



**Translocal and Transnational Movements of
Bugis and the Construction of Multiple Identities:
The Case of Bugis in North Kalimantan of Indonesia
and Sabah and Johor of Malaysia***



Yekti Maunati**

[Abstract]

It is widely known that the Bugis people, originally from South Sulawesi, have been migrating to many places, including both the Indonesian and Malaysian sides of the borders today. The translocal and transnational movements of the Bugis people, especially to North Kalimantan of Indonesia and Sabah and Johor of Malaysia, have occurred in several waves, particularly during the 17th century, around 1965 and from 1980 to the present. The fall of the kingdom of Somba Opu in South Sulawesi and the rise Dutch colonial power have been the triggers for the early

* This paper is based on the following: On the research "*Etnisitas, Pengembangan Sumberdaya Lokal dan Potensi Perdagangan Internasional dalam Rangka Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Nunukan Kalimantan Timur*" from 2007-2009 in Nunukan and Sebatik Islands in the Regency of Nunukan, East Kalimantan (now North Kalimantan, coordinated by I Ketut Ardhana (2008-9) and Yekti Maunati (2010), with Dundin Zaenuddin, Mayasuri Presilla, and Betti Rosita Sari; on "*Kontestasi Identitas dan Diaspora Bugis di Wilayah Perbatasan Kalimantan Timur-Sabah*" in 2009, coordinated by Yekti Maunati, with I Ketut Ardhana, Betti Rosita Sari, and Amorisa Wiratri, Rucianawati; and on "*Diaspora Bugis di semenanjung Malaysia: Identitas Budaya, Kewarganegaraan dan Integrasi Nasional*" in 2011, coordinated by Dundin Zaenuddin, with Yekti Maunati, Betti Rosita Sari, Lamijo, and Rucianawati. Thank you to all the team members of the said studies.

** Professor, Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI), yektim@yahoo.com

www.kci.go.kf

movement of the Bugis to both the Indonesian and Malaysian borders. This was followed by the second push of the Islamic rebellion in South Sulawesi, around 1965, creating another big wave of Bugis movement. The most recent one has been mainly due to economic reasons. These different phases of the movements, as well as the dynamic interplay of various aspects, such as citizenship, ethnic, and sub-ethnic groupings, practicing of cultural traditions and keeping the language, to mention a few, have contributed to the process of the construction of the multiple identities of the Bugis. Indeed, the Bugis people are no longer identified or identify themselves as a single group, but rather have fluid and contesting identities. This paper will discuss three main issues: the history of the translocal and transnational movements of the Bugis to North Kalimantan, Sabah and Johor; the process of adaptation to these new places; and the construction of Bugis identities.

Keywords: translocal and transnational movements, Bugis, multiple identities, Indonesia and Malaysia

I . The history of translocal and transnational movements of the Bugis to North Kalimantan, Sabah and Johor and the processes of adaptation

The Bugis people who originally came from South Sulawesi in Indonesia have high mobility. Indeed, Bugis people have been widely known as a group which has migrated to many different places, ranging from other parts of the Indonesian archipelago to Malaysia, Australia, and Africa (Lineton 1975; Ammarell 2002; Ito 2002; Acciaoli 2004; Said 2004; etc.). Lineton (1975: 173) notes that Bugis people have been known for their migration from the late seventeenth century and says that:

The late seventeenth century(,) carried them [Bugis of South Sulawesi] to all corners of the Malay world and beyond as traders and as conquerors of numerous petty states. This expansion of trade and political influence was accompanied by a process which

was less spectacular but of no less significance: the emigration of large numbers of Bugis, and some Makassarese, to all parts of the Indonesian archipelago and to the Malay Peninsula. As a result of this outflow of population from South Sulawesi, sizeable Bugis colonies were—by the beginning of this century—established in eastern Kalimantan (Borneo), near Samarinda and Pasir; in southwestern Borneo, in the Pontianak region; in the Malay Peninsula, particularly in southwestern Johor; and in many other islands of the East Indies. During the twentieth century, particularly in the 1950s and early 1960s, Bugis settlements also sprang up in the coastal areas of Java and Sumatra (Lineton 1975: 173).

Besides which Ammarell (2002: 52) for example, notes:

The first and greatest migration of the Bugis occurred in the late seventeenth century as a result of war in their homeland, establishing a pattern of migration that the Bugis describe as *massapa dalle* (*mencari rejeki* in Indonesian) (searching for good fortune) (2002: 52).

