

Social and Spiritual Capital in the Discourse of Multiculturalism *Kapital Spiritual dan Sosial dalam Wacana Multikulturalisme*

Wahyudi¹

ABSTRACT

This article explains the condition of Indonesia related to diversity, conflict, and violence. It also discusses the religious phenomenon in some parts of Indonesia regions in relation to the conflict and violence. Thus, this article proposes the important of multiculturalism concept to be implemented in Indonesia, concerning social and spiritual capital in the discourse of the concept. There is the need to create synergy of another capitals in a community with social capital.

Key word: conflict, violence, religious groups, multiculturalism, social, spiritual capital

ABSTRAK

Artikel ini menjelaskan tentang kondisi Indonesia berkaitan dengan keberagaman, konflik dan kekerasan. Artikel ini juga mendiskusikan tentang fenomena reigius dalam beberapa daerah di Indonesia dalam hubungannya dengan konflik dan kekerasan. Karenanya artikel ini menyarankan pentingnya konsep multikuturalisme diterapkan di Indonesia, berkaitan dengan modal spiritual dan sosial dalam wacana konsep. Ada kebutuhan untuk menciptakan sinergi dengan modal lain di dalam masyarakat dengan modal sosial.

Kata kunci: konflik, kekerasan, kelompok agama, mutikulturalisme, kapital sosial, spiritual

Diversity, conflict, violence, and multiculturalism have been being object to be studied by some researchers. In last ten years, researcher's interest in those themes has increased significantly. Researcher's ways in understanding diversity in Indonesia are not only in by describing identity, but also by seeing the interaction pattern of each group; whether it has conflict in integrative, accommodative, or competitive pattern. One of group identity in which attracts many researchers is religious diversity as one of crucial factors in social interaction among groups. The proof can be found from Clifford Geertz's research (1960) in Mojokunto. Although Geertz's research focused more on diversity on religious variants in Javanese Muslim society, such as *santri* (student who learns Islamic study), *abangan* (Muslim but has no enough knowledge of the religion), and *priyayi* (people who still have aristocratic blood), but he also noticed conflict process and integration between each variant. Geertz had succeeded in presenting important finding about factors behind the different interaction patterns between *santri*, *abangan*, and *priyayi*. Conflict happened among society in Mojokunto was not always only caused by different implementation of religious practices, but also it was caused by different political affiliation of each variant.² But, according to Geertz, integration also

¹ Correspondence: Wahyudi, Sociology, FISIP, Universitas Muhammadiyah, Malang. Jalan Raya Tlogomas, Malang 65144. E-mail: wahwahyudi@yahoo.com

² Political variable, it is more on difference of different political affiliation as the causal conflict between, *santri*, *abangan*, and *priyayi*, presented interestingly by Imam Tolkhah in his research *Anatomi Konflik Politik di Indonesia: Belajar dari Ketegangan Politik Varian di Madukoro* (2001). Madukuro is an alias of one of the villages in Madiun. In conflict studies in Indonesia, Madiun is often drawn as one of political conflict locus with ideological competition background and with horrified escalation and effects.

developed among those three variants. It was interesting because integration was exactly caused by cultural factor; that was sense of common culture.

Geertz's finding, especially related to non-religious factor as the cause of integration in Mojokuto, has similarity with Passen's (1985) in North Sulawesi. Passen's research location was dwelled by various religioned-background society, but this diversity—according to Passen's analysis—did not influence integration in society; among the groups had good cooperation. Passen found that there was integration factor in cultural mentality of North Sulawesi society. They were loyal to their cultural bound.

I also found the same phenomenon in Mojorejo, Batu. Although the village was resided by three religious groups of people; Islam, Pantecost, and Buddhism, but social interaction was dominated by integrative pattern. Mojorejo's society had the same feeling as Mojokuto's (Geertz's finding); that was sense of common culture. So, the religion diversity does not cause social conflict (Syamsul Arifin 2005). Imam Baehaqi, et. al. (2002) also found the same phenomenon in Solo, Yogyakarta, and Salatiga, just like what Geertz had found. Although there were various religion groups in those three research locations, but interaction pattern entirely happened integratively. Culture as Geertz had found also became factor in which could unity various religious groups in Solo, Yogyakarta, dan Salatiga. As Javanese part of society, people in those three location had cultural values such as *guyub* (willingness to take part in social activity), *gotong-royong* (cooperation), *musyawarah* (dialogue to find same voice), *rembug* (dialogue), and *tepa selira* (empathy). These values according to Imam Baihaqi et.al. had proved that they could glue relationship among people with various religions.

