadership recruitment, and such national leadership constructs of essentialistic ethnicity also penetrate the minds of citizens in general.

Thus, a permanent understanding of essentialistic identity is often reflected in the society in Indonesia, which creates a variety of political and socio-cultural problems in a disintegrative direction. The various facts of conflict that occurred in Indonesia during the post-New Order indicate that every time a significant political change occurs, it is followed by the emergence of the disintegration phenomenon. Especially in countries that are experiencing a democratic transition, conflict continues to fluctuate, and even conflict has become part of the democratic transition process itself. Even one of the main characters of the conflict that follows the democratic transition state is identity conflict. This fact is in accordance with

It was revealed in a different sentence, that Indonesia is a hiterogeneous society that has become a necessity, but history also shows that there are forces who want to deny that reality and then force a homogeneous society under the pretext of unity or the sake of the majority as state and religious power. What is imagined is then a dominant power and of course the choice taken is to make uniformity, anti-diversity, anti-locality, and also means anti-democracy.

The pluralistic facts are often denied and are not supported by the enthusiasm to accept differences. In fact, what often happens is that the differences are exploited for group political interests that do not prioritize common interests as a nation. As a result, in the course of the history of this nation it is often buffeted by a stream of uniformity imposed by interest groups that rely on autocratic authority and the power of religion. This situation then presents the problem of religious intolerance which has the potential to disintegrate from within.

*Religious Intolerance*

Discuss religious intolerance, because it does not escape the two main entities, namely the state and religion itself. Both in the course of the history of the archipelago have a significant relationship in coloring the nation's journey. The state and religion as the dominant narrative, often appear fierce to control citizens according to their wishes. In Durkheim's terms, the two dominant narratives are structures whose existence is outside the individual, but have the compelling power to control people's actions both individually and in groups. In history, there are two main groups that dominate the discourse of state and religious relations. First, integralistic groups in the sense that the religion and state are to become one; and secular groups that want separate countries and religions.
In many cases, the first group often brought about problems of religious intolerance, or at least attracted debate around religious relations. Whereas secular groups in the Indonesian context take an ambiguous attitude. Therefore, it is no wonder that ambiguity presents the fact that the "official" is a religion recognized by the state, namely Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Hinduism and Buddhism. The attitude of this country also gave birth to serious problems in religious intolerance, especially those relating to the flow of beliefs and local religions.

Meanwhile, religion also presents the problem of intolerance itself. In its position as the dominant narrative, religion then uses purification-oriented strategies with the aim of regulating, controlling, and disciplining all production of locality. By inheriting the construction of forces that dominate and subordinate those carried out by modernization, religion then also appears as a dominant force that puts pressure on anything that has a locality spirit. Purification of religious teachings that are used as the main program, has the implication of taking the method of homogenization or uniformity of local cultural entities. Puritanization of religion as a political and cultural movement, after the New Order government regime which marginalized it, then appeared to become a photocopy of it by carrying out a movement model similar to the dominant power which subordinated the existence of local entities. The puritan religious movement also borrowed a hegemonic instrument from the forces that had been repressing it, to then use the same strategy to suppress and marginalize the production of locality.

In the next process religion then sees the local as having to be withdrawn and forced as it did in the center of origin so that the production of locality must be purified, straightened and fostered, as well as controlled. The implication of religion became a loss of local touch, so religion became fierce and lost its basic humanistic character. In fact, in an effort to build a tolerant Indonesia, it depends on how far religion opens up or is willing to get a touch of spirit of locality.

However, it must be acknowledged that empirically the role of religion today is significant in social and political life. For this consideration, however, there needs to be an effort to encourage religion to prioritize its human nature. If traced from the beginning of the history of his birth, religion in principle is a reaction to a dehumanistic political system, so that the basic character of a religion from the beginning is humanism. The prophets of any religion are basically humanist figures who are able to answer the challenges of the times, which in their time were in a dehumanistic situation. By doing reflection and contemplation in quiet places, the prophets received divine revelation which later became the main spirit against dehumanistic authoritarianism. So the spirit of religion carried by the prophets, in essence, is a divine power that frees humans from various forms of oppression, discrimination, and exploitation, not to standardize differences. Therefore, religion can be a measure of truth, depending on the extent to which religion has an emancipatory commitment and solidarity as evidenced in the practice of inter-cultural dialogue (including interfaith), and the struggle for liberation for the weak. However, religion in subsequent developments is often not spared from the pressure to legitimize sometimes dehumanistic actions.