Ammarell (2002: 52) further pinpoints that by Bugis migrants residing in either big cities or border areas, connections with local noble people and authorities (both colonial and national) have been given priority since the seventeenth century. Often, local nobles and authorities have been the ones who approached the Bugis migrants and marginalized the indigenous people so that the Bugis had the opportunity to play important roles.

Another story of Bugis migration is that of them traveling to Australia prior to the twentieth century, especially “Bugis from the neighbouring kingdom of Bone” (Burton 2007: 409). Said (2004: 13) also notes that:

The Bugis are also known as prominent sailors. Many sources inform us that the Bugis boats were often seen all over the area known today as the Indonesian archipelago, from Singapore to New Guinea and from southern Philippines to north-western Australia, and they even sailed across the Indian Ocean to Madagascar (2004: 13).

The same author (2004: 14) further notes that Bugis people are acknowledged for their movements to other parts of Indonesia, as well as Malaysia and Australia. In new places, the Bugis often created villages and as traders played very important economic roles in eastern Indonesia, including Kupang, Kendari, and Ambon.

In a similar vein, Kenedi Nurhan in *Kompas* (2009: 1&15) reports on the diaspora of the Bugis-Makassar from Somba Opu. He argues that since the Bongaya (1667) agreement, the migrations of Bugis-Makassar to different places were not only done by commoners, but also by noble families who led such movements. The restrictions on trade and shipping by the Dutch Colonial Power at that time were purposed to take over the Gowa power in order to weaken the royal economy. This had become the important reason for large migrations of Bugis-Makassar all over the Archipelago. The existence of Bugis migrants in turn influenced local politics with the Bugis-Makassar people playing a role in the places that now belong to Indonesia as well as Malaysia. Apart from this, they have played important parts in trading relevant up to now (Maunati et al 2010).

Acciaioli (2004: 147) also notes the mobility of the Bugis throughout the Indonesian Archipelago as traders, fishermen, or farmers. Though many argue about the economic pursuit of the Bugis as motivation to migrate, Acciaioli (2004: 149) believes that it is more than that. The continuation of the migrations of the Bugis during both economic hardships and economic prosperity, prove that the Bugis migration had to do with something else. Acciaioli (2004: 149) states:

Thus, the task of interpreting Bugis activities requires that one consider them not simply as economic actors reacting to downturns and upturns in the homeland economy (and security) and responding to potentially lucrative opportunities in the periphery, but more complexly as cultural agents whose strategies of gaining a livelihood are inflected by values and beliefs that can even result in sometimes decidedly unprofitable courses of action (2004: 149).

Bugis migrations to the Malaysian side have been reported as

well. See, for example, this report by Noorduyn (1988):

Though this Raja Muda family was part and parcel of the Malay state system, its members were, in the male line, also of Bugis, i.e., non-Malay extraction, and this gives the story a markedly dual structure. On the one hand, the authors were proudly conscious of the age-old tradition of the Malay kingdom in which their story was set and they thus began their chronicle from the rise of the Melaka kingdom in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. But they were equally proudly conscious of the Bugis origin of their ancestors. Raja Haji Ahmad was a grandson of the second Raja Muda of Bugis extraction, Daéng Cellak (d. 1745), who had succeeded his elder brother Daéng Maréwa after the latter's death in 1728. These brothers were Bugis immigrants, who had come from their homeland in south Celebes as leaders of large groups of seaborne followers more than a decade before Daéng Maréwa's death (1988: 63).

Noorduyn (1988) further reports the link of Raja Muda and the five noble Bugis brothers who migrated to the Malay world: "Three of the five brothers who migrated to the Malay world (Daéng Parani, Daéng Maréwa and Daéng Cellak) are mentioned in Dutch records as brothers or half-brothers"¹⁾ (1988: 64).

Additionally, in Malaysia, in Kuala Lumpur and Kuching in particular, and also in Singapore, the Bugis presence has been marked by the establishment of *Kampong Bugis* (Ardhana and Maunati 2009). This indicates the historical existence of Bugis settlements in the said places.

Indeed, from the above illustration, Bugis translocal and transnational movements can be found through historical as well as contemporary accounts.

