

CONTESTATION OF ETHNIC IDENTITY IN FORMING ETHNO-TERRITORIAL IN PAKPAK BHARAT REGENCY, NORTH SUMATRA

Erond L. Damanik¹

¹Ph.D Student, Faculty of Social Science and Political Science. Airlangga University, Surabaya-Indonesia.

¹Lecturer at Departement of Anthropology, Faculty of Sociel Science, State University of Medan (UNIMED)-Medan-Indonesia

ABSTRACT: *Contestation of ethnic identity in a pluralistic society in Dairi is a phenomenon of ethnicity in order to achieve a political goal of ethno-territorial formation in Pakpak Bharat. Domination of immigrant gives a great impact on socio-cultural attributes, exclusion of ethno-religious and political deprivation for Pakpak ethnic in Dairi since the colonial era. The situation has caused an evasive identity as well as the breakdown of inter-ethnic relations. Momentum of government institution after the fall of the New Order opened wide opportunities to build ethno-territorial. Ethno-territorial formation in Pakpak Bharat is started with the contestation on the socio-cultural formulation of core identity, and seeps into the room of socio-religious, politics and government. Contestation of these three ethnic identities affects each other and cannot be separated from national policy. Contestation of ethnic identity on the formation of ethno-territorial is very essential phenomenon to understand political reality. Ethnicity becomes is the best strategy to mobilize ethnic to achieve political objective, that is the establishment of Pakpak Bharat. It happens because ethnicity consists of ethnic identity as a personal reference, a source of motivation, behavior and social construction in order to interpret and read the society in Dairi.*

KEYWORDS: *Contestation; Ethnic Identity; Ethno-territorial; Pakpak Bharat*

INTRODUCTION

Ethnicity and Ethnic Identity Contestation

Ethnicity is an important phenomenon in understanding political reality. According to Hale (2008), ethnicity is uncertainty reduction efforts while ethnic politics is the domain of interest. So ethnicity is the ethnic communities across languages, genetics or territorial (Rudolph, 2006). Understanding ethnicity refers to the three paradigms: primordial, constructive and combinative. Primordial paradigm, according to Geertz (1963), looks ethnicity as emotional attachment (emotional-laden), that is having the same feeling toward the specificity of the group (sense of belonging to a particular kind of group) as the basis of ethnic identity. Ethnic identity, according to this paradigm, is the core identity that is natural, permanent and given. Ethnicity is seen as part of a biological survival instinct that is based on nepotism, and is intended to preserve their ethnic generation. Therefore, ethnicity is characterized by strong

adhesion symbols on a basis of ethnic identity. These symbols serve to distinguish them from other ethnic groups as well as a personal reference, a source of motivation and behavior. Some scholars belonging to the group of primordial theorists are van den Berghe (1967), Smith (2000), Connor (1993), Horowitz (1983), and Shils (1957). Constructive paradigm, as it is mentioned by Royce (1983), De Vos and Ross (1975), regards ethnicity as a social construct or a choice to be made in order to determine the basis of their ethnic identity. Ethnicity is the cognitive processes formed in order to establish ethnic identity. Ethnicity is a strategy in a pluralistic society (strategies of diversity) to understand the social world.

According to this paradigm, a symbol of ethnic identity is a social construction adapted to the social and cultural changes in line with the ethnicity situation that it faces. Paradigm constructive doesn't view ethnicity circumstantially, but tends to instrumental, namely instrument of purposive behavior. From instrumentalism point of view, ethnic identity is born from ethnic itself, but the assertions that are continued in order to distinguish the group with the other being an indication that ethnic identity is a set of behaviors aimed. Some scholars belonging to the group of the constructive theorists are Anderson (1991), Barth (1969), and Brubaker, Loveman and Stamatov (2002).

METHODOLOGY

In this research, there are some methodologies which can be applied. One of them is about a combinative paradigm. According to Hale (2004), ethnicity cannot be separated primordially or constructively. Hale (2008), as well as Glazer and Moynihan (1973) inform that it would restrict the fundamental questions in understanding the phenomenon of ethnicity in political reality. Therefore, ethnicity should be viewed in an integrative manner. They are personal reference, a source of motivation and behavior as well as the social construction of social radar to read, interpret and understand the social world. Hale (2008) confirms the following:

“The motive behind ethnic identification is uncertainty reduction, whereas the motive behind the behavior of the resulting ethnic groups derive from the various interest people have. Ethnicity is thus most usefully described as neither primordial nor constructed, neither inherently conflictual nor epiphenomenal, but is relational at its core. Ethnicity defines the individual in relation to the social world, a process that occurs prior to purposive action. People have many points of personal reference that help them navigate the social world and ethnicity possesses several properties that, in combination, greatly facilitate its usage as a rule of thumb for inferring much information about the social world and for acting within in.”

