

# 1 Diversity and its discontents: an overview of minority–majority relations in Indonesia

*Greg Fealy and Ronit Ricci*

---

Indonesia has always perceived itself as being a tolerant, diverse and pluralist nation. As one of the most ethnically, religiously and culturally complex societies on earth, Indonesia has cast acceptance of difference and equality of rights and opportunities as a cornerstone of its existence. The nation's motto is *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*, an Old Javanese phrase typically translated as 'Unity in Diversity' but perhaps more accurately rendered as 'Out of Many, One'. The motto implies that Indonesia not only embraces but also celebrates diversity. Founding president Sukarno set the tone in a speech in 1955 when he declared: 'This country, the Republic of Indonesia, does not belong to any group, nor to any religion, nor to any ethnic group, nor to any group with particular customs and traditions, but is the property of all of us from Sabang to Merauke! [i.e., from the further-most northwestern to southeastern points of the archipelago]' (quoted in Vatikiotis 2017: 157). In essence, he was claiming that all who lived within Indonesia's borders were owed the same rights and no single group had preference. More recently, presidents Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (2004–14) and Joko Widodo (2014–) have made terms such as 'moderation', 'tolerance' and 'multiculturalism' central to their nation's international diplomacy. Yudhoyono, for example, declared at a Harvard address in 2009 that Indonesia was a 'bastion of freedom, tolerance and harmony' (Yudhoyono 2009) and stated at a high-level event in New York in 2013 that '[Indonesia] will always protect our minorities and ensure that no one suffers from discrimination' (Parlina and Aritonang 2013). In addition, and reflecting a broad sentiment, public opinion surveys have repeatedly shown that an overwhelming majority of Indonesians believe

their country to be tolerant and respectful of the rights of minorities (Fealy 2016: 120; Mietzner and Muhtadi in Chapter 9 of this volume).

But is this self-perception justified? In recent years Indonesia's reputation for tolerance and inclusivity has come under growing scrutiny from domestic and overseas civil society and human rights groups, the international media and the diplomatic community. Much of this scrutiny relates to the treatment of religious and ethnic minorities and of the country's lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) communities. They have variously been subject to condemnation or denigration by other sections of society and political leaders, and in some cases have been the target of violent attack.

Sectarian incidents have been rising since the mid-2000s, drawing international media coverage. The most high-profile targets have been the minority Muslim sects, Ahmadiyah and Shi'a. Ahmadi mosques, schools and residences have been attacked and sometimes destroyed by opponents, often with tardy or reluctant intervention by law enforcement officials. The most serious attack occurred in Cikeusik in Banten province in 2011, when three Ahmadis were killed as police looked on. Videos of the attack went viral on social media and the incident was widely reported internationally. In other instances, many hundreds of Ahmadis have been harassed and displaced from their homes, with little effective government action to resolve their predicament. On a lesser scale, Shi'as have also been targets of intimidation and violence from groups within the Sunni majority. One Shi'a died in 2012 during an attack on his village in Sampang, East Java, and some 220 fellow Shi'a villagers were evacuated, with only those who agreed to 'convert' to Sunni Islam being repatriated to their village. Major Muslim organisations have called for both the Ahmadiyah and Shi'a sects to be banned, but so far the government has only restricted Ahmadi outreach activities.

Non-Muslim religious minorities such as Christians and Buddhists have also reported an elevated number of breaches of religious freedoms over the past decade and a half, a claim supported by human rights groups. Many dozens of minority houses of worship, most commonly churches but sometimes also temples, have been denied permits for construction or renovation by local authorities on questionable grounds or have been attacked by vigilantes from the local majority religion (see Chapter 10 of this volume by Ali-Fauzi). Moreover, numerous provincial and district administrations have sought to restrict the activities of minority faith congregations and local Ministry of Religious Affairs officials have pressured heterodox religious groups to become 'orthodox' in order to avoid problems in gaining identity cards and receiving related welfare and educational support.

