



Indigenous People as "Object-Matter"

Intan Permata Sari¹, Irwan Abdullah²

¹ Universitas Islam Negeri Fatmawati Sukarno Bengkulu/ Leiden University sarii@vuw.leidenuniv.nl

² Faculty of Cultural Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada irwanabdullah6@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Submitted: 03rd November 2024

Review: 22nd November 2024

Accepted: 30th November 2024

Published: 23rd December 2024

KEYWORDS

Identity, Indigenous People, Power Dynamics, Cultural Representation.

CORRESPONDENCE

E-mail: sarii@vuw.leidenuniv.nl

A B S T R A C T

The literary tendency to map and position indigenous people as passive objects can be seen in three domains: (1) a study that maps the identity of indigenous people as something "authentic"; (2) alienated; and (3) vulnerable to change. This paper places indigenous people as the subject matter where the subject's perspective is accommodated in understanding their ideas and choices of attitudes and ways of life. This paper aims to (1) answer the question of how the literature defines the identity of indigenous people; (2) showing the misconceptions built by various literatures in interpreting the identity of indigenous people; (3) showing that stereotypes about indigenous people as a construction of thought from those in power. The data source for this article comes from literature in the form of journal articles and books. Two things can be reflected from this study of indigenous people: 1) the identity of indigenous people has been defined unilaterally by other people (outsiders); 2) the tendency of the literature to place indigenous people as passive objects that are static, accepting fate and not contributing to civilization.

INTRODUCTION

Béteille has clearly explained the concept of indigenous people in anthropological studies in his writings, *The Idea of Indigenous People* (Béteille, 1998). Béteille said that, at first, indigenous people were considered a primitive society. The labeling of "primitive" was changed after World War II to be designed as "disadvantaged" (Béteille, 1998). This concept then developed when the Indian literature found the use of the term "aboriginal tribes". The tribe is represented as a particular type of society and a particular stage of evolution (Béteille, 1998). The tribe is described as a society that was an isolated, self-contained, and primitive social formation (Béteille, 1998). After that, it was found a new phrase that points less to a type of society or a stage of evolution than to the priority of settlement (tribal population): where one now speaks more and more of its "indigenous people" (Béteille, 1998).

The term indigenous, long used to distinguish between those who are "native" and their "others" in specific locales, has also become a term for a geocultural

category, presupposing a world collectivity of "indigenous peoples" in contrast to their various "others" (Merlan, 2009: 303). Merlan argues that liberal democratic "political cultures" provided the push for the internationalization of indigenous identity. There are principles within these cultures that allow the recognition and regulation of persons who are not just obviously "different," but also marginalized and disadvantaged (Merlan, 2009: 304).

International Labor Organization (ILO) (1989) defines indigenousness as (1) "tribal" people whose social, cultural, and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community; (2) people descended from a population that inhabited the country at the time of conquest or colonization; (3) people retaining some or all of their institutions (Merlan, 2009). Merlan argue that indigenous peoples are defined as those who have significant moral claims on national-states and international society, frequently resulting from inhumane, unequal, and exclusionary treatment that has historical parallels to native peoples' settlement, colonization, and marginalization (Merlan, 2009). Indigenous as natives tend to be structured in a subordinate position in a modern

society's framework of thinking and serve as the basis for distinguishing one another.

As a result of the spread of indigenist activity on a worldwide scale, it has become obvious that a variety of claims and range of situations are being associated with emerging transnational conceptualizations of it. There have been acceptances, rejections, and strategic applications of the idea of indigeness. This claim has been rejected by states including China, India, Myanmar, Indonesia, and others who claim it does not apply to them (Merlan, 2009: 303). In Indonesia, the government does not recognize the term indigenous people because the government only classifies Indonesian people as a group of people "*bangsa*" (Indonesian people) (Persoon, 1998). On the other hand, the government uses the term "*masyarakat terasing*" (isolated society) to describe indigenous people (Persoon, 1998). Persoon explained that the use of the word *terasing* (isolated) refers to underdeveloped, undeveloped, and primitive because of the characteristics of being isolated (Persoon, 1998). Based on the definition made by Merlan, Béteille, and Persoon, indigenous people are described as traditional community groups that have certain historical roots, are underdeveloped, occupy a certain area (isolated area), and are marginalized by the state. Various viewpoints and state policies can show this trend.