Based on the quotation above, Hale (2008) asserts that ethnicity is an effort to uncertainty reduction and ethnic politics is an effort to achieve interest. Some scholars belonging to the combinative theorist group are: Fearon (1999), Laitin (1998) and Dashefsky (1975).

The third paradigm does not only intend to understanding the formation of ethnic identity in the community, but also to emerge ethnic identity contestation. The

emergence of ethnic identity contestation in society is given the urgency and significance of ethnic identity for the ethnic group. As it is explained by Burke and Stets (2009), Giddens (2003), Rawls (1971), and Habermas (1984), that interest is the social opportunities which are summarized in the social world. The social world must be interpreted and understood then taken in order to establish prestige and ethnic achievement.

This reality is in line with Hechter (1986), Cohen (1969), Brass (1991), Nash (1989), Horowitz (1985), Isaacs (1975) and Melucci (1989) that ethnic identity has never produced contestation, conflict or even competition if it is not attached the interest element. Ethnic identity demands the ethno-national struggle which also affects the distribution of resources and social opportunities, revealing old and new inequalities. In this article, the contestation of ethnic identity is intended to form an ethno-territorial in Pakpak Bharat, Dairi.

According to Connor (1984), ethnicity contains three main points namely: i) being, ii) doing, and iii) knowing. The concept of 'being' refers to something that is tangible, while 'doing' refers to the common paternal responsibility of lineage containing transcendental, and 'knowing' emphasizes on the philosophical and cosmological knowledge as the basis of cultural group. Cultural knowledge is important to design a particular kind of group to distinguish it from other groups. However, this cultural knowledge does not merely distinguish between groups, but also as a sustainable way to identify, reduce and reconstruct their ethnic identity according to social and cultural changes that occur.

To accommodate social change and culture in the ethnic identity has a benefit to achieve social position according to the ethnicity situation facing in the social world. As it is mentioned by Bells (1960), ethnicity is an understanding of the place or the claim social benefits. This opinion is in line with Royce (1983) that: ethnicity is how do members of different groups perceive themselves and others? How do they view the society as a whole? And how do they perceive each situation? Ethnicity as it is described by Rudolph (2006), how ethnic group sees itself and how others define it. The social world is an interest hierarchy as well as social opportunities which is seen in an integrative way between the situation of ethnicity in the context of space and time in local politics. Hierarchy of interest is layered arrangement of political interests that portrays the achievements and prestige of ethnic. Whereas social opportunities is a social occasion core of social equilibrium, social recognition, social comfort and social coexistence.

Ethnicity situation is the temporality of social reflecting the subordination of other ethnic contestation that underlies the emergence of ethnic identity contestation. While local politics is a reality or political performance at the local level to master both political, socio-cultural, socio-economic and socio-religion. Therefore, ethnic politics is the relationship of ethnicity as a personal reference, a source of motivation and behavior as well as the construction of a social symbol that radiates political behavior in order to achieve political objectives.

The problem in this study is: how ethnicity is defined in ethnic identity contestation to form ethno-territorial in Pakpak Bharat? To answer the problems, then this study moves to *mesos theoretical level* adopted by Hale (2008), Glazer and Moynihan (1973), Royce (1983), Geertz (1963) and De Vos and Ross (1975). Contribution of the study is to find the phenomenon of ethnicity in the ethnic politics; why and how ethnic acts on ethnic identity categories in a macro-level identity categories to form an ethno-territorial in Pakpak Bharat.

DISCUSSION

The Situation of Ethnicity in Dairi

Ethnicity on the social world in Dairi Regency shows that Pakpak ethnic is subordination due to the dominance of immigrants (Coleman, 1983). The dominance of ethnic immigrants such as Toba, Karo and Simalungun in Dairi cannot be separated from the role of colonialism and Zending Sungai Rhein (RMG) Germany (Pederson, 1975; Lempp, 1977) which tries to: i) conquer and organize the administration of *Pakpaklanden* (Castels, 1975) , ii) define the boundaries of ethnicity based on the history, topography and politics, and iii) provide the content to the ethnic communities formed (Perret, 2010).

This dominant of ethnic group controls government, political space, socio-cultural and socio-religion and determine the 'rules of the game' in the Dairi. The power of dominant groups according to Pelly (2015) comes from a combination of: i) the strength of materials, 2) ideology, and 3) the historical rights. An anthropologists, Bruner (1969), asserts that there are three major factors that lead to an ethnic group to be dominant group, namely: 1) demographics, 2) political and 3) the local culture. The dominance of ethnic immigrants in the Dairi Regency gives negative impact on ethnic in Dairi Regency to the Pakpak Barat ethnic: i) deprivation of politics and governance, ii) marginalization attribute in socio-cultural, iii) exclusion of ethno-religious, iv) dwarfing the ethno-territorial in *Pakpak Silima Suak* v) retardation socioeconomic. The situation of social reality such as this, will give an impact on the blurring of ethnic identity in Pakpak. Reality social, cultural and political gives an implication for the contestation of ethnic identity in Dairi. As for the situation of ethnicity in Dairi are as follows:

Table 1.
Ethnicity Situation in Dairi Regency

No	Social Space	Ethnicity Situation
1	Politics and governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deprivation of politics and governant to Pakpak ethnic in Dairi. • Mastery of ethnic immigrants at the local authority (regents) • Composition of Parliament in Dairi controlled by immigrants. • Bureaucracy and regional positions such as head of department, sub-district and village heads controlled by immigrants. • Recruitment of local employees (PNS) controlled by immigrants
2	Sociocultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginalization and domination of sociocultural attributes by immigrants ethnic in Dairi. • The replacement of sociocultural attributes from the host (architecture, greeting area, crafts area, food area, street names, monuments area, carnival culture) by sociocultural attributes of immigrants. • Manpower immigrant ethnic in Dairi.
3	Socio-religion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusion of ethno-religious Protestant of Pakpak ethnics by HKBP (ethno-religious institutions of Toba ethnics) • <i>HKBP Simerkata Pakpak</i> (HKBP using Pakpak language) should follow HKBP from Toba ethnics in Pearaja, Tarutung.

The fundamental problem of Pakpak ethnic in the political and administrative space in Dairi is the inability to win the social spaces and politics. Pakpak ethnics is almost scattered and less well known in North Sumatra as ethnic groups. It is caused by deprivation on political and governance aspects of the inability to seize local power. Local power is not only interpreted as the highest peak power and local government but also as a representation of ethnic groups. Since Dairi is established in 1964, Pakpak ethnic has never served as regent. It has an impact on the distribution of positions or bureaucrats area controlled by immigrants in Dairi. The existence of immigrants in Dairi gives implications on subordination ethnics on their homeland of its own. Therefore, the contestation of ethnic identity in politics and government space is the struggle for elite of Pakpak ethnics in Dairi.

The fundamental problem of Pakpak ethnic in the socio-religious space is the exclusion of ethno-religious of Protestant against Pakpak ethnics by ethno-religious institutions

of Protestant ethnic coming from Toba. Although HKBP Simerkata Pakpak has been formed (HKBP that uses Pakpak language), but this institutions is still under the command of HKBP which is centred in Pearaja, Tarutung. Therefore, the contestation of ethnic identity in the socio-religious space is the independence exclusion of ethno-religious of Protestant, namely the establishment of Pakpak ethnic, that is the establishment of Pakpak Dairi Christian Protestant Church (GKPPD) in 1994.

Actually, the basic problem of Pakpak ethnic at socio-cultural space is the marginalization of socio-cultural attributes of Pakpak ethnics in Dairi. This marginalization can be seen at domination of socio-cultural attributes of immigrant such as language, religion, food, music, dance, ornaments, street names and monuments in Dairi. Therefore, the contestation of ethnic identity in the socio-cultural space in Dairi is an attempt to seize and accentuate the socio-cultural attributes in Pakpak itself.

In turn, the elite of Pakpak ethnic should be able to reduce deprivation, exclusion and marginalization. A large number of elites from Pakpak try to be closer to the vortex of the local authority such as head of department, head of regency, chairman of parliament and drafted into the employee area. Similarly, the elites of Pakpak ethnics should be able to highlight the attributes of their socio-cultural such as the use of Pakpak language, making ornament of *Rumah Jojong*, the uniform of government officers should use Pakpak woven, making the monument figures of Pakpak ethnics, giving the name of the street using Pakpak ethnics and doing *Njuah-juah party* of Pakpak in Dairi.

However, the inability to get the highest position as the regional head (regent), makes Pakpak ethnics have some difficulties to form a new ethno-territorial in Dairi. Ethno-territorial formation probability is very possible in line with the transitional institutional system of the country after the fall of New Order in 1999. At that time, issued Law No. 22 Year 1999 on Regional Government which marks the end of centralism to decentralization. Regional autonomy is implemented in Indonesia since the Reform Era that opens the ethno-territorial formation opportunities through regional enlargement. UU no. 22, 1999 refurbished into Law No. 32 of 2004 discourses a new recruitment system of regional head election directly. Therefore, Pakpak ethnics realize that the new ethno-territorial should be set up, not only to separate ethnicity of the 'Host' with immigrants, but also to dominate politics and government space. Mastery of the political space and this government have an impact on the affirmation of ethnic identity of socio-cultural and socio-religion space at the new ethno-territorial. Therefore, to achieve their political goals, especially to form the new ethno-territorial in Dairi, Pakpak ethnic elites should identified and reduction of the core identity of their ethnic identity in order to emphasize the limits of their ethnic or collect Pakpak ethnics. From socio-cultural space, the contestation of ethnic identity will seep to socio-religion, politics and government which can establish a new ethno-territorial. The ability to form new ethno-territorial will give and implication to the affirmation of ethnic identity in the space of socio-cultural and socio-religion in Pakpak.