National laws and regulations also affect the rights of religious minorities. Only six religions are recognised by the state: Islam, Catholicism, Protestantism, Hinduism, Buddhism and Confucianism. All other faiths are excluded from receiving state support and typically cannot be listed on official documentation. Thus, Indonesia's small number of Jewish and Baha'í citizens are often forced to choose one of the six official religions for listing on their identity documents. Near-insurmountable obstacles are also placed in the path of those seeking interfaith marriages. This is especially the case if someone from a minority faith is seeking to marry a Muslim. Although civil registration of such marriages is possible, the Ministry of Religious Affairs usually refuses to recognise marriages between Muslims and non-Muslims. Non-Muslims and heterodox Muslims have also fallen victim to the draconian 1965 Blasphemy Law, which has a broad and vaguely worded definition of the offence of insulting religion and religious authorities. This law has been the basis of an unprecedented number of prosecutions in the past decade and a half. Since 2004, more than 100 convictions have been recorded, with no defendant being acquitted (see Chapter 3 by Lindsey).

The most controversial blasphemy case was that involving Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (commonly known as Ahok), the governor of Jakarta. During that city's gubernatorial election campaign in late 2016 and early 2017, Ahok, a Chinese Christian, was accused of insulting the Qur'an and Islamic scholars (*ulama*) when he told a rally that Muslims could elect a non-Muslim leader despite some *ulama* stating that the Qur'an forbade this. His remarks drew widespread condemnation not only from Islamist groups, which had long objected to his governorship, but also from many mainstream Muslims. This led to unprecedented public protests, including one in early December 2016 that was estimated to have brought more than half a million demonstrators onto Jakarta's streets. The protests were accompanied by a massive social media campaign demanding that the governor be charged with, and jailed for, blasphemy.

A major feature of the anti-Ahok protests was their explicit anti-Chinese and anti-Christian tone. Senior Islamic leaders made frequent reference to Ahok's race and religion and some called for laws preventing members of a religious minority from holding executive positions in a majority-Muslim community, such as Jakarta. Vilification of Chinese Christians was especially virulent on social media platforms. The sheer intensity and spread of the outpouring against Ahok forced a reluctant government to prosecute him and to expedite his trial. Most of the trial proceedings were conducted during the election campaign. Ahok lost the election and shortly afterwards was found guilty of blasphemy and jailed for two years.

The impact of the Ahok case both within and outside Indonesia was significant. Many politicians from minorities, especially Chinese and Christians, worried that their own careers in public life were now far less certain as they too might be vulnerable to similar forms of attack. In addition, the events had a chilling effect on up-and-coming members of minority groups contemplating entry into politics. Foreign media also carried extensive reporting on the protests and the trial, with many journalists stating openly that the Ahok case was proof of growing racial and sectarian intolerance in Indonesia, driven particularly by the politics of rising Islamic conservatism (see Chapter 9 by Mietzner and Muhtadi and Chapter 11 by Setijadi).

The other major 'intolerance' issue that attracted global attention was the sharp rise of anti-homosexual and anti-transgender discourses from 2015 (see Chapter 7 by Wieringa and Chapter 8 by Wijaya). Beginning with a campaign by conservative Muslims to ban LGBT awareness and rights programs on campuses, the issue was taken up in early 2016 by a wide range of leaders from across the political and religious spectrums. Ministers and community figures denounced 'sexual deviancy' and advocated rehabilitation programs; universities began asking incoming students to sign declarations that they were not homosexual; and the Indonesian Psychiatrists Association classified homosexuality as a mental disorder, drawing objections from Western psychiatric organisations. Local authorities also began to arrest men for alleged homosexual activities, with two men in Aceh publicly caned after being found guilty of indecent behaviour by a sharia court.

The international response to these cases of intolerance towards religious, ethnic and sexual minorities has been increasingly critical. In early 2018, the UN high commissioner for human rights, Zeid Ra'ad al-Hussein, warned that he saw 'strains of intolerance seemingly alien to Indonesian culture that have made inroads here [in Indonesia]. The extremist views playing out in the political arena are deeply worrying, accompanied as they are by rising levels of incitement to discrimination, hatred or violence in various parts of the country' (OHCHR 2018).

Major human rights organisations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch have also written damning reports on what they perceive to be Indonesia's worsening record on minority rights (Amnesty International 2018; Human Rights Watch 2018).