The study of indigenous people places society as an object not as a "subject matter" in understanding how indigenous people live and the reasons they choose a certain way of life. Many studies have defined the indigenous people as a marginal, vulnerable, discriminated against, and have a negative stereotype (Friedman, 2008; Haba, 2010; Merino et al., 2009; Ortiz-Prado et al., 2021; Saifullah et al., 2021; Samson & Gigoux, 2017; Schäublin, 2013; Smallwood, 2020). Indigenous people have also been labeled as dangerous people and believed to have magical power. Friedman linked indigenous people to nature, historical precedence, simplicity, equality and harmony, and the state of underdevelopment, savagery, and disorder (Friedman, 2008). Negative stereotypes have been addressed to them such as '*primitive*', '*ignorant*', '*mentally-backward*', '*lazy*', '*drunkard*' and '*obstacles to the progress and development of the country*' (Merino et al., 2009). This stereotype is ethnocentrism and sees the Indigenous people as an inferior group and vulnerable to the risk of becoming the objects of discrimination.

The discourse of indigenous people tends to position indigenous people as passive objects by not recognizing and appreciating their life choices as subjects. The birth of the tendency to place Indigenous people as passive objects occurs due to the traditional-modern dichotomy where the perspective of modern society has dominated the perspective in assessing local communities. Indigenous people are not seen from an emic perspective to be able to understand deeply the ideas and rationalization of the choices and ways of life they build. Understanding the native perspective can be a lesson learned about how a society lives in a dynamic environment, manages changes, and maintains group identity in the pressure of civilization that continues to occur over a long period in the life history of indigenous people.

The literary tendency to map and position indigenous people as passive objects can be seen in three domains that explain how the construction of thought could occur. First, a study that maps the identity of indigenous people as something "authentic", which sees indigenous people as a

static "original" group. Second, the position of indigenous people as an remoteness people in need of development from the state. Third, tendencies show closed ideas by reproducing traditional-modern, civilized-uncivilized, and static-dynamic dichotomous ideas.

This paper, in response to this dichotomous tendency, is based on an argument that indigenous people are subjects who actively adapt by developing ideas, values, and actions in the face of a constantly changing life. They do not live in isolation but live in an open and integrated world with value systems and institutions that continue to develop outside the community. Therefore, indigenous people cannot be seen as a group with isolated entities because they are part of the ongoing processes and changes that they experience through physical interaction with various ethnic groups and nations through media, information, and communication technology which continues to develop into an integral part of the community inseparable from their lives as indigenous people. At the same time, their intellectual progress also develops in line with the internal challenges of group existence and external challenges that threaten their cultural identity in modernization.

In line with that, this paper places indigenous people as the subject matter where the subject's perspective is accommodated in understanding their ideas and choices of attitudes and ways of life. In this paper, apart from mapping the thinking development in the discourse of indigenous people's identity which is inseparable from the dichotomous structure of thinking, criticism is also proposed against closed conceptualizations that tend to reproduce ideas biased towards power. Indigenous people become objects that are defined by the dominant ethnic group or ruler in an unequal structural position and relationship. Indigenous people are not placed in an open space that allows them to define themselves and have their voices heard.

This paper aims to (1) answer the question of how the literature defines the identity of indigenous people; (2) showing that stereotypes about indigenous people. The two objectives provide an understanding of the debate on how indigenous people are perceived in academic discourse and a basis for an action plan to place indigenous people in a fair position in academic and policy treatment.

