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Abstrak

Sejak awal berdirinya, Indonesia telah dibentuk berdasarkan gagasan bahwa 'kebudayaan nasional' dan 'identitas nasional' harus lebih diutamakan daripada identitas kesukubangsaan. Pemerintah Orde Baru berusaha menciptakan 'kesatuan dalam keragaman' ini tidak hanya melalui Pancasila, tetapi juga melalui 'konsep kepulauan' (wawasan nusantara) dan 'azas kekeluargaan'. Dengan berakhirnya Orde Baru, adakah cara untuk mengubah konsep-konsep ini, sehingga warga Indonesia dapat berpikir tentang diri mereka sebagai anggota suatu masyarakat nasional yang bersifat transethnic dan transreligious?

Dalam tulisan ini, penulisnya berargumentasi bahwa jawaban untuk pertanyaan ini adalah 'ya'. Dengan mengilustrasikan kenyataan identitas gay dan lesbian berdasarkan penelitian di Makassar, Surabaya dan Bali, penulisnya menunjukkan bahwa berbeda dari identitas seksual yang bersifat 'lokal' seperti bissu atau warok-gemblak, kaum gay dan lesbi Indonesia berpikir tentang diri mereka sebagai anggota dari suatu masyarakat yang tersebar luas ke seluruh negeri 'gaya nusantara', termasuk laki-laki dan wanita dari berbagai latar belakang etnis dan agama. Contoh-contoh etnografis dari kehidupan sehari-hari kaum laki-laki gay dan wanita lesbian memperlihatkan bahwa walaupun perilaku para individu ini seringkali dikatakan bertentangan dengan kebudayaan Indonesia, dalam kenyataannya, perspektif dan perilaku mereka merupakan contoh dari 'kebudayaan Indonesia'. Mereka memiliki perspektif 'wawasan nusantara' sesuai dengan konsep pemerintah dan menggunakan dengan cara-cara yang sebenarnya tidak diharapkan oleh pemerintah. Konsep nasionalisme Indonesia telah ditransformasikan dengan cara-cara yang tidak direncanakan sejak masa Orde Baru, dan akan terus berlanjut pada era reformasi. Dalam tulisan ini diketengahkan juga cara kaum gay dan lesbi memodifikasi 'prinsip kekeluargaan' ciptaan Orde Baru yang memungkinkan mereka diterima sebagai anggota masyarakat nasional yang baru.

As a sociocultural anthropologist I study culture, which to an anthropologist means not only dances, rituals, and art, but systems of

\(^1\) This article is based on a paper presented at the panel of 'Bhinneka Tunggal Ika': Masih Mungkinkah (Unity in Diversity: Is it still Possible)? at the International Symposium of Journal ANTROPOLOGI INDONESIA 'The Beginning of the 21st Century: Endorsing Regional Autonomy, Understanding Local Cultures, Strengthening National Integration', thinking and interacting in everyday life. As a result, anthropologists do not just study isolated groups; they can also study people in urban areas, people who are rich, people who are migrants, and so on.
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One of the topics I study is gay and lesbian identity in Indonesia. I have conducted this research since 1992 in Makassar, Bali, and Surabaya, and also for short periods in Samarinda, Balikpapan, Kediri, Yogyakarta, Bandung, Solo, and Jakarta. My research focuses on Indonesians who identify themselves as gay or lesbi—that is, homosexual people, who are sexually attracted to the same sex, but have what we might call ‘normal’ gender identities. In other words, the people I study do not identify themselves with transgender terms like waria, banci, kedi, or bissu; instead, they use the ostensibly foreign terms lesbi and gay.