Beside revealing social interaction pattern of various religious groups, previous research also concerning to the grouping phenomenon developed in one religion as it was done by Ahmad Fedyani Saifuddin (1986) in Alabio, South Kalimantan to the members of Muhammadiyah and Nahdatul Ulama (NU). In his research, Ahmad Fedyani Saifuddin had succeeded picturing hostility between the members of Muhammadiyah and NU in which rooted on different interpretations about religious lessons. It was then interesting because their different views and religious practices did not always raise hostility. Research conducted by Abdul Munir Mulkhan (2000) proved it. His research *Gerakan Pemurnian Islam di Pedesaan: Kasus Muhammadiyah Kecamatan Wuluhan, Jember, Jawa Timur*,³ was not only presenting little different picture from Ahmad Fedyani Saifuddin, but also shifted monolithic image stiked on Muhammadiyah. In Wuluhan, Abdul Munir Mulkhan found two variants of Muhammadiyah which was not only tolerant to religious practices that become point of hostility in Alabio society—Ahmad Fedyani Saifuddin's research location—but also they did it too. Abdul Munir Mulkhan called this variant as *Munu* (Muhammadiyah-NU) and *Munas* (Muhammadiyah-Nasionalist) which was also called *Marmud* (Marheinstein-Muhammadiyah). In social interaction context, those two Muhammadiyah variants considered integration with other groups as the most important thing, although from conception and religious practice they were totally different (contrary) with Muhammadiyah. This tradition intersection phenomenon was not only happened in the research location of Abdul Munir Mulkhan. Zainuddin Fananie and Atiqah Sabardila also found the same phenomenon in Surakarta. Through research *Sumber Konflik Masyarakat Muslim Muhammadiyah-NU: Perspektif Keberterimaan Tahlil* (2000), the two

In his introduction, Imam Tolkhah named Madukuro as one place in which could not be separated from conflict happened in Madiun. Imam Tolkhah's main focus of course directed to conflict popular as "Pemberontakan Madiun" (Madiun Rebellion) in September 18, 1948. Referred to local informant, Imam Tolkhah showed that there was political escalation in which horizontally taken place between communist—main actor of the rebellion—and Islamic *jamaah* (santri). In village level, as written by Imam Tolkhah, communists did not only *a coup d'état* against village government, but also attacked, kidnapped and even killed Muslim activists. The rebellion was scaring and it was tragic political phenomenon to *jamaah* around Madukoro.

³ After published by Bentang in 2000, the title changed into *Islam Murni dalam Masyarakat Petani*. The citation of Abdul Munir Mulkhan's research was based on the book published by Bentang.

researchers found another variant in Muhammadiyah community in which they performed *tahlil* ritual, a religious ritual often criticized by Muhammadiyah because it was considered deviated from *sunnah* (Muhammad's customary practices in life)

In addition, there is open conflict in which can come to an end in violent actions to other religious groups. Through his research in Situbondo, Thomas Santoso (1996) found the cause of conflict and violent actions between Muslim and Christian with damaging church as the *modus operandi*. According to Thomas Santoso's analysis, the action of damaging church was caused by religious understanding which was claimed to be the most rightful. Society in Situbondo which was famous because of the religiosity (Situbondo itself is called "town of *santri*") felt in danger for there were increasing number of churches (Thomas Santoso 1996). In Muslim society, there is development in exclusive religious understanding in which often criticizes other religious understandings. Research conducted by Fatimah Husein (2005)⁴ had succeeded in showing that there was exclusive understanding in elite of Muslims in which often criticized the concept of God in Christianity. This view then was not only developed in elite, but also spreaded in Moslem middle and tertiary level. This view, of course, influences the Moslems' acceptance to Christians as happened in Situbondo as it was proved by Thomas Santoso. Of course, religious understanding was not the only causal factor of conflicts and violent actions between different religious members. Research conducted by Riza Sihbudi, *et.al.* (2001) in considered-locations of religious conflict between religions happened such as in Kupang and Mataram was not only caused by religious factor—for example because of the spreadness of religious sentiment to the conflict in Ambon—but also caused by economic disparity especially between native and non-native people. Economic disparity often seemed to be main causal factor to the conflict in Indonesia. Research conducted by Nurhadiantomo (2004) about conflict between native and Chinese ethnic in Solo stated that economic disparity was the cause of the conflict.