For all these reasons, it is timely to make a closer examination of minorities in Indonesia—their lives, struggles and aspirations, and the ways in which they may feel a sense of belonging, or not belonging, within Indonesian society. To explore this theme we consider the position and status of different minorities within the Indonesian state both across time and in the present day. Thinking about the place of minorities in Indonesia today

involves thinking about religion and ethnicity; about the gap between creating laws and implementing them; about how ideas and movements that have emerged far from Indonesia affect Indonesian perceptions; about Indonesia's place among the nations in comparative perspective; about the power of discourses to shape politics and everyday life; and more. This book discusses the complex historical and contemporary dimensions of Indonesia's minorities from a range of perspectives, including historical, legal, political, cultural, discursive and social. While much of the current commentary on Indonesia's treatment of minorities is highly critical, our purpose here is to provide a balanced, nuanced and rigorous assessment. Although there clearly are particular minorities that experience discrimination and persecution, this is not true of all minorities, or even for the entirety of a given minority community. In other words, Indonesia's treatment of minorities is neither uniform nor monolithic. Why is it that a certain minority in a particular location incurs the wrath of state officials or surrounding communities when other groups within the same minority are undisturbed or even embraced by the majority? And why might the standing of a particular minority change dramatically over a short span of time? What role do discourses about minorities, and especially shifting nomenclatures that refer to particular groups, play in their plight? These are some of the questions that the contributors to this book seek to answer.

The overarching theme of the volume is that of contentious belonging. Itself an ambiguous and hotly debated term, 'belonging' here encompasses not only citizenship and legal rights but also a more subtle sense of attachment, loyalty and community within a national framework that is more difficult to define and quantify. How strongly do members of minority groups feel that they belong to and occupy a place within Indonesia? To consider this theme we examine the ways in which Indonesia has conceived of the place of minorities within the nation and how it has dealt with its minorities in practice. As noted in the opening paragraph, Indonesia prides itself on being a nation that acknowledges and accommodates diversity. But as recent cases of intolerance make clear, there can be a large gap between aspiration and reality. Indeed, from the earliest days of discussing the idea of 'Indonesia' in the 1920s, the issue of who or what should be part of the independent post-colonial state has divided opinion. The emergent nationalist movement in the Dutch East Indies discussed at length how inclusive or exclusive the proposed nation should be. Should preference be given to or limits imposed upon particular religious or ethnic groups, or certain political ideologies or cultural orientations? Should Indonesia be a nation in which the rights and wishes of the majority take precedence over those of minorities, or should all who reside within its borders have equal rights? Consensus

on such issues proved elusive, whether for the nationalists of the colonial period or the political and community leaders who have shaped public debate since Indonesia's independence in 1945. In fact, for the best part of a century, debates about which minorities 'belong' in Indonesia and what position in society, law and politics they should be accorded have been ever-present.

## IDENTIFYING MINORITIES

Determining who or what is a minority is far from straightforward. At one level, it can seem a simple matter of numbers and proportions. Dictionary definitions usually refer to minorities as being the 'smaller number or part, representing less than half of the whole' (Oxford English Dictionary) or as 'the smaller in number of two groups constituting a whole' (Merriam-Webster). Such numerical definitions appear to render minority status a clear-cut matter, but they fail to capture the complexity of lived experience and relations between groups of different sizes and power dynamics within a society. For this reason, many scholars have focused on such matters as the relative disadvantage borne by one category of people compared to the dominant group. This emphasis raises questions of equality of rights and opportunities and, more broadly, differential treatment and access to power within communities. For example, in apartheid-era South Africa, blacks were a numerical majority but manifestly subordinate to the much-smaller ruling white minority.

There is a large literature, especially in sociology and law, that attempts to provide more nuanced definitions of minorities. Much emphasis is given both to the qualities that a particular group may have that give rise to a self-perception of being a minority or to being classed as such by other groups, as well as to the nature of the relations between groups. Sociologists commonly define a minority as a group with observable characteristics or practices based on such things as gender or sexual orientation, religion, ethnicity or disability. For example, Wirth (1945: 347) defined a minority as

any group of people who, because of their physical or cultural characteristics, are singled out from the others in the society in which they live for differential and unequal treatment.

Membership of a minority group may be ascribed objectively by society or applied subjectively by members of a particular group. According to this view, minority identity is socially constructed. Perhaps the definition that comes closest to combining the numerical with the qualitative is that of the UN official and scholar Francesco Capotorti (1977: 96):

a group numerically inferior to the rest of the population of a State, in a non-dominant position, whose members—being nationals of the State—possess ethnic, religious or linguistic characteristics differing from those of the rest of the population and show, if only implicitly, a sense of solidarity, directed towards preserving their culture, traditions, religion or language.