It appears that Indonesians started identifying as lesbi or gay in the 1970s, but these terms did not start appearing on a nationwide scale until the 1980s. Mass media have been extremely important to these identities since their beginnings. One of the most important early events was the ‘wedding’ of two lesbi women, Jossie and Bonnie, in Jakarta in 1981. The ceremony was covered by Liberty and Tempo. Since that time, almost all lesbi women and gay men in Indonesia come to realize they could call themselves lesbi or gay after reading about these terms in mass media; for instance, through a gossip column in a magazine, a rumor about a movie star in a newspaper. The terms gay and lesbi are part of no ‘tradition’ or adat in Indonesia; they are concepts regarding sexuality, considered the most intimate and ‘local’ part of human life, but the concepts are always learned from a distance.

Despite the fact that the terms gay and lesbi have appeared in Indonesian mass media for many years now, many Indonesians still do not know what gay and lesbi mean. Often, Indonesians consider them English equivalents of waria, or terms used only for talking about foreigners. Those Indonesians who do know what gay and lesbi mean often think of these people as ‘deviants’, people who go outside the norms of society.

In my research I have spent many days with lesbi and gay people. I have met their lovers, their parents, and their friends. I have spent time with them in parks, apartments, and shopping malls. I have visited small villages where gay men or lesbi women live. What I want to emphasize in this essay is my discovery that in one sense, these Indonesians are not deviants. Their culture—their way of thinking—actually makes explicit many central assumptions in contemporary Indonesian society that otherwise might go unnoticed. As a result, gay and lesbi identities can be useful as analytical tools beyond the case of homosexuality. In particular, they are a striking example of truly national identities, integrated across ethnicity and religion, that were formed contingently through New Order ideology. This does not mean that lesbi and gay Indonesians are ‘bad’ products of the New Order; it means that like all Indonesians living under the New Order (and all people living under modern nation-states everywhere), dominant ideologies affect self-identity, but often in unexpected ways. The particular manner in which lesbi and gay Indonesians have transformed New Order ideology in unexpected ways is particularly interesting because it is surprisingly compatible with a new ‘era of reform’ or era reformasi where civil society is rejuvenated and tolerance is more valued. To illustrate this point, let me tell you a story that begins in a field in Makassar.

It is four o’clock in the afternoon and it looks like it might rain; there are dark clouds to the east, but no one seems to mind. The field is full of hundreds of people, mostly young men, playing volleyball and basketball. In the center of the field is a group of 20 gay men who come here almost every afternoon to play volleyball. Six gay men play on each team; others sit and talk along the sidelines. These gay men are not hidden, they are laughing and talking.
loudly, but no one else on the field seems to mind. A couple of normal men come over from the basketball court to watch us play, laughing if someone screams in an effeminate manner. One gay man sees them watching us and comments: '...wherever we go, we're visible.'

Soon it starts to rain and the game ends; several gay men get on a pete-pete and come to my house, where we start watching the television show 'Word Quiz'. I sit down with them and after a few minutes I ask them if they like the show. When they reply that it's one of their favorites, I remark that there is a show like 'Word Quiz' that is popular in the United States as well. My friends nod and say: '...that's true. It's like that with so many of the shows. It's like there are no new ideas here—we just use ideas from the West.'

The show ends and we sit down to eat; after a few minutes, another gay man enters the house, returning from a public health conference focusing on religious and cultural perspectives. He says he is worried that the following day, when the conference discussion is supposed to turn to the topic of gay men, the other conference participants will be intolerant and say that gay men are not real Indonesians. As he sits down to eat, he says something quite profound: 'Culture is something that is created by humans and then believed. There are people in Indonesia who have created gay here in Indonesia and believe in what they have created. Thus, gayness is part of Indonesian culture.'

In this story we see gay Indonesians reflecting on the fact that they, like most Indonesians, are expert at taking ideas from elsewhere and transforming them for the Indonesian context. My friend's statement that gayness is part of Indonesian culture is insightful for several reasons, not least that he referred to 'Indonesian culture', not 'Bugis culture' or 'Makassar culture'. One of the most interesting dimensions of gay and lesbi identities is that they are transethnic. Clearly, there are lesbi and gay Indonesians from every ethnic group: Javanese, Bugis, Balinese, Makassarese, Minangkabau, Torajan, and so on. However, while gay and lesbi Indonesians are certainly aware of their various backgrounds, in terms of their sexuality they identify themselves not as gay or lesbi Javanese, or gay or lesbi Bugis, but as gay and lesbi Indonesians. There are no ethnic gay or lesbi identities or networks; even the slang that gay and lesbi Indonesians use is based on Indonesian, not a 'local language' like Javanese, and varies to a remarkably small degree across the archipelago. This does not mean that gay and lesbi identities are the same everywhere in Indonesia; at issue is that lesbi and gay Indonesians see these differences as subsumed within a national identity.