Based on our series of studies in Johor (2011), Tawau (2009), and Nunukan and Indonesian Sebatik Islands (2008-2010), Bugis people have migrated and settled in these places. In Nunukan and Indonesian Sebatik Islands, they consisted the majority of the populations. According to *Census 2000*, the total population in

1) Noorduyn, citing from Dutch VOC letters

Nunukan Regency was 26,810 people, composed of Javanese: 3,103; Bugis, Ugi: 12,460; Banjar, Banjar Malay: 818; Kutai: 46; Pasir: 0; Dayak Kenyah: 31; Toraja: 1.760; Sundanese, Priangan: 122; others: 8,470. In 2014, the population of Nunukan was 34,83 (in millions). On the Indonesian Sebatik Island, the Bugis were also the majority. Mr. Sulaiman, during our study on Sebatik Island, claimed that some villages had certain ethnic groups. As illustration, he described it as follows: "Aji Kuning: Bugis, Timorese; Bina Lawang: Tidung, Bugis; Setabu: Bugis, Tidung; Liang Bunyu: Tidung, Bugis; Desa Sungai Nyamuk: Bugis (80%), 20% mix of Javanese, Buthon, etc.; Sungai Pancang: Bugis (90%); Tanjung Aru: Bugis (90%); Tanjung Karang: Bugis (90%), Bajau" (Maunati 2010).

The process of Bugis migration has not been a simple one. Many Bugis have been moving to different places prior to the migration and settling into Nunukan or Sebatik Islands. For example, our studies in 2008-2010 in Nunukan and Sebatik Islands found that many Bugis inhabitants who used to work in Malaysia moved to Nunukan and Sebatik because of particular problems. In Sabah, East Malaysia, the migrants moved out because of these issues: overstaying; being cheated by employers; and end of work contracts. Some of the people had been deported by the Malaysian government to Nunukan, on the border of Indonesia-Malaysia in East Kalimantan (now North Kalimantan). In the beginning, indeed, their destination was Malaysia, but due to the above reasons, they ended up staying in Nunukan or Sebatik. They did not want to return to their hometowns because they were ashamed to go back home or were simply reluctant for economic reasons, especially as it is difficult to get a job back home (Maunati 2010).

A case in point is a Bugis couple who had been working in Malaysia for a few years but due to overstaying, had to go back to Indonesia and stopped over Nunukan where they have stayed since 2000. Initially, they were assisted by a Bugis family opened up land in the area in the 1960's. They bought land in South Nunukan, then reasonably priced. The roads then were still under construction. During our initial fieldwork, the closest village that could be reached by any form of transport (like the *angkot* or vehicle) was the Tanjung Harapan village, South Nunukan. The couple said they had

to walk to reach their house in the hilly area (Maunati 2008). In 2008, the road was partly asphalted as it became very slippery during the rainy season and virtually unpassable to any vehicle for at least two days. In 2010, this road was finally fully (Maunati 2010). According to our interviews, Bugis people often have connections in Nunukan and get assistance from their networks (family, neighbors in their hometown), including information on land, jobs, and other matters. Networking is indeed very important for Bugis in the process of survival in new places. Kuncoro (2016) also finds a similar pattern on Muslim Burmese migrants in Northern Thailand where a mosque has been re-functioned as a place for community networking and even touching base with wider Muslim groups across ethnicity and nationality.

Those very successful Bugis people in Nunukan shared similar experiences. They emerged from difficulties and were able to move back and forth from Nunukan and Sabah to trade or work. Translocal and transnational movements have worked to establish networks.

This is also a pattern observable with the Bugis of Sebatik Island. Indeed, Sebatik Island was in the beginning not considered by people moving out of Malaysia, but it offered alternatives as it became home family or friends.

Another factor worth considering is how some Bugis people make translocal instead of transnational movements. According to interviewees from Nunukan Island, some Bugis people have been moving from different places in East Kalimantan, and not to Malaysia or any other countries. As mentioned previously, Bugis early settlements could be found in Samarinda (Lineton 1975) and in many other places in East Kalimantan, including Tarakan (which used to be in East Kalimantan but is now in North Kalimantan), Melak, and in coastal areas or in riverbanks. Some Bugis moved from other places in East Kalimantan or now North Kalimantan, especially when Nunukan was converted into a Regency in 1999 when regional autonomy was installed by the central government on the ground of Decision No. 22, year 1999. The Bulungan Regency area at that time was added two extensions and made into two

autonomous regions, Malinau and Nunukan. Previously, Nunukan was only one of the sub-districts of the Bulungan regency. With this extension, there have been many job and business opportunities in many sectors in Nunukan where many Bugis people already settled. According to many informants, Bugis people have added to the number of the existing Bugis populations but unfortunately, no formal records could be found to prove this.