Formation of Ethno-territorial in Pakpak Bharat

Ethno-territorial of Pakpak ethnics at Pakpak Bharat is separated from Dairi 2003 (Berutu, 2013). New ethno-territorial of Pakpak Bharat occupies one of the five *suak* (subculture) in Pakpak Pakpak called *Pakpak Silima Suak* (five Pakpak ethnic subcultures), namely *Boang*, *Pegagan*, *Kepas*, *Kelasen* and *Simsim* (Coleman, 1983). Since 1964 to 2002, Dairi Regency is the unity of three *suak* of Pakpak ethnics namely *Kepas*, *Pegagan* and *Simsim*. While *suak* of Boang is merged into South Aceh since 1906 for reasons of Islam, while *suak* of Kelasen is merged into North Tapanuli as a new territory in spreading Protestantism.

In 2003, ethno-territorial formation of Pakpak Bharat is supported by consciousness of Pakpak ethnics which grows by several reasons: i) the formation of Dairi regency in 1964, ii) the independence of ethno-religious exclusion in 1994, and iii) the enforcement of socio-cultural attributes since 1997-1999. Besides, a number of ethnic elites of Pakpak are nearer to the local power since Isodorus Sitohang as a head of regency in 1995-1999. The balance of political policy is played by Isodorus Sitohang by giving the position of head of department, local head and chairman of the Parliament to Pakpak ethnic elite. This reality is very beneficial, especially in reducing Pakpak ethnic political deprivation, marginalization in socio-cultural attributes, as well as the ethno-religious exclusion. In other respects, this fact affects the consciousness of Pakpak ethnics which have been displaced from their homeland since the colonial era until 1999.

At the same time, the momentum of the ethno-territorial formation of the regional expansion is very possible by new Indonesia constitution after the fall of the New Order in 1999. The publication of Law No. 22 of 1999 which is confirmed by the enactment of Law No. 32 of 2004 on Regional Autonomy marks the change of state government implementation system of centralism to decentralization power. Two national agenda of autonomous region are, first, allowing for the formation of ethno-territorial namely autonomous region in the territories of Indonesia through the expansion area, and the second the implementation system of the local elections directly (Nordholt, Van Klinken and Hooggenboom, 2007; Irtanto, 2008; Sahlan dan Marwan, 2012; Agustino, 2009).

At the first point, the establishment of ethno-territorial in North Sumatra is conducted in Nias, North Tapanuli, South Tapanuli, Asahan and Labuhanbatu including Dairi. Until 2010, from 16 administrative regions in North Sumatra rises into 33 territories. Not only the formation of regencies and cities, but since 2009, it is scheduled to separate from North Sumatra Province into Tapanuli Province, South Tapanuli Province, Nias Province and East Sumatra Province. While on the second point, the local elections (district heads, mayors, governors or parliaments) has been directly conducted since June 1, 2005.

The national policy of regional autonomy in 1999, has strengthen the desire of Pakpak ethnic elite to form a new ethno-territorial by forming Pakpak Bharat. This desire is narrowed in line with the implementation of a national policy to direct regional elections. At this level, Pakpak elite realizes that if the ethno-territorial formation is

not done, while the direct election is applied, then the situation is still implicated in the failure of Pakpak to achieve regional head position in Dairi. It is due to the quantity of Pakpak ethnic manpower which is less than immigrant ethnic especially Toba. Therefore, the most appropriate way for Pakpak elites to gain positions in the context of direct regional head elections in the era of regional autonomy is to form a new ethno-territorial. The purpose of establishing an ethno-territorial is to legitimize the existence of Pakpak ethnics in politics and government (district heads, heads of departments, district, village, employee recruitment area, and the membership of parliament), socio-cultural (language, religion, food, clothing, music, dance, clan, and ornaments as the core identity) and socio-religion (independence of Protestantism Pakpak ethnics).

In Dairi regency, the idea of expansion began in 2001 when M.P. Tumanggor is as the Head of Dairi Regency. To discourse regional expansion, Pakpak elites choose subordinated ethnic issues in his own homeland. The discourse of adversity, deprivation, marginalization, exclusion and economic underdevelopment has riled immigrant. This riled is added by the rumor of expulsion to immigrants from Dairi. This rumor has made Toba youth doing consolidation and meeting to establish new organization: *Sadabato Organization* (The Unity of Batak Toba). This organization is asked to revitalize Toba culture and it has a wide response among Toba ethnics in Dairi. In a short time, the establishment of organization branches, has spread throughout the Toba ethnic enclaves in Dairi. Sadabato Organization is formed by Toba ethnic to fight the Indonesian Association of Families of Pakpak Youth (IKPPI) in Dairi.