Capotorti's focus was on religious and ethnic minorities but sexuality and disability could easily be added to his definition without undermining its cogency.

Such discussions about minority status have emerged repeatedly in an Indonesian context, arousing much dispute about the categorisation and characterisation of minorities. For example, although Ahmadiyah regards itself as part of the Islamic community and indeed has this legal status in Indonesia, a large majority of Indonesian Muslims—up to 78 per cent according to one opinion poll—believe Ahmadi are not Muslims (Fealy 2016: 119). Ahmadi leaders have strenuously opposed attempts by some religious affairs ministers to reclassify them as non-Muslims or to shift Ahmadiyah from the religion (*agama*) category to the lower status of a belief (*kepercayaan*). For Ahmadiyah, being a subgroup within the Muslim majority is theologically valid as well as legally preferable to being a stand-alone minority, much less a minority without an officially recognised religion. Conservative Islamist groups also declare Shi'a to lie outside the faith, although this is not a position held by major Islamic organisations.

A quite different inflection on the majority–minority discourse was apparent during the repressive years of Suharto's New Order regime (1966–98), when some Islamic leaders were wont to declare that the Muslim community was a majority with minority mentality—repeating a statement first made in 1980 by the Dutch sociologist W.F. Wertheim (see Chapter 2 by Cribb). In effect they were observing that, despite its vast numerical superiority, the Muslim community was marginalised by the regime and behaved as if it were a small part of the nation. In a similar vein, numerous feminist writers have argued that despite comprising about half of Indonesia's population, women are effectively a minority, such is their lack of political, economic and cultural power. Gay activists also contend that excessive focus on their sexual orientation casts them into the status of a small and often-reviled minority, thereby overlooking their role as full citizens and contributors to mainstream society.

The position with ethnic minorities is even more complicated, as their sense of belonging and allegiance may be diffuse. The Chinese, Arab, Euro-Indonesian (usually known as Indo) and Indian communities are all examples of minorities that have experienced major internal differences over relations with majority communities and the degree of identification with the nation. Each of these communities contains elements that identify

primarily, even exclusively, with Indonesia and regard themselves unequivocally as Indonesian citizens. But each also possesses groups that retain strong loyalties to and connections with their homelands, whether real or imagined. For instance, a majority of the Chinese minority (known as Peranakan) are thoroughly Indonesian-ised, linguistically, culturally and in terms of national allegiance, whereas many other Chinese Indonesians remain strongly oriented towards mainland China. Arab communities also contain groups who maintain close ties with Yemen, whence many of their forebears came. Until the recent conflict in Yemen, many Arab families sent their sons to study in Yemeni schools and colleges, and prominent Yemeni *ulama* are revered within Indonesian Arab circles. As Maria Myutel makes clear in Chapter 12 of this book, many Sindhis living in Indonesia continue to visit India regularly and retain substantial economic, kinship and cultural links there.

Perhaps most complex of all is the position of 'indigenous' Indonesians, a varied array of minorities, estimated to number in the millions, who regard themselves as being the original inhabitants of a region or as having much longer ties of settlement to and affinity with a locality than the majority communities. Some of these communities seek to remain isolated from mainstream communities. For example, the Orang Rimba (Forest People) of Jambi and Riau continue to preserve centuries-old practices of living deep within the forest and having minimal contact with outsiders rather than integrate into Indonesian society (see Chapter 13 by Manurung). Relatively few Orang Rimba know about Indonesia's national history or its legal and political structures—matters regarded as obligatory for other citizens. Their awareness and primary identity are largely directed inward, not towards the nation. The Orang Rimba do perceive themselves to be part of Indonesia but nonetheless seek to maintain a high degree of separation from the state.

Hence, the sense of 'belonging' in Indonesia takes markedly different forms within different minority groups. This can heavily influence majority attitudes to particular minorities. In general, those minority communities that display a high degree of cultural assimilation and conform to majority notions of loyalty to the Indonesian nation tend to be better received and less likely to attract suspicion and denigration. By contrast, those that maintain very distinctive cultural patterns or remain separate from the mainstream are more likely to be regarded with suspicion, resentment or condescension. Peranakan Chinese tend to be better received than Totok Chinese, who do not speak Indonesian or demonstrate cultural integration. Smaller, less conspicuous minorities, such as the Indians, are largely absent from national debates about belonging. Indigenous groups such as the Orang Rimba generate paternalistic sentiment as governments at the national and local levels seek to 'modernise'

these communities and integrate them more fully into national life. And so it is that relations between the majority and minorities can vary substantially, making the task of generalisation hazardous.