METHOD

The data source for this article comes from literature in the form of journal articles and books related to indigenous subjects, both regarding identity issues and agencies involved in identity formation. In particular, the literature search was carried out using several keywords such as indigeneity, 'indigenous identity', 'identity', 'indigenous people and modernity' and 'indigenous people and national identity'. The data taken were from 1998 to 2022. Data collection was carried out for one month from April to May 2022. The references used as data were social studies such as anthropology and sociology. The majority of the methodology used comes from field research data.

The concepts found in the literature are read and understood in the relationship between concepts. How the conceptualization process takes place and has various points of view in defining indigenous peoples and the identities given to indigenous people. From this, there are

differences and inconsistencies in placing indigenous people. In addition, the concepts obtained from the literature in examining the identity of indigenous people are seen in several contexts, such as historical and sociological contexts where the formation and preservation of identity occurs in a society. The traditional-modern dichotomy has explained that a structuration process places indigenous people in a space that is not free from unequal power relations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Concept of Identity

Identity is a construct to define personality and character that makes the difference between one person and another. The construct of identity is happened when the people shared origin or characteristic with another person or group (Hall, 2015). Indigenous identities are reflexively generated and rely on others' acknowledgment as much as they do on self-designations and self-attributions made in social interaction (Harris et al., 2013). The consequence of this interaction has been the production of 'representations' of other individuals and groups in terms of real or attributed differences, and of course for those that construct these representations, the establishment of criteria by which they represent themselves (Harris et al., 2013: 3) As Hall (2015) says, character and personality are distinguishing characteristics brought by certain individuals or groups to interact with other people outside the group. In other words, identity will be formed if there is an interaction in it.

In contrast to Hall and Harris, Golubovic explains the concept of "identity" in two ways: a) as a "primordial identity" which naturally given and unchangeable entity – belonging to an ethnic type; and b) as a sociocultural, political, or ideologically generated collective sense of community or personal identity (Golubovic, 2011: 26). Golubovic argues identity as a socio-culturally conditioned phenomenon, whatever forms it takes in different historical conditions in a long run of historical process (2011: 28). Identity is not naturally "given" but it is culturally defined and constituted (Golubović, 2011: 25). Identity also identification with one's own culture and self-reflection which explain about class, status, profession, styling, or symbolic connotation (p.26). The concept of identity described by Golubovic emphasizes the nature of that identity. Primordial identity is an identity that is static and cannot change. On the other hand, sociocultural, political, or ideological are more dynamic because they are formed by certain awareness and interests.

What Golubovic said is in line with what Weaver thought, namely: self-identification, community identification, and external identification (Weaver, 2001). Self-identification occurs when a person or group defines themselves according to the identity they believe in and realize. Community identification is when a person becomes a member of a group so that self-identity becomes the same as the group's identity. External identification is

when other people (outside the group) define their identity. The concepts of self-identification and primordial identity are basically almost the same, namely when individual defines themselves based on their cultural identity. The difference is that self-identification is more dynamic because one's self-identity is not only seen from cultural identity alone, but it can also be seen from gender, occupation, social status, and etc. Self-identification can lead to feelings of narcissism and ethnocentrism because it is defined subjectively. On the other hand, community identification will be formed when there is interaction between individuals and certain groups to form a representation as said by Harris et al. (2013).

Regarding this conceptualization of identity, Weaver offers a concept she calls external identification which is different from the concept of Hall, Harris, and Golubovic. The three defined identity from a subjective perspective or the group in which they are involved, while in external identification, identity is defined by the dominant state or ethnicity. As a result, indigenous people will be described as inferior, 'backward', and underdeveloped by external actors who have power. This stereotype appears in line with the traditional-modern, inferior-superior, underdeveloped-develop dichotomy. This dichotomy is reproduced both through discourse and social practice in a society that establishes traditional and primitive indigenous identities.