The fact that a transethnic and translocal identity like this could have developed in Indonesia in the last twenty years raises a number of important theoretical and methodological issues. The only other clearly transethnic identities in Indonesia are religious and nationalist, but in each of these cases there are powerful institutions sustaining them. One important question is how gay and lesbi identities, which have never yet enjoyed this kind of institutional support, are nonetheless transethnic. One factor is that gay and lesbi identity is clearly new, not originating from tradition, parents or local communities. The national character of lesbi and gay identity is thus linked to modernity and to mass media.

However, the fact that gay and lesbi are clearly not 'traditional' does not explain how gay and lesbi Indonesians themselves understand these identities. It is not the case that gay and lesbi, or any other identity, is ever just 'imported' into Indonesia. It is always transformed in the process, changed to fit new circumstances. In the case of gay and lesbi identities, one important aspect of this transformation is that gay and lesbi Indonesians use metaphors of an 'archipelago' when they think about their identities. Sometimes this is explicit. For instance, the national network of gay and lesbi
groups is called GAYa Nusantara. Gaya means 'style', but when the first three letters are capitalized it seems to contain gay within it. Nusantara means 'archipelago' but it can also mean 'Indonesia'. In Indonesian, nouns come before adjectives, while in English they come after adjectives; since GAYa is both English and Indonesian in this phrase, GAYa Nusantara can have four meanings: 'archipelago style', Indonesia style', 'gay Indonesia', and 'gay archipelago'.

Such naming practices, however, would have little meaning if not reflected implicitly in the daily lives of lesbi and gay Indonesians. While these Indonesians recognize and comment on differences between lesbi and gay identity in different parts of Indonesia, most are firm in their conviction that this diversity is enclosed within unity—that gay and lesbi are fundamentally Indonesian identities, not the property of any one area or ethnic group. There is a two-fold metaphor at work. On one level, the idea is that gay and lesbi Indonesians are part of a national archipelago of diversity within sameness. This archipelago metaphor is then projected recursively so that on another level gay and lesbi Indonesians as a whole are one single 'island' in a global archipelago of gay and lesbian communities, one that includes other 'islands' like Holland, Thailand, and the United States.

It is clear that lesbi women and gay men got the idea that unity in diversity could be represented as an archipelago from the Indonesian state. The archipelago concept (wawasan nusantara) dates from the early period of nationalism at the beginning of the twentieth century but gained new force in December 1957 in the context of an international dispute over maritime boundaries. At the First International Conference of the Law of the Sea in Geneva, the Indonesian state argued that its borders were not limited to a certain distance from the coast of each island, as was the international norm, but should include all of the waters 'within' the archipelago. Indonesia's request was granted, and the Second International Conference in 1960 recognized the notion of an 'archipelagic state' and with it the archipelago concept. In 1973 a government resolution decreed that the archipelago concept 'gives life to national development in all its aspects—political, educational, and sociocultural' (Kusumaatmadja 1982:25). The archipelago concept continues to be used in the era reformasi, as we saw in a speech given by Vice President Megawati Soekarnoputri at the PDI-P Congress in Makassar in July 2000, where she emphasized that Indonesia is an archipelagic state, not a continental one.