## **A GUIDE TO THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK**

This volume is divided into five parts: history and law; disability; sexuality; religion and ethnicity; and a final set of reflections. In the following 13 chapters, the contributors explore diverse aspects of minority life in Indonesia. Taken together, the articles expand and deepen our understanding of Indonesia by highlighting and engaging critically with core themes of Indonesian life through the ‘minority lens’: the role of civil society, the stakes of political struggles, past and present discourses in the public sphere, integration versus separateness, justice and democracy, the malleability of collective categories and more.

Part 1 opens with a broad survey of the history of minorities in Indonesia by Robert Cribb. Although at present we tend to think of minorities as living under threat, the author suggests that minority status has at times carried advantages and even privilege. Above all, Cribb argues, minority status in Indonesia needs to be considered as a product of complex social and political forces that have shifted over time. He shows this by focusing on three groups: the Indo-Europeans, the Chinese, and the Islamists who have rejected the idea of a secular Indonesia. The latter’s growing self-confidence during the New Order’s later years, and especially after Suharto’s fall, has propelled them to centre stage in Indonesian society and politics. Cribb argues that, with this shift and the accompanying rise in intolerance towards various ‘others’ (with the Ahok case signalling a watershed moment), a new tendency towards cantonisation based on religious and ethnic identity has emerged. This poses a threat to the unity of the state and its historical embracing of plurality, as well as creating challenges for what Cribb terms the ‘new minorities’ (for example, indigenous groups, women, people with disabilities) that cannot readily be cantonised.

In Chapter 3, Tim Lindsey provides an overview of aspects of the complex legal framework regulating the treatment of minorities in Indonesia. Although the post-Suharto era began with aspirational and often impressive constitutional reform between 1999 and 2002, followed by policy debates (typically led by civil society) that produced sophisticated reform models based on global standards, the laws and regulations eventually produced by the government or the national legislature tend to be flawed or incomplete. Further complicating things has been a lack of compliance measures and sanctions as well as multiple enforcement challenges. All

this, plus a growing culture of intolerant Muslim majoritarianism, means that there is in fact no coherent framework for the protection of minorities, leaving them vulnerable to discrimination and abuse. To demonstrate this point, Lindsey surveys key laws and regulations relating to the treatment of disabled Indonesians, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex (LGBTQI) Indonesians, religious minorities, customary (*adat*) communities and the ethnic Chinese. Lindsey concludes that the shortcomings of minority-related laws create major challenges for minorities, ensuring that ‘their “belonging” remains contentious legally as well as in other ways’.

In Chapter 4, Simon Butt examines Indonesia’s Constitutional Court, established in 2003, as an arena in which minorities can pursue their interests. To exemplify the workings of the court, he focuses on two cases handed down in 2017. The first touched on the interests of some of Indonesia’s LGBTQI community. Had the applicants, members of a conservative Muslim group, won, the court would effectively have outlawed consensual gay sex. Although the applicants did not win the case, Butt writes that the court’s very narrow decision (five judges rejected the application while four supported it) ‘does not bode well for the future of Indonesian pluralism’. The second case concerned the constitutional recognition of indigenous beliefs (*kepercayaan*), the followers of which have often suffered marginalisation and discrimination. The court’s decision to change the provisions of a statute that required the followers of indigenous religions to leave the religion column in their state-issued identity cards blank may be a step towards greater state recognition and support of indigenous minority religions. The decision represents an advance for religious freedom in Indonesia but nevertheless needs to be viewed with caution because its actual implications are far from clear. In his analysis of both cases Butt shows that, despite the Constitutional Court’s image as a protector of human rights and democracy, its work leaves much to be desired: its review powers are narrow, it has no formal powers of enforcement and its rulings are not retrospective. In addition, its decision-making process is far from transparent and its often-crude methods of balancing minority and majority rights ‘will rarely, if ever, permit acceptable levels of constitutional protection for minorities’.