Contemporary migrations have mostly been motivated by economic reasons. In Malaysia, the new Bugis migrants, like other Indonesian migrants, are often spoken of as Indon (Indonesian migrants, especially the *Tenaga Kerja Indonesia* (TKI) - Indonesian overseas workers).

In terms of the process of adaptation, translocal and transnational migrants go through varied experiences, depending on many factors. In addition, each country may have a different policy for migrants. Though these migrants have distinct collective experiences, experiences of translocal and transnational movements clearly function as social capital for the process of adaptation. This is partly because the networks created could easily assist the process of adaptation in the new places.

According to Ammarell (2002), Bugis people have strategies of adaptation in new places and often are able to dominate the local economy and politics. This phenomenon was observed in Nunukan, North Kalimantan, where Bugis have played important roles in economic and political matters (Ardhana et al 2010; Maunati 2010). Our series of studies show that Bugis people have generally evolved strategies to adjust in new places, whether in the Indonesian side of Nunukan or the Malaysian side of Tawau or Johor. In the translocal and transnational experiences, networking among the Bugis plays an important part.

In her study of Bugis in Tawau, Maunati (2010a) writes about how the Bugis people, having had a long tradition of migration, perform three practices when they migrate to new places, as reminded by parents or elders: *jagalah ujung lidah* (look after the tip of the tongue); *jagalah ujung badik* (look after the end of the badik or knife); and *jagalah ujung "anu"* (look after the edge of the

male genitalia). This concept has been discussed widely. Majid (2013) notes the concept of *Tellucappa* (three ends): *viso*, *lila*, and *laso*. With these three, the Bugis could show their identity and existence and influence others. The first, *cappa viso* (knife edge or sharp object edge) must be made able to cut or break something. The second, *cappa lila* (tip of the tongue) refers to be able to interact with other people by communicating and influencing well. The third, *cappa laso* (the end of the male genitalia) suggests a way to enter and influence and even control others, which basically boils down to marrying a girl from a family as a way of entering a family and her larger society. This concept of adaptation is rather similar to that of a well-known Minangkabau concept of “*dimana bumi dipijak di situ langit dijunjung*” (where the earth is stepped on, the custom is obeyed/followed). For the Bugis, cultural negotiation could work in this process of adaptation, where on the one hand they attempt to integrate with mainstream, while on the other, they also keep their tradition for certain matters, like language, wedding rituals, and so forth.

The types of migrations also depend on whether they are permanent or temporary. Based on our interviews with informants and the stories told by the Bugis from Nunukan, Tawau, and Johor, Bugis people tend to settle down in the new places. The stories of the Bugis of Nunukan, as well as those in the frontiers of Tawau and Pontian, Johor, show that the Bugis people have settled well in new places, from generation to generation. A showcase of this is the settlement of the Bugis in Johor. Indeed, Maunati (2010a) notes that Bugis people tend to settle down when they migrate to a new area. Mr. Hambali, a Bugis informant, for example, told us that both in Tawau and Nunukan, unlike Javanese who often return to their homeland, the Bugis have settled and built families there. Mr. Hambali viewed this is a positive point because the Bugis could thrive in new places, as seen in Nunukan and Tawau. He also told us that the descendants of Bugis people used to be headmen (*penghulu*) and played important roles in developing Tawau. The concept of the three ends worked for the Bugis in the process of adaptation.

Information gathered from our fieldwork in Tawau show that

at the beginning of the settlement there, Bugis were placed in positions as headmen and received land which their descendants still own in some cases. There were times when they rent it to Chinese traders. In Tawau, many Bugis informants who have successfully adapted to local traditions and cultures (*budaya tempatan*) own land and houses. Nevertheless, they also preserve their traditions. In terms of adaptation, the Bugis could also hold double positions: supporting the national identity of Malaysia while holding Indonesian citizenship (Ardhana and Maunati 2009). Again, this shows a cultural negotiation where there is an attempt to integrate into the cultural mainstream as a way to adjust smoothly. Besides, the experiences of translocal as well as transnational movements have added to the widening of social and economic networks among the Bugis.