It is interesting to note that at the praxis level of religion shows an ambiguous face, sometimes revealing what Gregory Baum (in his book entitled Religion and Alienation, Marquette: Paulist Press, 1975) is called liberating, but in sometime not infrequently it appears as enslaving. Following this thesis, a hypothetical statement can be expressed, that the more religion is normative-scriptualistic oriented, the more it shows the character of submission. Conversely, the
more religion opens itself to be understood historically in a scientific perspective, the more the character of its release will open.

Baum synthesizes between the theological paradigms which assume that religion is something standard and objective, not a subjective one, and a humanistic-historical paradigm that is always different in interpreting reality. With a synthetic framework between the normative and historical sides of reality through the glasses of Karl Mannheim's sociology of knowledge, Baum offers a synthetic point reflected in his view of emancipation and solidarity. That is, truth discourse is drawn away from only questions of objectivity and subjectivity to discourse to what extent the truth reflects the mission of liberation to the oppressed people based on emancipatory commitment and dialogue based on solidarity commitments.

A set of norms, whatever their background, whether political, traditional, or religion must be held accountable, why does a set of norms regulate human actions. Thus every normative system must open itself to discourse, not be a closed ideological entity. There have been many facts to show, the closure of an ideology, always produces followers who choose the way of violence, and unconsciously encourage the creation of dehumanization. What happens is nothing more than the subjugation of human consciousness which makes it an object and its authority is revoked. At that time, ideologies including religion began to be part of the process of human hegemonization.

It is this historiographic understanding of religion that will encourage religion to be accommodative of democracy and recognize local culture. In other words, a dialectical, inclusive and substantive understanding of religion will be able to make religion a component of a multiculturalism-based society system. In the context of Indonesian society, the emergence of the issue of the need for civil society development, for example, religion will be able to strengthen civil society as long as it does not have the pretense of merely labeling it as "civil society" which has historically been unknown in Indonesia.

Open Indonesianness

After all this time Indonesia has experienced an essentialistic process of identity formation, it's time to start constructing identity constructively. The thesis offered is, Indonesia is no longer a closed concept, but an open concept that gives space for every citizen to construct it. This means providing equal opportunities for all citizens as active subjects who construct their Indonesian identity.

The theoretical foundation used needs to refer to the notion of identity which is no longer permanent by referring to ethnicity, ideology, or even a normative system controlled by certain groups in the name of a single defender of the Pancasila or in the name of the majority religion. Rather it refers to an understanding of the concept of identity that is dynamic, discursive and fluid. By understanding such identity, there is no absolute claim that has implications for the emergence of Indonesia which is a central bias, Javanese bias, or Islamic bias as has happened so far.

That means providing the widest possible space for every citizen to construct their Indonesian identity according to their abilities and desires. So let the people of Papua or Aceh for example, construct their Indonesian identity according to their knowledge and conscience. Thus, there is no more they are forced to recognize their Indonesian identity in accordance with the central construction or construction of Jakarta which is Javanese or Islamic bias, for example.
Of course the construction of the citizen must still refer to the discourse about plural Indonesia. Because empirically Indonesia is not single, but full of diversity. Recognizing the fact that Indonesia is not a single entity, it will become a source of energy tolerance in any field. However, if you reject the empirical facts, what happens is intolerance and often will make uniformity controlled by a single force. Although for the time being the control by a single entity such as military or religious power, it can also create an integrative situation, but it has been proven that control is strict while making conditions disintegrative.

CLOSING

Thus, in the political and social dynamics of contemporary Indonesia, the tides are always tinged with various social and political conflicts. The assumption that the disintegrative situation is always caused by external factors involving the power of major countries with an interest in Indonesia is not all true. There are also internal factors which are disintegration processes from within. This fact is caused by the still dominant understanding of the concept of ethnicity and identity essentially. The problem is that such understanding continues to be maintained because it is deliberately produced by all political elites both locally and nationally. Ironically, such essentialistic understanding experiences reproduction precisely when the choice of its political system is democracy, so that the process of democracy experiences banality and even contradictions.

Indonesia's future will be largely determined by the tug of understanding the concept of ethnicity and identity between essentialistic and anti-essentialistic. If the dominance of essentialistic understanding of identity still continues both at the elite and grass root level, the disintegrative situation will remain potential and even at a certain moment can be explosive. Therefore, it is time to change understanding of identity constructively which is a manifestation of the concept of anti-essentialistic identity. Changes as well as development towards constructive understanding of identity will help create an open and inclusive Indonesian identity construction. The development of open Indonesian identity construction will neutralize the process of disintegration from within, and at the same time the social political process of democracy will take place more substantially.
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