Part 2 of the book, consisting of two chapters, focuses on disability. In Chapter 5, Thushara Dibley and Antoni Tsaputra begin by positing that being disabled in Indonesia has traditionally been seen as an impediment, a source of pity and a driver of acts of charity. Influenced by shifts in attitudes taking place elsewhere, Indonesian activists began to campaign for this ‘welfare’ approach to disability to be replaced with a ‘social model’ that prioritised the social structures that make it difficult for people with disability to participate in society. Ensuring that the principles of the

social model are put into practice in Indonesia, the authors argue, lies at the heart of why disability activists have remained so persistent in their pursuit of legislative and policy change. In their exploration of activists' role in bringing about change, Dibley and Tsaputra focus in particular on how activists have maintained pressure on the government since the passing of Law No. 8/2016 on People with Disabilities. While activists are deeply committed to ensuring that the ministerial and other regulations required to implement the Disability Law reflect the changing international norms, there has been considerable resistance from policy-makers to applying these ideas. Pragmatism and the notion of people with disability as requiring charitable assistance have prevailed throughout the process of implementing the Disability Law. Another impediment to implementing the law is the fact that, unlike other (sexual, ethnic, religious) minority groups, people with disability are advocating for an issue that is 'morally appealing but politically neutral', giving policy-makers little incentive to follow through on their promises. A final obstacle is the significant gap in access to disability services and information between Jakarta and other parts of the country.

In Chapter 6, Dina Afrianty analyses efforts to integrate people with disability into Indonesia's education system, especially the Islamic sector. Indonesians with disabilities continue to face significant difficulties in gaining entrance to the higher education sector due to barriers in the form of policy, funding and—above all—attitudes within the administration of higher education institutions. In recent years, however, gradual improvements have been evident. Beginning with the premise that cultural and religious beliefs play a role in shaping perceptions of people with disabilities and citing research showing that certain religious interpretations have contributed to discriminatory treatment, Afrianty argues that there is potential, nonetheless, for religious teachings to become a major source of social change. The intersection of faith-based cultural views and social practices, she suggests, could ultimately contribute to a dialogue about faith as a source of inclusive and pluralist beliefs and practices more broadly.

The two chapters that make up Part 3 of the book discuss the problems faced by sexual minorities in Indonesia. Saskia Wieringa argues in Chapter 7 that despite the widespread perception that Indonesia is relatively tolerant towards sexual minorities, heteronormativity has in fact always been the dominant regime. After querying how 'tolerant' in relation to same-sex practices the Indonesian archipelago actually was in the past, Wieringa provides examples of the homophobic campaign sweeping the country since 2015. Coming in the footsteps of a period in which LGBT issues gradually became more visible and sexual rights were discussed more openly in Indonesia after the fall of Suharto's military

dictatorship in 1998, this homophobic campaign, Wieringa says, constitutes the second sexual moral panic in Indonesia's modern history. The first, motivated by political interests, started in 1965 following an army-orchestrated campaign of sexual slander, epitomised by the accusations of sexual deviancy and violence directed against the members of the prominent socialist women's organisation, Gerwani. The present-day sexual moral panic builds on the earlier one and has been spurred by the rise of conservative Muslim militias. Although homophobia has taken different manifestations in Indonesia, it has been persistent; the brief post-*reformasi* lull in its expression was more of an anomaly than a long-held conviction.

Chapter 8 by Hendri Yulius Wijaya focuses on the multiple strategies of Indonesia's queer activists and the ways these have shifted over time, with the term 'queer activists' referring to the articulation of Indonesian queer activists' efforts to eradicate stigma and discrimination through diverse forms of advocacy. Drawing on discourse analysis of historical archives and his own personal engagement with local queer activists, Wijaya traces the emergence of diverse sexual and gender identities in Indonesia, from gay, to LGBT, to more nuanced understandings of sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression (SOGIE). He suggests that the adoption and refashioning of those identities reveal the activists' strategies and encounters with transnational discourses, localised in an Indonesian context. Wijaya claims that LGBT and, later, SOGIE discourses are inextricably linked to claims of national belonging, and are deployed to forge a sense of community and political allegiance among Indonesian sexual minorities in their resistance of heteronormativity.