In Nunukan, the Bugis people not only own land but many have become landlords. Tidung people who moved to the outskirts of Nunukan City report that they sold their lands to Bugis people who used to rent their houses. In the past, Tidung people owned land in the city, but today many of them have moved to the outskirts having sold their lands. In Nunukan, Bugis people are not only religious and economic leaders, but are also political figures in the local level. Essentially, they are active not only in social and cultural arenas but also in politics (Maunati 2009). There have been many Bugis descendants who have held structural positions in the Nunukan Regency during our fieldwork in 2008-2010, including the head of the Regency (Maunati 2010). Based on our interview in Nunukan, many Bugis are of noble lineage and brought their own capital to Kalimantan.

Some Bugis in Tawau and Johor have been incorporated as Malays. This has been a strategic way to benefit economically and politically. Being Malay could get them more opportunities in terms of trade, economics, and politics.

Bugis people have certain strategies to survive in new places, whether in Nunukan and Sebatik in the Indonesian side or Tawau and Johor in the Malaysian side. The Bugis concept of three ends have worked to provide a spirit of survival for the Bugis outside

their homeland. Another important feature that has been argued by Ammarell is the ability of the Bugis to establish connections with important figures in the new places, as seen in Nunukan where they been dominating politically and economically.

This also is closely linked with their construction of identity. Bugis people have never been passive but have always been active in the process of identity construction. Nevertheless, Bugis people have always sported multiple identities and often contested ones depending on certain situations and contexts, making Eriksen's argument on this issue is still relevant (Eriksen 1993).

II. The Construction of Bugis Identities

It has been widely discussed that identity is socially constructed (Hall 1992; Kahn 1995; Eller 1999; Wang 2007; Maunati, 2011; Maunati 2012; Maunati and Sari 2014, etc.), fluid and contested (Maunati 2000; Kivisto 2001; Vertovec, 2001; Ito 2002; Yu and Jing 2015; Eisen 2016). Eisen (2016: 856), reviewing *Multiple Identities: Migrants, Ethnicity, and Membership*, edited by Paul Spickard, and published in 2013 by Indiana University Press, notes that "...the contributing authors effectively demonstrate that identity construction and belonging are fluid and contextual and that the two operate interdependently" (Eisen 2016: 856). Glick Schiller et al.²⁾, believe that historically, there is a different perspective between contemporary immigration and that of perspective by the end of 19th and the early 20th centuries. It is said that in contemporary times, immigration is always related to a homeland, while in the past, there was none. Therefore, migrant identity is always deemed multiple and fluid, according to Kivisto (2001: 554).

According to Yu and Jing (2015), the national identity of the Miao/Hmong people in the Vietnam-China border is a result of

2) Cited by Kivisto (2001), Glick Schiller, Nina, Basch, Linda and Szanton Blanc, Christina. 1992. Transnationalism: a new analytic framework for understanding migration. *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered*, Glick Schiller, Nina, Basch, Linda and Szanton Blanc, Christina, eds. 1-24. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

political, economic (especially land resources) and cultural factors. For example, the policy on the restriction on the number of children in China influenced the movement of people from China to Vietnam. The Miao people value having sons to bring family names, thus such a strict policy became a grave cultural issue, and led to the return of some of them to Vietnam (Yu and Jing 2015: 118). Yu and Jing (2015) also argue that the construction of national identity has been firstly assumed to relate to merely political matters, to be later on affected by economic and cultural aspects. They further believe that globalization has also shaped this construction of national identity (Yu and Jing 2015). Aside from national identities, people are also expected to hold some form of ethnic identities. Indeed, identity is often not a single matter but a gamut of other components depending on contexts.

The question is, if identity is a social construction, who then has the power/authority to do such construction? This is an important point that needs to be understood. There have been many arguments for this issue (King 1982; Barth 1989; Said 1993; Eriksen 1993; Kahn 1995, King and Wilder 2003, etc.). For example, Barth (1989) argues that there are many representations which have contributed to the construction of Balinese identity. In Vietnam, the classification of ethnic groups has been influenced by the colonial power. Stokhof and Salemink (2009: 157) mention that the colonial administration in Vietnam often lumped many different groups into one, like the Malais who were from Malais (from the Malay world) and the Cham. Indeed, there are many representations involved in the construction of identity, like in the case of Balinese, the Malais, or other groups. Maunati (2000) notes that in the case of the Dayak, people are not passive recipients in the construction of their identity but are involved in such construction.