2. Indigenous People as Passive Object

a. Authenticity of Indigenous People

The debate on authenticity becomes an interesting discussion when indigenous people begin to lose their identity. On the one hand, cultural authenticity is continuously produced to display a unique, unchanging identity, highlighting traditionalism and depicting exotic values (de Bernardi, 2019; Silver, 1993). On the other hand, the state defines authenticity through state standardization (McKay, 2021; Weaver, 2001) by dividing the dichotomy of aboriginal, part aboriginal or not aboriginal (Carlson, 2016) or 'degrees of blood' ('full blood', 'half caste', 'quarter caste', 'octoroon', and etc.) (Maddison, 2013: 289). The dichotomous division on the one hand strengthens the sense of ethnics' primordialism but on the other hand places them in an inferior position in the perspective of the state and the majority.

Labeling original or non-original is still an important issue for some indigenous people. For example, in Australia, Indigenous people who have higher education, have good economic income, and are in the social middle class are considered unable to be Aboriginal, less indigenous, and are considered to want to be whites (Paradies, 2006: 358). In addition, skin color and physical appearance are considered as Aboriginal identities, therefore, when these identities are not owned by indigenous people, doubts arise about the authenticity of their identity (p.359). As Tania Li said that 'a group's self-identification as tribal or indigenous is not natural or inevitable, but neither is it simply invented, adopted, or

imposed. It is rather, a positioning which draws upon historically sedimented practices, landscapes and repertoires of meaning, and emerges through particular patterns of engagement and struggle' (Li, 2000: 150).

The ambiguity of the identity of indigenous people cannot be separated from state policies that carry out assimilation, segregation, take their land, keep them away from their ancestral culture, and discriminate against them (Eriksen, 2010; Maddison, 2013; Samson & Gigoux, 2017). The existence of these state policies forced them to adapt and redefine their identity. According to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (2018), there are only 1.9 million members of 567 federally recognized tribes, which is more than 67% of persons self-identify as American Indian (and ethnic Indian if they claim tribal affiliation) without having formal tribe membership status (McKay, 2021: 13). Therefore, some of the indigenous people have difficulty getting recognition from the government which results in the loss of the rights they should get.

Authenticity is defined through blood quanta, phenotype, cultural performance, and tribal citizenship (McKay, 2021: 12). McKay argues that blood quantum often symbolizes belonging without any participation requirement and have higher blood quantum show more authentic (McKay, 2021: 19). However, a child with lighter complexion and 'less Aboriginal blood' was seen more likely to assimilate (Maddison, 2013: 290). Blood quantum, lineal descent, and evidence of Indianness are all ingrained in the colonial-era racial worldview, institutionalized by federal Indian policy, reified by tribal limits, and internalized by indigenous communities (McKay, 2021: 16). In addition to blood quantum, McKay explained that Indian cards are a symbol of authenticity of indigenous identity which is legally recognized by the state and culturally recognized by indigenous people. Indian cards are one way to show one's authenticity when cultural boundaries (such as language, tradition, and physical form) no longer represent one's self.

Maddison argues that blood quantum is not enough to explain the identity of 'the real Aborigine.' The real aborigines must also be defined by their place of residence, whether they live in a traditional community or in an urban area. Indigenous people living in urban areas are considered unauthentic and unacceptable for non-indigenous people in Australia. The prevalent settler-colonial image of so-called 'real' Aboriginal people continues to be that of the remote-dwelling, spear-carrying 'traditional' Aboriginal person. However, based on Australian Bureau of Statistics (2008) over 70% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people currently live in urban or rural locations (Maddison, 2013). Aboriginal people must defend their 'authenticity' while also integrating into society's' mainstream (p.299).

From the perspective of Bernadi, McKay and Maddison, authenticity can be seen from a different perspective. Bernadi shows authenticity as an effort to show the traditional life of indigenous people. McKay sees the authenticity of what they have, namely the blood quantum and from what they stand for, namely the Indian card (legal identifier). Maddison emphasizes the importance of place of residence in determining the authenticity of one's identity.