In 2001-2002, the situation in Dairi is on the brink of conflict. This conflict has remind the previous conflict between Pakpak and Karo ethnic in Toba at Pinem Land 1947 or even the conflict between Pakpak and Toba with the political upheaval in 1958 (Smail, 1968) in Dairi. Toba youth fights against Pakpak youth rising ethnicity issues. Meanwhile, Toba ethnics insisted not to leave the lands and their businesses in Dairi to Toba. Toba ethnic insisted on defending himself in Dairi though they have to pay with their soul.

Toba ethnics consider that the organization of IKPPI evokes displeasure feelings of ethnicity created by Pakpak because of the domination of Toba ethnic. On various occasions such as weddings, misfortune, and internal associations among Toba ethnics have always argued that their existence in Dairi being threatened. In the 'threatened' is a discourse that in the event of expulsion and even attacks against ethnic Toba in Dairi, then it must be paid with a physical attack.

In 2001-2002, the conflict of ethnics in Dairi has greatly affect the local authority policies which tends to provide a 'bargaining' on Pakpak ethnics. Local rulers at that time is still controlled by Toba ethnics and it is enough to treat Pakpak ethnics as customary owners. The situation is very dyeing in formatting Pakpak Bharat which does not deserve molded into new ethno-territorial. At first, the ethno-territorial formation is intended to repeat the formation of Dairi regency in 1964 under the name of Pakpak.

Redistricting Dairi received by Master P. Tumanggor becomes regent after his inauguration in 1999. Beside separating Dairi Regency, Pakpak ethnic elites plan to reunite the entire region of Pakpak culture (Pakpak Silima Suak) to form the new province that is Pakpak Raya Province. Ideas and discourse of division Dairi is increasingly on Simsim People's Congress on 22 June, 2002 in Sukaramé. This activity is initiated by Consultation Development Planning of Indonesia (LKPP-Indonesia). Afterwards, *Arisan Keluarga Phakpak* is formed mainly by the bureaucrats Pakpak ethnics in Dairi Regent's office. From this informal discussion, the consciousness of Pakpak ethnics grows and strengthen the desire to divide the region. To do this idea, they form the Committee for Redistricting Dairi (KPKD). The Committee is composed from *five suak* of Pakpak society in Dairi and also the nomads Pakpak in Indonesia. The source of funds is accommodated in Dairi district budget in 2002.

Based on the result of division, it shows that the dominance of Pakpak ethnics is in Pakpak Salak District and Kerajaan District in the area of Suak Simsim. Therefore, this region will be divided out of Dairi. Selection of this region tends to be separated Pakpak ethnics by other ethnicities. Thus, Pakpak ethnics can appear as the ruler of his own territory. Composition of Christianity and Islam in the region of Pakpak can be as a bridge in distribution some posts to the elite of the two faiths and also 'head of regional rainbow', in terms of religion and clan. The planning to divide Pakpak cannot be done because there are only two districts, namely Salak and Kerajaan Districts.

Therefore, the first step towards splitting the two districts is to divide it into four districts so it is in accordance with the legislation. In 2002, Salak District is divided into Sitellu Urang Jehe District and Kerajaan District is expanded into Silima Pungga-Pungga District. Discussions of separation is done at many places such as at the pavilion of regent's house, Simatupang Monument, Taman Wisata Iman, etc. People involved in this discussion are from cross-territorial Pakpak ethnic, religious, clan and party who lives in Medan, Jakarta and elsewhere in Indonesia. The support for this division appears from a person in Jakarta, namely co-regent M.P which becomes a mediator for commissions in Senayan.

Pros and cons of Pakpak division appears from Pakpak themselves. For the anti-expansion, the assumption is, it is not eligible to expand because of two districts, the lack of human and natural resources to support the new district, as well as assuming the less role of Pakpak ethnics in Dairi. For these reasons, some Pakpak elites do not willing to become administrators of KPKD. As for the pros, the division should be made soon to accelerate the advancement of territorial and Pakpak ethnics. Redistricting Dairi cannot be separated from the synergy of the various ethnic components in Pakpak with the executive and legislative branches. The synergy is seen from the flow of support to the establishment of Pakpak Bharat. There are two main things to encourage flows swift support to the expansion: first, the control range is relatively far and contrasts among other districts with Sidikalang as a capital regency. Second, the lack of existence of Pakpak ethnics in the ranks of the political and bureaucratic in Dairi so the impact is the marginal of Pakpak ethnics in Dairi.

Pros and cons of ethno-territorial formation is also related to the determination of its capital. At that time, there are three proposed name: Sibande, Salak and Kerajaan. At

the first meeting of the parliament, it is planned that capital is in Sibande because it is a cross-country road between Aceh and Medan so it tends to open. At that time, people in Sibande and people in Sitelu Tali Urang Jehe Regency is willing to set up a land of 20 hectares for offices. But at the second meeting, there is a 'deadlock' between people from Sibande and Salak to be the capital. At the third meeting, the parliament agreed on a new district capital is Salak. The harshness of this disagreement led to the third option that is Kerajaan Regency as the capital because some teams of division are from Kingdom Districts. Mediation between the two supporting capital is held in Hotel Lolona, Dairi, by appointing Salak as its capital. At the end, Parliament of Dairi chooses Salak as the capital of the district. Regarding the name of the district formed, there is a fierce debate between Parliament from Dairi and Redistricting Committee.