This transformation of the archipelago concept by gay and lesbi Indonesians is an example of hegemony, a concept often associated with the work of the Italian social theorist Antonio Gramsci and developed by 'Birmingham school' theorists like Stuart Hall and Raymond Williams, as well as many Indonesian intellectuals (Gramsci 1971; Hall 1986, 1988, 1991; Williams 1977). Gramsci recognized that powerful groups rarely hold power solely through state force; they also use culture and mass media within the realm of civil society to build a 'common sense' where citizens see themselves as invested in the state's perpetuation. This dominant way of thinking, established primarily through consent in the realm of civil society and only in the last instance through violence, is one crucial dimension of Gramsci's formulation of hegemony.

An important aspect of Gramsci's theory of hegemony is that this dominant way of thinking must constantly be renewed in civil society. It must always adapt itself, and for this reason it is always at risk of being transformed
by grassroots groups in unexpected ways. This is exactly what we see in the case of gay and lesbi identities. These Indonesians have taken a core element of state ideology, the archipelago concept, and transformed it to understand their sexualities and the way these sexualities are linked nationally and transnationally. Most of the time this process is not conscious; these Indonesians rarely say explicitly that they are transforming a state concept. But this is what they are doing, at the same time that they are transforming the concepts gay and lesbian from outside Indonesia. It is not hard to imagine that if gay and lesbi identity had arisen in the Old Order, in the context of the Non-Aligned Movement and a strongly antagonistic stance toward the West, its character would not have been what it is now. It would also be different if it had arisen only now in the era reformasi.

It is with this concept of hegemony in mind that I can make the following statement: gay and lesbi Indonesians are the New Order’s greatest success story—albeit a success the New Order state never intended! What I mean by this is that these identities are the greatest example in Indonesia of a truly national identity—translocal, transethnic, and transreligious. They have successfully incorporated the state’s archipelago concept, but in a way the state never imagined. Gay and lesbi Indonesians thereby illustrate that we can take concepts from sources that we may not agree with, or may even completely reject (such as the New Order state) and still transform them into something useful and legitimate. (Early nationalists made the same point when they noted that the greatest gift of the Dutch to Indonesia was the idea of ‘Indonesia’ itself.)

The archipelago concept is not the only state concept I would like to mention today as an example of hegemony. A second is the ‘family principle’ (azas kekeluargaan). This principle regards the nation as made up of families, of very particular families—not ‘traditional’ extended families, but modern families with a husband, wife, two children, a home with smooth white tile floors, a television set, car, and other paraphernalia of the new middle class. In this idea of the family, every family member is supposed to follow the father. The metaphor is that every citizen is a child and the state is a father, and therefore the citizen doesn’t know what is best and should just follow the wise state. One concrete illustration of how these two principles come together—the archipelago concept and the family principle—can be seen in the ‘nusantara galleries’ found in Indonesian museums. In these rooms, which focus on how the ‘local culture’ a particular museum exhibits is actually part of a national culture, one of the most common kinds of displays ‘shows sets of male and female dolls dressed in wedding garments of each province’ (Taylor 1994:80). In these displays, heterosexuality defines the national archipelago.

It is obvious that many Indonesians (including many lesbi and gay Indonesians) do not believe this state propaganda. However, one’s relationship to a dominant ideology is not a simple matter of belief or disbelief; the theory of hegemony predicts that even when people fight the state, they may do so by transforming the state’s own way of thinking. We have seen how the archipelago concept was unexpectedly transformed by lesbi and gay Indonesians. A series of drawings made by a gay man in Jakarta in 1997 illustrate how lesbi and gay Indonesians might transform the family principle in their thinking.

In the first picture we see ‘a poor hetero family that does not follow Family Planning’. Utensils and toys are strewn about a dirt floor; a mother, weighed down by an infant, screams over a gas stove, while the father is incapaci-
tated in bed by the fighting of the other four children. One child is urinating on the floor; curtains hang precariously from unhinged shutters. 'The parents have 'create[d] not heaven but a 'hell' on earth. How far can this husband and wife guarantee that their children will become successful people later on?' By contrast, the second and third figures show 'a lesbi couple who are professionals' and 'can live together comfortably' and 'a young gay couple who, besides being happy, also can enjoy life optimally'.