Part 4 of the book, consisting of five chapters, discusses various religious and ethnic minorities. The opening chapter in this section, by Marcus Mietzner and Burhanuddin Muhtadi, analyses Muslims' attitudes towards religious and ethnic minorities using quantitative data gained primarily from surveys conducted in 2018 but also drawing on other polling going back to 2010. The authors ask if the mass mobilisation against Ahok in 2016–17 represented deeply held discriminatory views or was triggered by exclusivist Islamist sentiment. They also seek to establish whether the protests led to an increase in intolerance that persisted well after the tumult of the gubernatorial election had receded. The authors find that about a third of Muslims hold strongly intolerant views towards both non-Muslims and Chinese, and that the level of intolerance actually increased after the election campaign, something they believe is due to the role of conservative religio-political entrepreneurs in building on existing community dislike of those minorities. Moreover, their data suggest that while well-to-do and well-educated urban Muslims drove much of the anti-Ahok mobilisation, the swelling numbers of protestors on the streets of Jakarta were drawn mainly from lower-class Muslims,

many of whom have maintained their activism since Ahok's defeat and jailing. Mietzner and Muhtadi conclude that anti-minority thinking is penetrating more deeply into mainstream politics and, as such, undermines Indonesia's standing as a democracy that upholds principles of religious and ethnic pluralism.

In Chapter 10, Ihsan Ali-Fauzi explores the dynamics of religious conflict in Indonesia by focusing on the role of the state-mandated Inter-religious Harmony Forums (Forum Kerukunan Umat Beragama, FKUBs) in resolving community tensions over houses of worship. He uses two contrasting case studies—one of a disputed mosque construction in the majority-Christian city of Kupang in eastern Indonesia and the other of a contentious church development in a largely Muslim area of Gunung Kidul in Java—to examine how local FKUBs, officials and civil society organisations serve either to facilitate or to obstruct the resolution of religious disagreements. Ali-Fauzi shows that in the Kupang case, the local FKUB contributed to the escalation of the mosque dispute by incorrectly issuing a construction permit and that it was interfaith community groups that eventually succeeded in negotiating a compromise solution and bringing the disputing parties together. In Gunung Kidul, too, the local FKUB was of limited effectiveness, but a resourceful and astute local official managed to broker a lasting and peaceful agreement between Muslim groups and the Christian congregation. Ali-Fauzi uses these case studies to show that the Interreligious Harmony Forums have the potential to resolve religious conflicts but lack the resources, training and local government support to fulfil their mandate.

Charlotte Setijadi in Chapter 11 investigates xenophobic discourses about the Chinese community during the 2016–17 Jakarta gubernatorial election, paying particular attention to the return of the term *pribumi* (indigenous or native) to the rhetorical vocabulary of political and community leaders who were pursuing anti-Chinese agendas. She traces the long historical precedents for counterposing *pribumi* and Chinese in a way that consigned the latter to being conspicuous outsiders or 'others' in Indonesian society. In such a context, *pribumi* denotes a sense of 'nateness', marking a racial boundary between those who are seen as belonging to Indonesia and those who are not. After Ahok's defeat, various Muslim political leaders used the term *pribumi* to signal the grievances of 'indigenous' Indonesians against economic inequality and dispossession by foreigners, especially the Chinese. Setijadi further argues that, despite its apparent restoration of Chinese rights that were withdrawn during the Suharto era, the *reformasi* period has in fact seen a continuation of powerful anti-Chinese views and activism. Long before the anti-Ahok mobilisation, vilification of Chinese and conspiracy theories surrounding the Chinese were commonplace in politics. Unlike Mietzner and Muhtadi,

she contends that anti-Chinese sentiment declined following the Jakarta election but she points to the 2019 general elections as providing an indicator of whether Chinese have lessened their political participation as a result of the Ahok case.

In Chapter 12, Maria Myutel opens a window to the little-known Sindhi minority in Indonesia. Although numerically miniscule (numbering approximately 10,000 out of Indonesia's 260 million inhabitants), this minority has played a significant role in the country's economy and in cultural production in particular. Myutel argues that, contrary to conventional narratives that view minorities as always occupying a disadvantaged position and/or resisting the state, the case of the Sindhis shows that minority status can signal an advantage, even privilege, over a majority of the country's population. Their case, she suggests, shows how an overall disregard of state power, often in the form of disregarding both obligations and rights, can be an effective way of preserving a distinct identity. She claims that the mostly neutral relations between the Sindhis and the state, with very few points of interaction, have only rarely led to pressure or antagonism. Thus, overall, the relations between the Sindhi minority and the Indonesian state do not fit into the commonly used frameworks of forced assimilation or targeted discrimination and marginalisation, offering an alternative paradigm for considering minority status in Indonesia.