The interest of many researchers to the diversity, conflict, and violence, it does not mean that they "only" describes various patterns of social interaction between different groups, but also tries to find solution to the conflict and violence. Such kind of researches were conducted by, for instance, Mohammad Sabri (1999), Syamsul Arifin (1999; 2000), Abd. Rahman Assegaf (2004), Syamsul Ma'arif (2005), and M. Ainul Yaqin (2005). Mohammad Sabri's research belonged to library research. It tried to trace the possibility of religion

⁴ Compared to the research conducted by Mujiburrahman, "*Feeling Threatened: Muslim-Christian Relations in Indonesia's New Order*," (Dissertation, Amsterdam University Press, 2006). The research strengthen Fatimah Husein's finding. According to Mujiburrahman, relationship between Muslim and Christian in New Order filled with suspicious feeling so that there was strained situation between them. In the conclusion chapter (look at p. 299-307), Mujiburrahman, among other things, written as follows: "The relation between Muslim and Christians has been tensed because of mutual suspicions existing between them. The mutual suspicions have been reflected in, and exacerbated by, the antagonistic discourses in which the Muslim and Christian leaders perceived each other as a threat against their respective religious communities. Among the Muslims, the Christian threat has been called '*Kristenisasi*' (Christianization). Among Muslim's discourse, christianization is meant to be unfair and aggressive efforts to convert Muslim into Christianity by offering money, food, education, and health care to the poor Muslims; building a church in a Muslim majority area; encouraging Christians to marry Muslim partners in order to convert in the latter; inviting Muslim to participate in Christmas celebrations under the pretext of religious tolerance; and teaching Christianity to Muslim student in Christian schools. In the Muslim's discourse, christianization could also mean a political conspiracy of the Christians with other enemies of Islam, particularly the secularist, inside and outside the country, to weaken the Islamic groups culturally, politically and economically. Christianization was therefore described as a 'new style of crusade', 'religious expansionism', 'foreign intervention', 'arrogance of cultural superiority' inherited from the West, and 'intolerant to Muslim's feeling'." Meanwhile, the suspicion of Christian to Muslim drew by Mujiburrahman, as follows: "Whereas the Muslims felt insecure and threatened by christianization, the Christians were afraid of the threat of an Islamic State. For the Christians, to have to live under an Islamic state in which the *sharia* law was implemented would mean that they would be turned into second class citizens."

companionship using perenial philosophical analysis "knife". Through the approach, Mohammad Sabri found the possibility of religion companionship which was based on the unity of transcendental orientation. Based on his research, Mohammad Sabri recommended that religion-related studies in the future would be more orientated on efforts in finding *modus vivendi* rather than debating the differences. The result of Sabris's research, on the other side, firmed more on important meaning of cross religious discourse which was also often raised by Abdurrahman Wahid dan Nurcholish Madjid (Syamsul Arifin 1999).

Researchers see that education is a strategic social institution to disseminate cross religious discourse. Research conducted by Syamsul Arifin (2000) showed that there were many lecturers of Islamic Study (*Pendidikan Agama Islam*) who had awareness in socializing pluralistic attitude to other religions to the students so that the conflict between religions could be avoided. Strategic posiiion of education as a media used to socialize pluralistic attitude got stressing in studies done by Abd. Rahman Assegaf (2004), Syamsul Ma'arif (2005), and Ainul Yaqin (2005). From those three researchers, research conducted by Ainul Yaqin had the up to date designation for it presented multiculturalism. Using this approach, Ainul Yaqin then offered multicultural education. In his view, multicultural education is not only developing knowledge, but also pluralistic, democratic, humanistic, and fair attitude related to cultural differences around students' social environment.

Explanation above gives important signal that studies aroud diversity, conflict, violence, and multiculturalism were plentiful, but it does not mean that studies around these topics have no magnetic attraction anymore especially to the development of knowledge. From all the topics in which had been studied, it seems that multiculturalism still needed deeper study especially to strengten its pragmatic truth. In philosophical study, there are three truth theories; those are coherence, corespondence, and pragmatic theory. In some countries, multiculturalism concept has been institutionalized as a part of approach to public policy in facing complexity probems. It means that multiculturalism concept is considered to be true pragmatically because it has been used empirically. In Indonesia, multiculturalism indeed has had apreciation especially from academic people. One of the apreciation forms, for example, is apparently visible from the existance of the discourse of multiculturalism as an alternative of pluralism concept. Appreciation also appears on various efforts to objectivize multiculturalism in many life field such as in education. Beside Ainul Yaqin who had studied multicultural education sistematically, there are also some researchers who apreciated the concept of multiculturalism in education, such as H.A.R. Tilaar (2004; 2005), S. Hamid Hasan (<http://www.depdiknas.go.id>), Hujair Sanaky (<http://www.sanaky.com>), and Ainurrofiq Dawam (2003).⁵