By claiming that a gay or lesbi couple can create a 'modern' household even better than a hetero couple, this writer is critiquing the family principle. But at the same time the writer still uses the state's own way of thinking. For this author what counts as a successful family that enjoys life optimally? It is not any 'traditional' extended family gathered around a cooking-pot. Instead the writer presents a pair of two lesbi women, and later a pair of two gay men, in both cases with beautifully coiffed hair, clean clothes, smooth white tile floors, television sets, automobiles, two servants, gardens being watered, and the calm aura of leisure. In other words, what counts as success is the same modern middle-class, professional household the New Order state claimed was the ultimate goal of 'development'. This writer tries to break away from the state's ideology by claiming that lesbi and gay Indonesians can make families, but still keeps many of the state's assumptions in his definition of what counts as a 'successful' family.

This example shows how when social groups fight a hegemony, they almost always use some of that hegemony's own ways of thinking. We have to be careful, because this could have a negative effect—groups think that they are resisting the state but actually support it. However, it can also have a positive effect. This is demonstrated by my earlier example of the archipelago concept, where gay and lesbi people have created something new from old ways of thinking—bonds of tolerance, understanding, and closeness across ethnicity and religion through a shared sense of being Indonesian. Gay and lesbi Indonesians show that the archipelago concept can be transformed, that it may be possible to create a new archipelago based upon greater tolerance and social justice.

It is insufficient to say that gay and lesbi Indonesians could never become accepted in Indonesian society simply because in 'local culture' there is no idea of lesbi and gay. The ideas of 'local' and 'global' are not real aspects of the world, but ways of thinking about the world that can change over time. Indeed, 'local culture' is a concept the New Order took over from the colonial era (Burns 1999; Pemberton 1994; Tsing 1993). Very few groups in Indonesia are really 'isolated'. Throughout Indonesian history, most groups have been taking ideas from the 'outside' and transforming them. Lesbi and gay Indonesians demonstrate it is possible to think of Indonesia as one big 'locality'. How might that change the way we think about some of the current conflicts in Indonesia?

This raises a set of interesting questions concerning the place of lesbi women and gay men in a rapidly changing Indonesia. The key to effective civil society is tolerating diversity, even when we do not completely agree with some of that diversity. If we are only willing to accept as part of society people that we agree with one hundred percent, then sadly I do not believe unity in diversity is possible. Can the Indonesian people create not only a new archipelago concept, but also a new family principle? One that recognizes that there are many kinds of families, and that not everyone has to marry to be an adult? One that accepts gay and lesbi Indonesians? These men and women say that they did not choose to be
this way. Many are very religious and believe
that God intended them to be this way. They
try to live lives that are positive and good, and
they try to contribute to society. Must they be
rejected? If they are accepted, might that not
be a sign that we can tolerate other kinds of
differences as well?

I conclude by returning to several key ele­
ments of my argument. To understand the
lifeworlds of lesbi and gay Indonesians, it is
vital to develop a theoretical and methodologi­
cal approach recognizing that aspects of life
which are ostensibly intimate and personal—
like sexuality, identity, or the family—may not
necessarily be ontologically founded in locality. Second, to understand such translocal di­

tions of culture, anthropologists must
sometimes conduct research in more than one
place. Third, the concept of hegemony has util­
ity in underscoring how groups that resist
dominant ideologies may unintentionally use
parts of that dominant way of thinking—but
that a group reconfigures dominant ideologies
does not necessarily mean the group in ques­
tion suffers from ‘false consciousness’. Finally,
gay and lesbi Indonesians are not ‘deviants’;
their lives illustrate some fundamental characteris­
tics of Indonesian culture. Additionally,
they illustrate how it is possible to forge new
ways of being that are still authentically Indo­
nesian. These Indonesians show us that it is
possible to create a new archipelago concept
for the era reformasi, and I look forward to
watching how my Indonesian friends work to
create these new possibilities for tolerance, civil
society, and social justice.
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