Butet Manurung examines the position of the Orang Rimba, a largely forest-dwelling indigenous community in Jambi, in Chapter 13. Drawing on her extensive experience of working among the Orang Rimba as an educator and human rights activist, she describes in detail the culture, values and lifestyle of the community and its increasingly complex relations with the Indonesian state and local government and society. For more than 50 years, Manurung says, state policies have progressively marginalised and disempowered the Orang Rimba. During the Suharto period, developmentalist priorities meant that forest areas in which the Orang Rimba lived were cleared for lumber, mining and plantations, with subsequent displacement and disruption of traditional lifestyles. *Reformasi* period policies on the creation of national parks and environmental sustainability have also impacted negatively on forest peoples by impinging on their traditional zones of habitation, cultivation and religious activities as well as limiting the free movement of Orang Rimba within the jungle. The national and local governments have sought to integrate the Orang Rimba by encouraging conversion to mainstream religions and participation in the national education system, despite many indigenes regarding these as irrelevant to and destructive of their customary way of life.

In a final chapter reflecting on the main theme of this book, contentious belonging, Sidney Jones suggests that we need to shift the focus away

from the national to the local level, and from Java to the Outer Islands, in order to identify several additional dimensions of minority status. One such dimension is the tension between indigenous and migrant communities: in many areas of Indonesia outside Java the line between the two is constantly changing, at times leading to animosity and violence. The process of subdividing administrative regions (*pemekaran*) provides another example of constantly changing minority–majority status at the local level, because an ethnic minority can be transformed into an ethnic majority by redrawing the boundaries so that a particular ethnic group dominates at the district level. A third additional dimension of minority status explored in the chapter is racial identity, especially along Melanesian versus Malay lines. The diverse examples of these phenomena discussed by Jones underscore how the concept of ‘ethnic minority’ in Indonesia is ‘both politically charged and infinitely malleable’. Jones concludes by returning to the growing spectre of Muslim majoritarianism in Indonesia, a concern that informed the analysis in many of the preceding chapters. She closes the volume with the apt observation that ‘a fundamental principle of democracies is political equality and justice for all—and that means equal rights regardless of race, religion, ethnicity or sexual orientation. It does not mean simply that the majority can dictate the rules’.

## REFERENCES

- Amnesty International (2018) ‘Indonesia: crackdowns on LGBTI people hit alarming levels’, Amnesty International, 6 November. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2018/11/indonesia-crackdowns-lgbti-people-hit-alarming-level/>
- Capotorti, F. (1977) *The International Protection of Persons Belonging to Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities since 1919*, United Nations Economic and Social Council, New York NY.
- Fealy, G. (2016) ‘The politics of religious intolerance in Indonesia’, in T. Lindsey and H. Pausacker (eds) *Religion, Law and Intolerance in Indonesia*, Routledge, London and New York, 115–31.
- Human Rights Watch (2018) ‘Indonesia: failure to confront intolerance’, Human Rights Watch, 18 January. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/01/18/indonesia-failure-confront-intolerance>
- OHCHR (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights) (2018) ‘UN human rights chief ends visit to Indonesia’, OHCHR, Geneva, 7 February. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=22637&LangID=E>
- Parlina, I., and M.S. Aritonang (2013) ‘SBY vows to address religious intolerance upon receiving international award’, *Jakarta Post*, 1 June.
- Vatikiotis, M. (2017) *Blood and Silk: Power and Conflict in Modern Southeast Asia*, Weidenfeld & Nicholson, London.
- Wirth, L. (1945) ‘The problem of minority groups’, in R. Linton (ed.) *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, Columbia University Press, New York NY.

Yudhoyono, S.B. (2009) 'Towards harmony among civilizations', speech delivered to John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge MA, 29 September. <http://indonesia-oslo.no/towards-harmony-among-civilizations-speech-at-the-john-f-kennedy-school-of-government-harvard-university/>