Authenticity shows that the identity of indigenous people is static and emphasizes the values of

traditionalism. Authenticity is not only used by indigenous people to show their cultural characteristics but is also needed by the state to define indigenous people. Like through blood quantum and identity cards. In my opinion, when the state participates in defining the authenticity of certain individuals or groups of people, the state has indirectly discriminated against its citizens. Isn't every citizen entitled to the same treatment by the state, regardless of how authentic they are as indigenous people? In addition, doing proof of authenticity is not easy because it takes more time and effort to get the legality. On the other hand, not all countries require individual legality to define themselves. In Indonesia, for example, legality as indigenous people is fought for in the form of a collective (community) movement by certain actors and assisted by NGOs. This legality is needed to be able to fight for their customary lands and traditions that contest the interests of the state.

In the literature, authenticity is also associated with the location of the residence of indigenous people which is remote and geographically isolated. Although the people mobility is getting higher, the relationship with the land of birth is difficult to separate if the state is to reconstruct the history and identity of indigenous people. The literature does not explain the concept of 'belonging' which is very important when authenticity becomes a topic of discussion. The concept of belonging can be considered even though indigenous people have migrated from their homelands. Belonging will bring someone to remember their origins, the history of their ancestors, and can maintain a cultural identity passed down from generation to generation. Indigenous people tend to use various ways to present the past in their new lives as a sign of strong awareness of belonging that can reproduce the dichotomy of past and present in indigenous life.

The elements of blood quantum, identity card, and location of residence do not guarantee how much they understand and bond with their native culture, which can impact the loss of their cultural identity. However, these three elements can redefine a new concept of authenticity which has been imagined as race/physical form, language used, and traditionalism on display (de Bernardi, 2019; Silver, 1993). However, the writings of McKay and Bernadi forget that authentication is an accepted, negotiated, or rejected process. Authenticity may be a colonialization construct, but it should be understood that Indigenous people are not static; they are dynamic. Rejection, protest, conflict, negotiation, and acceptance are processes of forming an agreement regarding the authenticity of Indigenous people's identity.

b. Indigenous People and Remoteness

One of the problems of indigenous people is the problem of alienation. Indigenous people are often described as people living in remote, homogeneous areas, and far from the center of development. The state's view that defines indigenous peoples as a vulnerable, poor, and remote group causes the policy direction to focus on development, both physical development (infrastructure) and human resource development through education. The paradigm used by the state in defining indigenous people is in line with what was said by Friedman (2008) indigenous people are linked to nature, historical

precedence, simplicity, equality and harmony, and the state of underdevelopment, savagery, and disorder. This tendency places indigenous people as objects vulnerable to objectification processes in the name of modernity and development. Those who are described as living and residing in remote and isolated environments should be transformed into a more civilized society.

Remoteness is a problem of inequality in access to infrastructure, education, and health. The state, as the party responsible for the welfare of indigenous people, seeks to build access to connect them to the outside world and integrated with the modern system. In the perspective of the state, indigenous people need various infrastructures such as the construction of roads, bridges, schools, and other state facilities for them to feel the presence of the state. On the other hand, Schweitzer & Povoroznyuk (2019) stated *that* remoteness depends on the social characteristics (such as age, occupation, and ethnicity) of that person. For residents outside the settlement, remoteness is seen as something negative. On the other hand, for indigenous people remoteness is considered better than development, while for migrants they enjoy development but on the other hand have a fear of the impact of development. Remoteness is typically seen favorably and as a form of protection for indigenous culture from the influences of migrants (Schweitzer & Povoroznyuk, 2019: 246-247).

Bocco has a different take on remoteness. He saw remoteness from two perspectives. One is the absolute, geometric dimension, related to distances as measured on parallels, meridians and over altitudes. The other is a relative, geographic dimension, subject to scale, and to connectivity rather than distance (Bocco, 2016: 178). Bocco's view is based on advances in technology and transportation which require scholars to redefine the concept of remoteness. Remoteness is no longer a matter of distance but must be seen from the perspective of space and time (Bocco, 2016: 180). That way, the location of where indigenous people live far from the city center can be overcome with advances in technology and information. The State could change the development planning from easy access to transportation to easy access to technology and information. Therefore, the concept of isolated community will change its meaning, no longer about the distance traveled but more on the limited information.