The name proposed by committee is Pakpak Barat, but the name is questionable by parliament because it is assumed that there will be other capital such as Pakpak Timur, Pakpak Selatan ataupun. Pakpak Utara. The Committee argued that the real name '*Bharat*' and not Barat in the sense of winds. In Pakpak language, 'hunten' is not synonymous with '*Bharat*', because 'hunten' means 'stretch' or 'stretched'. However, because it faces considerable opposition in the local parliament, then take a shortcut to keep using the name *Bharat* which refers to its geographical position in 'the west of Dairi'.

In order to assess the feasibility of ethno-territorial formation in Pakpak Bharat, on 17-20 May 2002, the Commission II of the House of Representatives visited Dairi. In the end, on February 25, 2003, issued Law No. 09 Year 2003 on the Establishment of South Nias Regency, Pakpak Bharat and Humbang Hasundutan in the province of North Sumatra. Publishing laws occur within a period of six (6) months prior to the plenary of Parliament. Post-formation that, on July 23, 2003, Tigor Solin (Pakpak ethnics) is designated as Task Executor (Plt) of Pakpak Bharat Regency.

The boundaries of Pakpak Bharat are Silima Pungga-pungga District, Lae Parira and Sidikalang, Dairi regency in the north. Parbuluan Districts, Dairi Regency, Harian District in Toba Samosir, and Parlilitan Regency in Humbang Hasundutan in the east. Tarabintang District in Humbang Hasundutan and Manduamas District in Middle Tapanuli in the south, and Aceh Singkil District in Aceh Province in the west.

From the above discussion, it can be summarized that the pattern of ethnic identity in order to seize the contestation of social space on ethno-territorial formation in Pakpak Bharat are as follow:

Table 2.**The Contestation of Ethnic Identity on Ethno-territorial Formation in Pakpak Bharat**

No	Pattern of Contestation	Description of Contestation
1	Doing discourse of internal marginalization at Pakpak ethnics.	Gathering Pakpak ethnics at a non-formal meeting such as <i>arisan</i> for a big family gathering to discuss the 'backwardness of Pakpak ethnic' as the basis for the formation of ethno-territorial.
2	Doing consolidation ethnics for some cross-organizational ethnics in Pakpak.	Gathering cross-organizational of Pakpak ethnics, some youth organizations, non-government officer in Dairi Regency to get support in forming ethno-territorial in Pakpak Bharat Regency.
3	Propose expansion on local power in Dairi Regency	Propose agenda of ethno-territorial formation in Pakpak Bharat to the regent and the parliament.
4	Consolidating of Pakpak ethnic, across organizations religion and territorial.	Getting support in forming ethno-territorial of Pakpak Bharat from Pakpak ethnics at grassroots level, through the organization of interreligious and ethnic territorial as in Medan and Jakarta.
5	Consolidation of the expansion plan across government and across party lines.	The plan to form ethno-territorial forwarded to a higher level, ie from Dairi Regent and parliament to the Governor and the North Sumatra Provincial Parliament and Commission II of the House of Representatives in Jakarta.

Strategy Used to Get Political Goals

Ethnic identity is social radar. As a social radar, the identity contains personal references to guide the ethnic to the social world, interpreting the constellation of social relations faced, lead to ethnic on social constellation, and understanding the opportunities that may be achieved.

Although the ethnic in Pakpak elite can reduce social disequilibrium (political deprivation, marginalization and exclusion of socio-cultural attributes of ethno-religious) in Dairi, but Pakpak ethnic is still failed to take the highest position as the leader of the regency. At this level, the regional head office of the regents is not solely meant as a political position of government, but rather that the representation of ethnic identity. Therefore, the highest office of the local authority as regent representation of ethnic identity should be invaded and occupied. Mastery of regents is very important, especially to designate the achievements and prestige of ethnic identity.

Ethnicity situation is reflected in the beginning of the era of reform that the governor in Dairi is still controlled by the immigrants from Toba (Pakpahan, 2011). Aware that regional head position cannot be taken (controlled) by Pakpak ethnics, Pakpak ethnic elite then docked in power to consolidate their ethnic to form a new ethno-territorial. The main purpose of ethno-territorial formation is not solely based on the acceleration of development of territorial or social, but rather than the separation of ethnic groups namely Pakpak with immigrants. The new of ethno-territorial formation does not only provide the ethno-territorial boundaries but also on the acquisition of political space and governance, strengthening the socio-cultural attributes and ethno-religious and socio-economic space.

Contestation of ethnic identity moves from core formulation of socio-cultural identity in space, then seeps into the room of socio-religion as the formulation of social identity. From these two identities (primordial and constructive), then it moves to the contestation of political space and governance in identity. Achieving goals in the contestation of politics and government, used to confirm the new ethno-territorial in Pakpak Bharat.