⁵ Compared to Mashudi Noorsalim, dkk. *Hak Minoritas: Multikulturalisme dan Dilema Negara Bangsa* (Jakarta: Interseksi Foundation, 2007). In 2005, Interseksi Foundation published the same genre-book: *Hak Minoritas: Dilema Multikulturalisme di Indonesia*. This book includes the preliminary research of Interseksi Foundation in five local communities which were facing existential problem against combination state authority and formal religious authority (also called state religion) in Indonesia. This book offers the fight of Tanah Toa community people in Kecamatan Kajang, Bukukumba, South Sulawesi. According to researcher's analysis, this community is an example of minority group in Indonesia in which still has no existential acknowledgement as it is pointed by multiculturalism. Community people of Tanah Toa, for example, considered having deviated doctrines in which become *dakwah* target from Muslims community who thought that they hold the most pure Islamic doctrines. The next publication, it also shows the existence of minority groups spread in five regions. One of the minority groups who got attention in second publication is Ahmadiyah community in Ciparay, Cianjur, West Java. One of the prominent conclusions from research conducted by Interseksi Foundation is government's policy to the minority groups needed to be framed using multiculturalism. Thus, cultural diversities in minority groups also get the same acknowledgement as other majority groups in Indonesia. Before the minority groups get the equality in public arena, according to Interseksi team, Indonesia cannot be called as multicultural country although Indonesia has various cultures. According to Ridwan al-Makassary, one of Interseksi team member, the existence of various cultures in a country cannot make the country straight becomes multicultural society. A state is only to be said multicultural country if the

From Muslim people themselves, there are also some appreciation to the concept of multiculturalism. M. Amin Abdullah (2000), for instance, in his philosophical doctoral dissertation offered multiculturalism as epistemologic basis in developing Islamic studies, but if it was compared to the development in education field, discourse and praxis of multiculturalism in Islamic studies were considered awkward. Whereas, scientific capital to develop religious studies which is based on multiculturalism has been available. Since last two decades, there is school of thought in Indonesia which is called *Islam Liberal*.⁶ Study done by Greg Barton (1999) showed that Islamic thought movement in which has liberalistic orientation had emerged in 1960's and figured by Ahmad Wahib. Since last decade then, activists of liberal Islamic movement in Indonesia have strengthened itself especially institutionally because it has been coordinated through various network such as *Jaringan Islam Liberal* (JIL) and *Jaringan Intelektual Muda Muhammadiyah* (JIMM).⁷ One of the themes in which has got deep elaboration from activists of Liberal Islam is relationship inter-religious members. Their idea related to this topic tends to inclusive. They develop thought in which can open dialogue space and cooperation between different religious people. The development related to it is a scientific capital to develop religious studies based on multiculturalism.

Genealogy and the Development of Multiculturalism

"The best way to start discussing multiculturalism and multicultural education may be putting forward such historical roots of the concepts as plurality and pluralism, and multicultural and multiculturalism," said Kamanto Sunarto, Russell Hiang-Kheng Heng, and Achmad Fedyani Saifuddin in Introduction of the book they edited entitled *Multicultural Education in Indonesia and Southeast Asia: Stepping into the Unfamiliar* (2004). Study on multiculturalism exactly needs to be related to the origin of the concept of multiculturalism so that it can be recognized its sociological background of the development of multiculturalism concept and its relevance to the condition and situation in Indonesia. In some studies of multiculturalism, for example in which had been done by Melani Budianta (2004), Hilda Hernandez (2001), Will Kymlicka (2003), Donna M. Gollnick and Philip C. Chinn (2002), H.A. R. Tilaar (2004), and Alo Liweri

various cultural diversities have equality in public arena (look at Ridwan al-Makassary, "Multikulturalisme: Review Teoritis dan Beberapa Catatan Kritis," in Mashudi Noorsalim, et. al., *Hak Minoritas: Multikulturalisme dan Dilema Negara Bangsa* (Jakarta: Interseksi Foundation, 2007).