The literature explains remoteness in relation to inequality of access. On the one hand, the state sees indigenous people as objects of development (Sengupta, 2015). The state believes that development will provide many benefits for the lives of indigenous people, especially when infrastructure begins to be built. Areas that were initially difficult to reach will be more accessible through the construction of roads and bridges. That way, the economy will begin to develop and affect the income of indigenous people. On the other hand, state development is considered to destroy customs, so isolation is the safest way to protect indigenous people.

c. Indigenous People and Cultural Change

As a community group that is quite vulnerable to change and the entry of new values, indigenous people are faced with three choices, namely resistance, adapting, or accepting changes and new values. Each choice has consequences. First, resist and maintain the origins or

authenticity of their identity. This choice was made by the Ammatoa people who tried to maintain the traditions of their ancestors, tried to eliminate the role of the state, and were resistant to modernity (Nas et al., 2019: 99).

Second, adapt to changes and new values. In this condition, indigenous people are faced with the dilemma of wanting to maintain their customs or accept modernity. It is quite difficult to maintain tradition if they continuously interact and engage in modernity. However, if they follow the modern trend, they will lose their cultural identity. In this condition, they negotiate in order to maintain their cultural identity and also to accept new values.

Attanapola & Lund using the concept of 'professional primitivism' in his study about Veddas who live in the traditional way and engage in income generating activities for tourist purposes. This implies that people re-indigenize their culture by reverting to traditional ways of living and embracing traditional cultural identities in the contemporary market economy. Such an approach leads to cultural hybridization, which may be considered as a response and an adaptation to modernity by embracing both contemporary and traditional ways of living (Attanapola & Lund, 2013: 175). The cultural changes that are currently happening were realized by their chiefs as a threat to damage the Veddas traditional identity as 'people of the forest'. However, these changes need to be adapted to survive in a market-oriented society. One way to protect cultural identity is to maintain their traditional lifestyle and sell it through the tourism sector. On the one hand they obtain the income, on the other hand their traditions and cultural identity can be maintained. (Attanapola & Lund, 2013: 179).

Adaptation to modernity also happened to Ndebele community (Ndlovu, 2020). Traditional beliefs are increasingly shifting along with the inclusion of modern values among their children. Various taboos are no longer considered and the meaning of traditional prohibitions has lost its meaning and has been replaced by new meanings believed by modern society. The prohibitions on taboo things have transformed into values that focus on issues of human rights, education, children's rights, and so on. In fact, taboos are used to protect the lives of indigenous people which are currently being criticized by modern society. The inclusion of modern values in the lives of indigenous people could threaten the traditional values that they try to maintain. Therefore, the Ndebele people need to redefine the taboo for their society in accordance with today's modern values.

Third, accept new values from the state, such as national identity. The state builds a national identity through symbols to unite its entire people. For example, the state uses the national language as the official language. The national language is very important as a means of inter-ethnic communication. Therefore, the state spreads national identity as a shared identity, not belonging to just one ethnicity. National identity brings indigenous people to homogenization and promotes collective identity as a principle of state policy. In contrast to cultural values that aspires to individual and collective emancipation, which are ascribed, inherited and inborn determination (Golubović, 2011: 32-33). This acceptance is a consequence of the integration of indigenous people's lives into the state.

Acceptance of new values brings consequences to changes in value orientation that threatens the existence of

local culture where the identity of indigenous people is rooted. At the same time, state policies are not infrequently coercive in nature, forcing the values and interests of the state to be accommodated not only as a world view but as a political statement for compliance and submission to the authorities. In this process, political nationalism was born which was based on regulation and coercion, but not cultural nationalism on the basis of awareness to be part of an entity that tends to be singular.