The question now is, what is the reason behind such construction and who contributes to it for the Bugis? Have the Bugis also contributed in their identity construction? As mentioned earlier, historical accounts have been very important in the process of the construction of the Bugis identity. The historical context has been argued to make a significant contributions in the construction of cultural identity (Eriksen 1993; Kahn 1995; etc). Citing from Shelly

Errington, Acciaioli (2004: 148) reports that the Bugis in their homeland follow a hierarchical social order where the noble family takes the highest level by virtue of being descendants of the “spirit of the upperworld.” Commoners obey their orders. Accioaioli (2004: 148) further notes that the depictions of Bugis migrants have been somewhat different to those of the Bugis of their homeland. In this case, Bugis migrants have been portrayed to be more egalitarian and have mostly become “economic actors.” This is just one depiction of the Bugis involved in translocal and transnational movements.

The depiction of Bugis migrants have been various. According to Ammarell, over centuries Bugis migrants have been able to play important roles in local economies (Ammarell 2002:51). He further states that Bugis migrants in Eastern Indonesia, for example, were able to forge close connections with important individuals or parties, like noble families, local government officials, and so forth. This argument has been somewhat relevant to the Bugis of Nunukan where Bugis people have dominated local politics and economy (Maunati 2010). By using certain elements of the Bugis traditions, Bugis migrants were able to succeed politically and economically. This seems to be still related with the concept of the three aforementioned ends. Besides, the Bugis translocal and transnational movements have paved away for Bugis social, economic, and political networks both within and without. In new places, Bugis have established and joined several social organizations (see for instance, Ito, 2002, for Bugis in Sabah).

The strengthening of Bugis identity has also worked to support economic and political gains. This phenomenon has not been exactly the same in different places. There have been complex processes in the construction of identity for Bugis people, like in Tawau and Johor where like blended identities emerged between the Bugis and the Malays in the second or later generations. A migrant community strengthens its identity by way of economic, political, and cultural gains, among others. In addition, identity is not fixed, depending on the situation. In the case of the Bugis people, there have been many markers of identity taken from their religion, language, and cultural traditions, etc. Said (2004: 14) argues that maintaining language, traditional festivals, and customs to mention

a few, are components of upholding cultural heritage.

Said (2004) notes that today, Islam has become an important aspect of Bugis. The process of Islamization for the Bugis had taken a long time, but Islam was later on recognized by the Bugis kingdoms as their formal religion at the beginning of the 17th century (Said 2004: 15). Later on, Islamic teachings were incorporated into Bugis life (Said 2004: 15).

As adherents of Islam, Bugis people could blend with the Malays of Malaysia in many ways. Historically, Said (2004: 12) notes that at the end of the 16th century, Islam came to the Bugis of South Sulawesi and later on “Islam has become a fundamental aspect of the Bugis culture.” Being Muslim has become associated with being Bugis (Said 2004: 12). In addition, Pelras (1996: 4) also argues that in Bugis culture, religion has been very important. Therefore, in terms of Bugis identity, Islam is an important marker, the way it shapes Malay and other Moslem cultures (Musa 2000; etc). Kahn (1995) argues the existence of a grey area in identity construction in the shared elements of markers of identity. Markers of identity could be taken from many aspects of a culture, depending on selection. This is also the reason why identity could be fluid depending on the context and situation.

Despite practicing Islam, Bugis people continue to preserve the cultural values of their ancestors, like the concept of “siri”, which means “honor, dignity or courtesy” (Said 2004: 16). This concept of Siri could be explained as composed of five cores:

1. Ada Tongeng (truthful wording);
2. Lempuk (honesty);
3. Getteng (steadfastness);
4. Sipakatau (mutual respect);
5. Mappesona ri dewata seuwe (submission to the will of God) (Said 2004: 18).

Said further argues that basically, this concept establishes a harmonious life for the Bugis community (2004: 20). Of course, some elements may be used for the Bugis markers of identity but at other times different elements may be utilized. A process of

negotiation may take place in selecting the elements for the markers of identity. Below, I will discuss in detail the construction of contested identity in the cases of the Bugis in Nunukan, Tawau, and Johor.