⁶ Nomenclature of *Islam Liberal* (Liberal Islam) is introduced by, for instance, Charles Kurzman, lecturer on Sociology at University of North California. In the book entitled *Liberal Islam: A Sourcebook* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), Charles Kurzman explained Liberal Islam as one of socio-religious interpretation tradition which is different with customary Islam and revivalist Islam which is well known as Islamism, fundamentalism, or Wahabism. Customary Islam signed with accommodative relation between Islam and local customs. On the other hand, revivalist Islam tries to take back the purity of Islamic doctrines in which has been contaminated with local customs accommodated by customary Islam. Meanwhile, Liberal Islam, according to Charles Kurzman on that book: "...clearly defines itself as different with customary Islam and proclaims the excellence of the most early period of Islam to assert validity of recent religious practices, but Liberal Islam presents the past for the importance of modernity. Meanwhile, revivalist Islam asserts modernity (as electronic technology) in the name of the past." Look at Charles Kurzman in "Pengantar: Islam Liberal dan Konteks Islaminya," in Charles Kurzman (ed.), *Wacana Islam Liberal: Pemikiran Islam Kontemporer tentang Isu-isu Global*, translated by Bahrul Ulum and Heri Junaidi (Jakarta: Paramadina, 2001).

⁷ Recently, JIMM activists prefer to call themselves as progressive Islam especially because of the Islamic discourse brought by JIMM wants to advocate the marginal group in which do not get benefit from the development of neo-liberalism. Farid Esack gave the definition of progressive Islam as follows: "*Progressive Islam is that understanding of Islam and its sources which comes from and is shaped within a commitment to transform society from an unjust one where people are mere objects of exploitation by governments, socio-economic institutions and unequal relationships. The new society will be a just one where people are the subjects of history, the shapers of their own destiny in the full awareness that all of humankind is in a state of returning to God and that the universe was created as a sign of God's presence.*" Look at Esack (2003).

(2005), western countries such as America, Canada, Australia, Germany, and England were often called as the origin countries of multiculturalism concept. In those countries, multiculturalism concept has now not only become academic discourse, but also become strategic part of public policy just like in a form of affirmative action. It is empowerment program to certain group categorized as minority (Paul B. Horton & Chester L. Hunt 1992). In those countries, multiculturalism is also used as reference design in planning an education program in which accommodates diversity in society.

At least, there were two main considerations as the reason of using multiculturalism to be the reference in planning public policy in those countries. First, there is diversity in society. The countries are resided by citizens with various social and cultural backgrounds. Second, there is segregation as the continuity of the diversity. In this context, United States (US) can be used as one of the examples. Before it has been changed into society based on multiculturalism, according to Parsudi Suparlan (2003), US was considered having racist society and it resulted on social hierarchy with various forms of discriminations just because there were different races and ethnics. From the various races and ethnics in the US, White Anglo Saxon Protestant (WASP) group became majority and was in dominant position. On the other hand, the Black people were minority and often suffered from discrimination.

One of the public sectors treated discriminatively was education. In its early development, education in the US was used to be related to discrimination practices. Tilaar in his book *Multikulturalisme: Tantangan Global Masa Depan dalam Transformasi Pendidikan Nasional* (2004), explained briefly discriminative practices in the US education. The early form of education in the US before the emerging of multicultural education was popular as segregative education. In the line with segregation term, thus in segregative education there was differentiation in educational service program between White and Black. The White got the high quality of education services. On the contrary, the Black got low quality. This policy of course rose discontent and opponent movement. One of the opponent actors mentioned in many studies of multiculturalism was Martin Luther King. This Protestant figure who was well known with his speech *I Have a Dream*, started his movement named *civil rights movement*. The main objective of this movement was wiping all the forms of discrimination which was also existed in the US education. In education field, according to Tilaar (2004), *civil rights movement* has born a new pedagogical praxis in which gives the same opportunity and appreciation to all the civil people without differentiating their origins and religions. This education praxis is also called multicultural education.

Diversity in society in which has given the basis for development of multiculturalism as it had been experienced by US and some other western countries has similarity with the development of multiculturalism in Indonesia. So, multiculturalism is relevant to be the starting point in carrying out complexity in Indonesia. The development of diversity in Indonesia has become the attraction to many experts, for instance J.S. Furnivall who offers *plural societies* construction as Indonesian ideal type of society (Nasikun 1992). Furnivall seemed to have rational reason to the usage of the construction. There is something interesting in Furnivall's construction. Parsudi Suparlan (2001), for instance, stated 500 as number of ethnics in Indonesia. Plural society concept offered by Furnivall is not only based on those statistical facts, but also it is more on development of interaction patterns of inter-social groups in Indonesia. According to Furnivall's observation, the complexity of Indonesian people was not balanced by socialization and there was segregation between each social group. The development of diversity drawn by Furnivall clearly would not give benefit for the future of Indonesian people because it would potentially raise opened-social conflicts. The possibility of social conflict in complex society was clearly described by Pierre L. van den Berghe's study (Nasikun 1992). It showed six basic characteristics of complex society, those are: (1) there is segmentation into the forms of groups in which often has different subculture one and another; (2) it had social structure divided into non-complement institutions; (3) it had lack of development in the concensus between its members related to the basic values; (4) relatively it is often faced conflicts between one group

and another; (5) social integration relatively grows on coercion and it is economically dependence; and (6) there is political domination by certain group on others.