The existing literature tends to describe the subordinated position of indigenous people over state domination in the framework of modernization and nationalization. Most of the literature shows the forms of community resistance, especially when state policies threaten their original identity. As can be seen from the case of the Baduy Dalam tribe in Indonesia who chose to be resistant to modernity, chose to live a simple life, and isolated themselves (Suhud U et al., 2019). Others find ways to adapt to change, such as in the Ndebele community (Ndlovu, 2020). They have to redefine the concept of taboo and adapt it to modern thinking. Otherwise, their children will not understand the meaning of each prohibition in their society. Likewise, the people in Sri Lanka (Attanapola & Lund, 2013), have no other choices but to show their cultural identity in the realm of tourism.

These cases illustrate the condition of indigenous people who are subordinated by modernity-oriented policies. They are forced to change their way of life and redefine their history and cultural identity in order to survive. Apart from being intimidated by modernity, indigenous people must also be internalized by the interests of the state within the framework of national identity. As subordinates, they have no choice but to submit to state domination through objectification policies. Indigenous people tend to be placed as passive objects who must follow the wishes of the dominant state, migrants, or more superior ethnic powers. The discourses built in the existing literature tend to raise issues of conflict, the impact of modernity on indigenous people, and general stereotypes, which describe the inferiority of indigenous people.

Researchers do not pay attention to, for example, how indigenous people successfully manage changes and established new values through their cultural strengths. Although there is discussion about how indigenous people have managed to adapt to socio-cultural changes, the general trend is more towards how indigenous people are intimidated by greater forces forcing them to change their cultural identity. This happens because researchers tend to reproduce the idea of indigenous people as passive objects not as active subjects who have the potential and competence in facing the challenges of change. Research tends to focus on the problems faced by indigenous people, not on the cultural strength of indigenous people to indigenize external values.

CONCLUSIONS

Two things can be reflected from this study of indigenous people. First, the identity of indigenous people has been defined unilaterally by other people (outsiders). The existence of inequality in the relationship between indigenous people and "the other" (migrants and dominant ethnics) has resulted in discrimination, negative

stereotypes, and inferior views. Second, the tendency of the literature to place indigenous people as passive objects that are static, accepting fate and not contributing to civilization. The potential of indigenous people is ignored by ignoring the power they have as active subjects. With their power, they basically perceive every change and design their life creatively to live a better life. This aspect of the active subject needs to be studied carefully, especially how indigenous peoples manage the challenges and changes that occur in their lives.

Further research needs to be done to see not only the wisdom but also the cultural intelligence of indigenous people. The ideas and rational choices they make historically and culturally can be a source of intelligence for a deeper understanding of indigenous peoples and for a source of social arrangement in building indigenous people's lives in a more dignified manner.

REFERENCES

- Attanapola, C. T., & Lund, R. (2013). Contested identities of indigenous people: Indigenization or integration of the Veddas in Sri Lanka. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 34(2), 172-187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjtg.12022>
- Béteille, A. (1998). The idea of indigenous people. *Current Anthropology*, 39(2), 187-191. <https://doi.org/10.1086/204717>
- Bocco, G. (2016). Remoteness and remote places. A geographic perspective. In *Geoforum* (Vol. 77, pp. 178-181). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.11.003>
- Carlson, B. (2016). *The Politics of Identity: Who Counts as Aboriginal Today?* Aboriginal Studies Press.
- de Bernardi, C. (2019). Authenticity as a compromise: a critical discourse analysis of Sámi tourism websites. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 14(3), 249-262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2018.1527844>
- Eriksen, T. (2010). Ethnic classification: Us and them. *Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 18-35.
- Friedman, J. (2008). Indigeneity: anthropological notes on a historical variable. *Indigenous People: Self-Determination, Knowledge, Indigeneity*, 29-48. <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=aVJyN5ZAHeUC&oi=fnd&pg=PA29&dq=indigeneity&ots=bHEBEH-eao&sig=24qDZHcoXitM6kPDpR-U4Qp9Bh0>
- Golubovic, Z. (2011). An Anthropological Conceptualisation of Identity. *Synthesis Philosophica*, 51.
- Golubović, Z. (2011). An anthropological conceptualisation of identity. *Synthesis Philosophica*, 26(1), 25-43.
- Haba, J. (2010). Realitas Masyarakat Adat Di Indonesia: Sebuah Refleksi. *Jurnal Masyarakat & Budaya*, 12(2), 255-276.
- Hall, S. (2015). Introduction: Who Needs Identity? In *Questions of Cultural Identity*. Sage Publication.

