prohibiting it. Then it must be remembered, until now the clear regulation regulates about the consumption of complete alcoholic drinks with new alcohol content in Manado (from the 5 major cities studied) while other regulations are still unclear about alcohol blood content (blood alcohol content) which banned. Likewise, with other legal rules, including the Criminal Code. Then a tool that can be used to measure the alcohol content in his blood, defining drunkenness as drunk as what will cause a crime and how to prove it, because a person's physical ability to adapt his body to alcohol also varies. Therefore, it is better to regulate the misuse of alcoholic beverages and their products, rather than prohibiting the consumption of alcoholic beverages and their circulation.

In the literature review that we obtained, crimes associated with alcohol consumption are often identified with the hangover conditions experienced by the perpetrators (Martin, Maxwell, White and Zhang, 2004). According to Pettigrew (2008), the reasons people consume alcoholic beverages are for the purposes of (1) celebration; (2) relaxation; (3) complementary foods; (4) socializing; (5) hospitality to; and (6) diversion of mood (mood alteration). Then it can be said that consuming alcoholic beverages does not aim to commit a crime. Meanwhile there are 5 assumptions about the relationship of alcohol to crime, namely: (1) consumption of alcoholic beverages leads to crime; (2) The act of crime results in the consumption of alcoholic beverages; (3) the relationship between crime and consumption of alcoholic beverages is reciprocal; (4) consumption of alcoholic beverages only becomes a common cause in the sense that the perpetrators of consuming alcoholic beverages and crime are committed but are not a major factor; (5) coincidence model, the existence of alcoholic drinks is merely a coincidence and does not significantly explain the crime done (Pernanen, 1982; White, 1990; in Bennett and Holloway, 2005).

Moral Politics of Nationhood: Examining The Politics of Diversity and The Management of Unity

Coordinators: Ratna Saptari (Leiden University), Anton Novenanto (Universitas Brawijaya), & Mia Siscawati (Universitas Indonesia)

The democratic reforms that followed the stepping down of the authoritarian New Order regime, faces a rapidly shrinking space for religious diversity, sexual difference, and critical social movements. The morality of nationhood, epitomized by Indonesia's national slogan of 'unity in diversity', historically refers to a respect for difference within the principle of inclusion. At the moment, however, diversity is increasingly becoming a scapegoat for political and social evils. the anti-LGBT movement, the criminalization of social movements and the religious fatwa against liberalism, secularism and religious minority groups are recent examples of social and political exclusion for the sake of 'saving the nation' or for 'purifying religion'. In order to understand these dynamics, in this panel we will examine the issue of moral politics and the process of exclusion in Indonesia. “Unity” and “diversity” are both concepts that need to be examined critically since within diverse power structures these terms may be used for different purposes. Unity is an overarching rhetoric for solidarity and togetherness, but it may also involve the disregard of different claims and rights to justice. Diversity, on the other hand symbolizes the culture of difference, variations in values, but at the same time involves processes of boundary making and placing individuals or groups in particular boxes. The purpose of this panel is not to look at which term best suits our perception regarding cultural and societal ideals but more to examine the
dynamics behind the cultural politics of unity or diversity and the consequences these have on different groups in society.

**REFRAMING AND DEMONIZING: MORAL POLITICS OF THE POWERLESS**  
Anton Novenanto  
*Universitas Brawijaya*

The practice of othering indicates the occurrence of power relations between different actors. There is a tendency that such practice is performed only by state actors to their citizens, not the other way around. Learning from the victims of Lapindo mudflow in Porong, Java, the paper addresses how these seemingly powerless actors are indeed very powerful in utilizing moral politics through the practice of reframing and demonizing. Generally speaking, disaster victims are frequently perceived as powerless due to physical and mental sufferings they experience following environmental hazards. These people not only already had to lose their time, energy and materials, but they also must recover and pursue all the backwardness. Calling from Foucauldian discourse theory and analysis, the paper aims to describe how Lapindo mudflow’s victims are actually very creative and, therefore, powerful in inventing own agency to compete in the battle of social construction of the disaster through ongoing, yet unequal power relations with other actors in power, the government and the company. Recalling and challenging some Javanese traditions, narratives, and conception of power, these victims came to a position that it is the time for them to become the subject of power in defining the historiography of the event/process by utilizing the momentum of disaster anniversaries as discursive field to reframe the event as industrial accident as well as demonize actors in power.

*Keywords: power, powerless, moral politics, demonizing*

**BACKGROUND**

The morning of May 29, 2013, hundreds of Lapindo mudflow victims gathered in the Porong Square. They were preparing a march along the Porong highway from the square to the western embankment as a series of the seventh-year commemoration of the mud eruption. One interesting, attractive, eye-catching object of that march was a-five-meter-high effigy, *ogoh-ogoh*, of a male figure wearing a yellow suit, carrying a briefcase full of money, and sitting on a mud-volcano. The procession ended with a finale of victims escorting that *ogoh-ogoh* to the edge of the embankment and throwing it into the mud lake as if after it drowned their problems would end too. One victim yelled to the crowd: “This [throwing the effigy into the mud lake] is a sign of throwing our misfortunes, made by [Aburizal] Bakrie. We dispose misfortunes”.

**OBJECTIVE**

This paper aims to trace cultural contexts which enable the procession on that day possible, the contexts which provide values and practices for people to reframe the “official” discourse of the mudflow. Implying Michel Foucault’s conceptual framework (Foucault 1972, 1978, 1980), I examine moral politics of the seemingly powerless actors through a critical analysis into commemorative practices. As to Foucault power is not a thing that can be possessed, transmitted,