Berghe's theoretical view strengthened Furnivall's. It corresponds with the diversity development in Indonesia. It is because social conflicts often happened between each social group as it was in 1990's to 2000's in Situbondo (1996), Tasikmalaya (1997), Rengasdengklok (1997), Sanggauledo (1997), Kerawang-Bekasi (1997), Sambas (1999), Ambon (1999), Kupang (1997), and Mataram (2000). Reflected on those nasty precedence, it was natural that in the future social conflict would be the challenge and could be the threat for Indonesia. If we reconstruct previous study, social conflict theme actually has become the interest and it was linked to complexity and integration theme. Koentjaraningrat's study (1984) then can be dropped here. Koentjaraningrat stated, at least there were four big problems faced by Indonesia as the consequence of the complexity in its society. Those four problem were: (1) problems in uniting various cultures and ethnicity; (2) problems in inter-religion relationship; (3) problems in relationship between majority and minority; and (4) problems of cultural integration in Irian Jaya and Timor Timur with Indonesian cultures. As a scientist who had been studying anthropology for long time, Koentjaraningrat's identification of course were far from just common sense result of thought, but it was truly based on dept analysis, right from problem closeness to nation's integration agenda as well as to the effects of the problem if it were unsolved. In fact, Indonesia faced negative effect from problems identified by Koentjaraningrat because especially state (government, beside its people) failed to manage the diversity of its society.

It is fair then to say that state is responsible to the social conflicts because ideologically and politically state has authority in managing the diversity so that it will not develop negatively. In this context, state's policy to the existence of diversity as long as Orde Baru (New Order) period is important to notice. In the era, complexity was potitioned as subordinate to the national development. In early development of Orde Baru, state was faced to the national economic disaster as the legacy of Orde Lama (Old Order). Therefore, it was natural when Orde Baru government gave more priority on economic development which was rested on stability of national security. It was said that one of the elements would potentially disturb the stability—and thus it also became the barrier to the continuity of national development—was complexity and it was enclosed to SARA concept (*Suku, Agama, Ras, dan Antargolongan*= Ethnic, Religion, Race, and Inter-groups). Belows are Nugroho's reconstruction (1999) about state's view on SARA:

There was common situation understood through the common people's thoughts that SARA was potencial to the occurence of various social conflicts. The state even constructed SARA as a breaker element to the unity of Indonesian people so that it needed to be waried.

The complexity of indonesian people which was parts of the elements in SARA interpretation was considered as something given and it needed no to discuss further. The differences between elements in SARA was a destiny of a nation and speaking of the differents meant creating disintegration itself because it was "like" refusing the destiny.

The state construction according to Heru Nugroho contained serious problem because there was unbalance in understanding SARA. In the state construction, SARA was placed negatively as the only cause of conflict. Heru Nugroho did not deny to the existence of SARA as a certainty in which should be faced by the traditional or modern society. Heru Nugroho also admitted SARA potion to the social problems such as conflict and disintegration, but he rejected the discourse of SARA which was dominated by state since it only fertilized manipulation practice to SARA in order to reach the elites's goals. As it has been explained that

in the era of Orde Baru, the development was the main priority for it had not been noticed in the previous regime.

The development program held by Orde Baru regime are considered as having some achievements by some people. The spectacular success is economic growth and modernization in many aspects, but there are also many critics beyond the success. Developmentalism and modernization in Orde Baru era was identical to the uniformity where the center government used as measuring rod.

Such kind of orientation had clearly bad effects on the continuity of local culture as an inseparable part of SARA concept. Instead of improving development and modernization to empower local culture, on the other hand, local cultures experienced destruction after the development and modernization (Ricklefs 2005). Since development and modernization were rooted on political and security stability, all the forms of counter hegemony especially from civil society, unilaterally it was considered as threat by the government. Ironically—it was maybe confusing—the counter hegemony viewed as something close to SARA. In the view, there was treachery to the meaning of SARA concept which was originally a sociological fact and thus it was neutral. The meaning and its function then were shifted into government's ideological instrument to reassure the implementation of national development and modernization programs.