- Harris, M., Carlson, B., & Poata-smith, E. (2013). INDIGENOUS IDENTITIES AND THE POLITICS OF AUTHENTICITY. In *The Politics of Identity: Emerging Indigeneity*. UTS ePRESS.
- Li, T. M. (2000). Articulating indigenous identity in indonesia: Resource politics and the tribal slot. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 42(1), 149–179. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417500002632>
- Maddison, S. (2013). Indigenous identity, “authenticity” and the structural violence of settler colonialism. *Identities*, 20(3), 288–303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2013.806267>
- McKay, D. L. (2021). Real Indians: Policing or Protecting Authentic Indigenous Identity? *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 7(1), 12–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649218821450>
- Merino, M. E., Mellor, D. J., Saiz, J. L., & Quilaqueo, D. (2009). Perceived discrimination amongst the indigenous Mapuche people in Chile: Some comparisons with Australia. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(5), 802–822. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870802037266>
- Merlan, F. (2009). Indigeneity: Global and local. *Current Anthropology*, 50(3), 303–333. <https://doi.org/10.1086/597667>
- Nas, J., Nurlinah, & Haryanto. (2019). Indigenous village governance: Lessons from Indonesia. *Public Administration Issues*, 2019(6), 94–104. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1999-5431-2019-0-6-94-104>
- Ndlovu, S. (2020). Child development through Ndebele taboos: Motivation to blend the indigenous and the exotic. *Jnl Hum & Soc Sci*, 2020(1). <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4664-1909>
- Ortiz-Prado, E., Cevallos-Sierra, G., Vasconez, E., Lister, A., & Pichilingue Ramos, E. (2021). Avoiding extinction: the importance of protecting isolated Indigenous tribes. *AlterNative*, 17(1), 130–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180121995567>
- Paradies, Y. C. (2006). Beyond black and white: Essentialism, hybridity and indigeneity. *Journal of Sociology*, 42(4), 355–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783306069993>
- Persoon, G. (1998). Isolated Groups or Indigenous Peoples Indonesia and the International Discourse. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde, Globalization, Localization and Indonesia*, April 1998. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379-90003899>
- Saifullah, M. K., Masud, M. M., & Kari, F. B. (2021). Vulnerability context and well-being factors of Indigenous community development: a study of Peninsular Malaysia. *AlterNative*, 17(1), 94–105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180121995166>
- Samson, C., & Gigoux, C. (2017). *Indigenous Peoples and Colonialism: Global Perspectives*. Polity Press.
- Schäublin, B. H. (2013). Adat and Indigeneity in Indonesia. In B. H. Schäublin (Ed.), *Adat and Indigeneity in Indonesia* (Vol. 7). <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.gup.150>
- Schweitzer, P., & Povoroznyuk, O. (2019). A right to remoteness? A missing bridge and articulations of indigeneity along an East Siberian railroad. *Social Anthropology*, 27(2), 236–252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12648>
- Sengupta, M. (2015). Migrant Narratives in State-led Development: The Reang Experience in Tripura (North-east India). *Journal of South Asian Development*, 10(1), 73–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0973174115569037>
- Silver, I. (1993). MARKETING AUTHENTICITY IN THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES. In *Annab oj Tourinn Research* (Vol. 20).
- Smallwood, R. L. (2020). Referenced reflections to my wurrumay (son): awareness of the impact of colonisation. *AlterNative*, 16(4), 309–314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180120967997>
- Suhud U, Tarma T, & Maulida E. (2019). Authenticity of fourth world country tourism: A case of Baduy, Indonesia. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 10(9), 133–153.
- Weaver, H. N. (2001). Indigenous Identity : What Is It , and Who Really Has It ? *American Indian Quarterly*, 25(2), 240–255.