Consideration of the social achieved on the political and governance aspects of it, is the main assets to form a new ethno-territorial namely Pakpak Bharat. The new ethno-territorial formation is very possible by national policies through autonomy since the fall of the New Order in 1999.

Formation of ethno-territorial of Pakpak Bharat in 2003 is defined as: i) separation or polarization between Pakpak ethnics and immigrants in Dairi Regency ii) strategies to achieve local power in order to strengthen ethnic identity in the space of socio-cultural and socio-religion, iii) acceleration of development of society and territorial of Pakpak ethnics. Combination of ethnic identity is as personal references (personal references), a source of motivation and behavior (exploring motivation and behavior), as well as the construction of a social symbol that is social radar in order to interpret and understand the social world in accordance with the situation of ethnicity in Dairi. The combination of ethnic identity is formulated very loose, adaptable, involving Pakpak interfaith, cross-territorial and cross-party. Therefore, ethnic identity is very pragmatic.

Contestation of ethnic identity on ethno-territorial formation Pakpak Bharat is the configuration of integration of ethnic identity primordial and constructive. It becomes a strategy to reduce political and administrative deprivation, marginalization, socio-cultural attributes of the independence of ethno-religious exclusion.

However, it is important to understand that the contestation of ethnic identity is not linear from one room to another, but tend to be interlocking. Thus, the achievement of the objectives of contestation on three social and political space in Dairi (socio-cultural, and socio-political socio-religion) becomes an important capital to form an ethno-territorial of Pakpak Bharat. Therefore, this research emphasizes again that ethnicity is a very important phenomenon to understand political reality. Ethnic politics played by Pakpak ethnics is claimed as a result of

political deprivation, marginalization and exclusion of socio-cultural attributes of ethno-religious in the face of immigrants who dominate in the customary own.

CONCLUSION

From the description above, there are three major conclusions of ethnic identity contestation on ethno-territorial formation in Pakpak Bharat: first, the contestation of ethnic identity on ethno-territorial formation in Pakpak Bharat is a combination of a primordial ethnic identity and constructive. Contestation of ethnic identity combination is very loose, pragmatic and involves ethnic, inter-religious, territorial and party. Ethnic identity combination tends to fluctuate, melting and pragmatic. Contestation of ethnic identity on ethno-territorial formation characterizes the struggle for political interests. Contestation of ethnic identity combination is demanded for solidarity in the form of their obligations and responsibilities towards their ethnic community. Solidarity is confirmed through an ongoing process of socialization that is based on the supervision of social, economic incentives to deal with external pressures.

Second, ethnic identity contestation on ethno-territorial formation in Pakpak Bharat does not move linearly among socio-cultural space, socio-religion space, politics and government. Contestation of ethnic identity in the socio-cultural and socio-political, socio-religion into energy is to form ethno-territorial. Then, ethnic identity on the socio-cultural and socio-political, socio-religion reaffirmed in ethno-territorial region in Pakpak Bharat.

Third, ethnic identity contestation on ethno-territorial formation cannot be separated from the context of space and time as well as provincial and national policy. Momentum of regional autonomy and elections after the fall of the New Order gives an opportunity to form an ethno-territorial in Pakpak Bharat.

REFERENCES

- Anderson. Benedict, 1991 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Agustino. Leo, 2009 *Pilkada dan Dinamika Politik Lokal*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Agustono. Budi, 2010 *Rekontruksi Identitas Etnik: Sejarah Sosial Politik Orang Pakpak Di Sumatera Utara 1958-2003*. Yogyakarta: Disertasi Doktor Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Gajah Mada Yogyakarta.
- Barth. Fredrick, 1969 *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Boston: Little brown.
- Berutu. Lister, dkk. 2013 *Sejarah Berdirinya Kabupaten Pakpak Bharat*. Medan: Pemkab Pakpak Bharat, Laboratorium Antropologi FISIP-USU dan Monoratama.
- Bell. Daniel, 1960 The Break-Up of Family Capitalism, in *The end of Ideology*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Brunner. Edward M, 1969 *Kinship Organization Among the Urban Batak of Sumatera*. Transactions of the New York Academy of Science 22 (2)., pp.

118-125.