How can the treachery be understood? The studies on ideological criticism can be used to explain the treachery. In this context, SARA is supposed to be understood as an inseparable part of the authority's meaning construction to social reality. The studies on ideological criticism recommends to investigate elites' ways in reconstructing meaning and its expression through various forms of symbol used to establish and maintain dominant relation between elite and mass of people (Thomson 2004). Through this critical study of ideology, treachery to SARA can be understood. Once again, it needs emphasis that SARA actually is a construction to draw the complexity of Indonesian people which is contained elements of ethnic, religion, race, and inter-groups.

In the next understanding, there was difference in meaning related to SARA position in social interaction. The state viewed SARA as the source of disintegracy. Thus, it considered as a taboo reality. According to Heru Nugroho, it was ironic. In one side, value system which was convinced as a state official ideology admitted the existence of plurality of SARA. Even, the plurality itself was claimed supporting the concretion of complexity of Indonesian people under the slogan “Bhinneka Tunggal Ika” (although there are differences, but they are united). On the contrary, the practice was never be implemented. It seemed that false interpretation of SARA was still continued. Then, the state even made SARA concept more than construction of complexity, but as symbol used to labelling discourse and action against the nation. The state seemed to widen scope of the complexity in SARA, so it would not be limited on ascribed-elements. All the things beyond the state which were considered potential to be the threat to the state, viewed as threat. For instance, counter hegemony from civil society. If it came to national development, it was included to SARA concept. Thus, the counter hegemony as well as SARA was the interference to the stability and establishment. It was natural then that as long as Orde Baru era, state showed uncooperative nature to institution in civil society domain which was suspected as a counter hegemony's birth place.

State's view on SARA which was more stressing on unity of Indonesia, on the other side neglecting the variousness because it was viewed as threat and it was not proper. Beside it faded local cultures with local wisdoms, it also widened social gap between each social group. This condition in line with Furnivall's concept about plural societies as stated above. A discontentment to pluralism concept used by state motivates many experts to look at the multiculturalism in western countries in which has been developed into cultural political policy. In multiculturalism, the special culture of certain local community valued the same as another community's culture. More than that, multiculturalism has constructive view that local culture community gave benefit to the development of democratic culture. Therefore, multiculturalism has a more open view to the diversity. Bhiku Parekh in the article *What is Multiculturalism?*

(<http://www.india-seminar.com/1999/484%20parekh.htm#top>), proposed three basic views on multiculturalism, as written belows:

First, human being is culturally embedded. It means they grow and live in a cultural-structured world and they live their lives and social relationships in a framework of meaning system and interpretation culturally inherited. Although human being is embedded with the cultural world, according to Parekh, it does not mean that human beings were always in deterministic position with the origin of their cultures. They could develop their cultures over their origin cultures. Using this view, Parekh seemed to avoid myths and fallacy from primordial-essentialist group (Trijono 2004) that culture is self-contained units which are considered having special spirit, ethos, or organized principals, and easily to be individualized and differentiated between one another (Nurkhoiron 2005).

Second, difference culture represents meaning system and vision about well life which is also different one another. Because the member of each culture realize that there is limitation of capacity and human's emotion and is only able to catch a few part of totality of human existence, human needs another cultures to help in understanding himself better, develop intellectual horizon, extend imagination, and save him from narcissism to keep from temptation in self-absolutment, and so on

Third, each culture is internally plural and it reflects continuous conversation between traditions and different thoughts. It did not mean that it has no coherence and identity, but the identity is plural, open, and flexible. Cultures grow from various forms of interaction with others consciously or unconsciously. At least, the formation of a few parts of it is multicultural. Each culture brings the parts of other cultures in it and it is not purely sui generis.

Those three views of Parekh mentioned above raise the optimism on multiculturalism as a turning point in managing the complexity so that it can develop in its form constructively. Thus, multiculturalism becomes an alternate choice from the pluralism concept or plural society although Gurpreet Mahajan stated that it does not do constructive action on complexity. Mahajan in *Rethinking Multiculturalism* (<http://www.india-seminar.com/semframe.htm>) said that "Plurality suggests the presence of many, but it does not stipulate anything about the nature of many. How the multiple forms is structured, and how they relate to one another, is aspect on which the idea of plurality is silent".

The content meaning on multiculturalism shows parallel relationship with social capital concept in which is used to be meant as social capital. Capital or capital term is common to be used in economy activities as one of production factors in addition to land or natural resource, labour or human resource, and managerial skill. In economics, capital is all types of goods made to support production activities of goods and services (Rosyidi 1996). At the most recent development of social knowledge, capital meaning is not only in connotation with economy, but also has wider meaning. Zohar and Marshall (2004) widened the usage scoop of capital concept which exceeds economic limitations. Beside capital in material interpretation, according to Zohar and Marshal, human needs another two capitals; those are social and spiritual capital. Zohar and Marshal interprets social capital as the wealth in which can make community and organisation became effective in function for collective goal. The social growth and development are dependent to the emotional quotient (EQ). Whereas, spititual capital is the authentic dimension in which gives meaningful touch in human's life so that it would have substantial meaning.

The broader content meaning to social or capital capital given by Zohar and Marshal is the same as stressing that economic or material capital only is not enough, but it also needed to take a look at another capital like social capital (and of course spiritual capital also). Although social and spiritual capital are not in the form of goods (in economic meaning), but it cannot deny that it has no economic benefit. Fukuyama in his influential book *The Great Disruption: Human Nature and The Reconstitution of Social Order* (1999), had asserted that social capital gives broader use than economic capital. Belows are the explanation of various capitals in community which are needed to manage synergically (Hasbullah 2006):

It has been explained that multiculturalism could have coherence with social capital. Why? One way to know the coherence is by understanding the meaning of social capital. Because of the space limit of explanation, there are not all the related definitions would be given, but it will only several definitions which are considered having the suitable meaning to social concept. Fukuyama (1995, 1999) interpreted social capital as a set of informal values or norms owned collectively by a group and there is possibility of cooperation among the member. The next definition comes from Putnam, one of the experts who popularize social capital concept. According to Putnam, social capital refers to parts of organisation such as trust, norm, and network in which can increase efficiency in society by facilitating coordinated actions (Lawang 2004). Another definition is from Coleman (1990). He stated that social capital is a part of entity variants contained some social structures in which facilitate the subject whether it is in the form of personal action or corporation in a social structure. Although there are variants of definition, according to Lawang (2004), there are three basic elements in social capital; those are trust, network, and norm. These are the essence of social capital. Trust is the attitude of giving trust one another in society and it gives the possibility to the member of the society to unite. By the existence of trust, it would be easy for society to design a social network or voluntary, equality, freedom, and civility principle. The next element is norm. Norm is a set of rules that should be submitted by the society involved in social network (Hasbullah 2006).

Therefore, it needs to create synergy of another capitals in a community with social capital.

References

- Fukuyama F (1999) *The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order*. London: Profile Books.
- Fukuyama F (1995) *Trust: Kebajikan Sosial dan Penciptaan Kemakmuran*. Yogyakarta: Qirtas.
- Gollnick DM & Chinn PC (2002) *Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Hernandez H (2001) *Multicultural Education: A Teacher's Guide to Linking Context, Process, and Content*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Lawang RMZ (2004) *Kapital Sosial dalam Perspektif Sosiologik: Suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta: Fisip UI Press.
- Mujiburrahman (2006) *Feeling Threatened: Muslim-Christian Relations in Indonesia's New Order*, Disertasi, Amsterdam University Press.
- Mulkhan AM (2000) *Islam Murni dalam Masyarakat Petani*. Yogyakarta: Bentang.
- Noorsalim M (2007) *Hak Minoritas: Multikulturalisme dan Dilema Negara Bangsa*. Jakarta: Interseksi Foundation.
- Rosyidi S (1996) *Pengantar Teori Ekonomi: Pendekatan kepada Teori Ekonomi Mikro dan Makro*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Sabri M (1999) *Keberagamaan yang Saling Menyapa: Perspektif Filsafat Perennial*. Yogyakarta: Bigraf.
- Sihbudi R (2001) *Kerusuhan Sosial di Indonesia: Studi Kasus Kupang, Mataram, dan Sambas*. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Suparlan P (2001) *Kesetaraan Warga dan Hak Budaya Komuniti dalam Masyarakat Majemuk Indonesia*. *Antropologi Indonesia* XXV(66).
- Suparlan P (2003) *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika: Keanekaragaman Sukubangsa atau Kebudayaan?*. *Antropologi Indonesia* XXVII(72).
- Suparlan P (2003) *Kesukubangsaan dan Posisi Orang Cina dalam Masyarakat Majemuk Indonesia*. *Antropologi Indonesia* XXVII(71).

- Tholkah I (2001) Anatomi Konflik Politik di Indonesia: Belajar dari Ketegangan Politik Varian di Madukuro. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Tilaar HAR (2004) Multikulturalisme: Tantangan-tantangan Global Masa Depan dalam Transformasi Pendidikan Nasional. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Zohar D & Marshall I (2004) Spiritual Capital: Wealth We Can Live by Using Our Rational, Emotional, and Spiritual Intelligence to Transform Ourselves and Corporate Culture. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.