- Burke. J. Peter, dan Stats. Jan E, 2009 *Identity Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brass. Paul, 1991 *Ethnicity and Nationalism*. New Delhi, Newbury Park, London: Sage Publication.
- Brubaker. R, Loveman. M, and Stamatov. P, 2002 *Ethnicity and Cognition. Theory and Society*. Vol. 29., pp 1-47
- Castels. Lance, 1975 Statelessness and State Forming Tendencies Among the Batak before Colonial Rule. In *Pre-colonial State system of Southeast Asia*. Anthony Reid and Lance Castels, (eds). Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. Monograph No. 6. Kuala Lumpur.
- Connor. Walker, 1984 Social Theory and Ethnography, in *Ethnic Diversity and Conflict in Eastern Europe*. (Peter Sugar, ed). Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio. 1993 Beyond reason. In *Ethnic and racial studies*. Vol 16. No. 3., pp 373-389.
- Cohen. Abner, 1969 *Custom and Politics in Urban Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coleman. R. Griffin, 1983 The Village as a Category of Pakpak Batak Descent. In *Beyond Samosir: Recent Studies of the Batak Peoples of Sumatera*. (Rita Smith Kipp and Richard D. Kipp, eds). Ohio: Ohio University Center for International Studies, Southeast Asia program. 1983 *Pakpak Batak Kins Group and Land Tenure: A study of Descent organization and its Cultural Ecology*. Columbia: Ph.D Dissertation, Columbia University.
- Dashefsky. Arnold, 1975 *Ethnic Identity in Society*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company
- De Vos. George and L. Romanucci. Ross, (eds). 1975 *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change*. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing.
- Fearon. J.D, 1999 *What is identity as we now use the world?*. Unpublished manuscript
- Geertz. Clifford, (ed). 1963 The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiment and Civil Politics in the New States, in *Old Societies and New States*. New York: The Free Press Glencoe.
- Giddens. Anthony, 2003 *Masyarakat Posttradisional*. Yogyakarta: IRCisoD.
- Glazer. Glazer, and Moynihan. Daniel P, 1963 *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Hale. Henry E, 2004 Explaining Ethnicity, in *Comparative Political Studies*, Volume 37. No. 4. Pp.458-485. 2008 *The Foundations of Ethnic Politics: Separatism of States and Nations in Eurasia and the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Habermas. Juergen, 1984 *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and Rationalization of Society., Vol.1*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hechter. Michael, 1986 A Rational Choice Approach to Race and Ethnic Relations, in *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations* (D. Masson and J. Rex, eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horowitz. Donald L, 1983 *Ethnic Groups in conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Isaacs. Harold R, 1975 *Idols of Tribes: Group Identity and Political Change*. New

- York: Harper and Row.
- Irtanto. 2008 *Dinamika Politik Lokal Era Otonomi Daerah*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Laitin. D.D, 1998 *Identity in formation: the Russian-speaking Populations in the Near Abroad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lempp. Walter, 1977 *Benih Yang Tumbuh Jilid XII: Suatu Survei Mengenai Gereja-gereja Di Sumatera Utara (Laporan regional Sumatera Utara)*. Medan: Gereja-gereja Di Sumatera Utara dan Lembaga Penelitian dan Studi Dewan Gereja-gereja di Indonesia.
- Melucci. Alberto, 1989 *Nomads of the Present*. London: Hutchinson Radius.
- Nash. Manning, 1989 *The Cauldrom of Ethnicity in the Modern World*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Nordholt. Henk Schulte, van Klinken. Gerry, dan Karang-Hooggenboom. Ireen, 2007 *Politik Lokal Di Indonesia*. Jakarta: KITLV-Jakarta dan Obor Indonesia.
- Pakpahan. Lasmaria, 2011 *Peran Hubungan Kekerabatan Dalihan Na Tolu pada Pelaksanaan Tugas dan Fungsi Birokrasi Lokal Dalam Pelayanan Masyarakat di Kabupaten Dairi*. Thesis. Program Pascasarjana, Prodi Antropologi Sosial. Universitas Negeri Medan.
- Pederson. Paul Bodholdt, 1975 *Darah Batak dan Jiwa Protestan: Perkembangan Gereja-gereja Batak di Sumatera Utara*. (translater: Maria Th. Sijabat dan W.B. Sijabat). Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia.
- Perret. Daniel, 2010 *Kolonialisme dan Etnisitas: Batak dan Melayu di Sumatera Timur Laut*. Jakarta: EFEO dan Kepustakaan Popular Gramedia.
- Pelly. Pelly, 2015 *Etnisitas Dalam Politik Multikultural. Buku-I*. Medan: Casa Mesra Publisher.
- Rawls. John, 1971 *Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Royce. Anya Peterson, 1983 *Ethnic Identity: Strategies of Diversity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Rudolph. Joseph, 2006 *Politics and Ethnicity: A Comparative Study*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Sahlan. Sartono, dan Marwan. Awaludin, 2012 *Nasib Demokrasi Lokal di Negeri Barbar: Kajian Reflektif Teoritis Pilkada Langsung*. Yogyakarta: Thafa Media.
- Smail. John, 1968 *The Military Politics of North Sumatera December 1956-October 1957*. *Indonesia*, No. 6: 128-187.
- Smith. Anthony D, 2000 *The nation in history*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Shills. Edwards, 1957 *Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties*. In *British Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 8, pp 130-145.
- van den Berghe. Pierre L, 1967 *Race and Racism: A Comparative Perspective*. New York: Jhon Willey and Sons, Inc.