My discussion about the Bugis in the Nunukan Regency will be limited to the Bugis on the Islands of Nunukan and Sebatik. As mentioned earlier, the Bugis people consist of the majority of the populations in both islands. Based on our many years of studies in Nunukan North Kalimantan (which used to be East Kalimantan)³⁾, the Bugis people on the Island of Nunukan have been residing there for a long time, especially since the Confrontation between Indonesia and Malaysia around 1963 to 1966. At that time, there were many Bugis people on the Malaysian side who migrated to the Indonesian side, particularly to Nunukan Island located near Tawau in Malaysia. The population of the Island of Nunukan at that time was small and the land uncultivated yet abundant. In the beginning, the Bugis people engaged in fisheries and agriculture. In Kalimantan, there is tradition where the ones who cultivated land earned it (Maunati 2009). This tradition is practiced by the Dayak group in East Kalimantan especially after abundant lands have been left by logging companies (Maunati 2000)⁴⁾.

Since it is located near Tawau of Sabah, Nunukan has been a strategic and attractive place serving as a transit area for those who want to leave or return to Malaysia. Riwanto Tirtosudarmo (2005) argues that Nunukan is a kind of transit spot. People who intend to return to their hometowns but did not have sufficient funding often stayed in Nunukan and attempted to get a job and settle there. There have been many Bugis people who succeeded in business after engaging in economic activities in the locality (Maunati 2009).

Our studies in Nunukan (2008-2010) showcase how Bugis businessmen succeeded and preserved traditions. Mr. Haji Baha (not

3) North Kalimantan established in November 16, 2012 under Decision No. 20, 2012. It was in April 22, 2013 when the first governor was installed.

4) This became a problem when the price of land increased due to the rise of coal mining. Some migrants encountered problems when the indigenous people claimed the land they were cultivating (Siburian and Maunati 2013).

his real name) was one of the successful businessmen in Nunukan—and even assumed to be the most successful of all. He lives in a huge and luxurious residence. He followed his uncle who was already in Nunukan and moved there in 1971. He only studied and was not able to complete in primary school. He was forced to migrate outside South Sulawesi. He worked very hard to fulfil his basic needs. When he was asked by his uncle to come to Nunukan from South Sulawesi on November 18, 1971, he travelled on a sailboat for 5 days and 5 nights. In Nunukan, he opened a cassava garden with his uncle. At that time, he had to get basic necessities from Malaysia and Tarakan in Indonesia. Ships from Surabaya only operated regularly after regional autonomy was installed in 2001 (Maunati 2009).

He became a full-pledged businessman after the Regency of Nunukan, which used to be a sub-district, was set up in 2000. To succeed, he had to work very hard. He started out as a plantation laborer. He “used to work in Malaysia for a wage.” He faced trouble when his passport expired while working in the Malaysian plantation. During our fieldwork, he had already become a contractor. He thought that the change in status of Nunukan was a starting point for economic progress. He used this opportunity to open a business for building infrastructure. He received a loan from a local bank (*Bank Pembangunan Daerah*) to open his construction business. He also told us that he was able to collaborate well with the local government and businessmen, so he can engage in business. Jobs/projects from local government are aplenty (Maunati 2009).

Apart from becoming a contractor, he has extended his business by opening up a palm oil plantation in the Nunukan Regency. Palm oil plantations had become a new industry at that time in Nunukan, and it still depended on Malaysia to sell the plantation’s products because of limited Crude Palm Oil (CPO) in Nunukan. He hoped that there will be more CPO in Nunukan as palm oil plantations already thrived there. He opened up land of around 20,000 hectares for palm oil in Sebuku and another 2,000 hectares was planted for a year. Problem is, the area of palm oil plantations overlapped with the *Kawasan Budidaya Kehutanan*

(KBK). At that time, a master plan for spatial planning was adopted due to varying interests (Maunati 2009).

Many Bugis people residing in border areas between Nunukan and Tawau have been successful in business. If Nunukan had Pak Baha, Tawau had Hj Imran, who owned a ship to served the Nunukan-Tawau route. Hj Imran has a Malaysian Identity Card (IC), and thus could easily open a business in Tawau. His co-owns his ship with a Bugis friend in Nunukan (Maunati 2010).

The success stories of Bugis people in both Nunukan and Tawau are often associated with the religious following of the concept of the three ends passed on from generation to generation. The practice of the three ends marks Bugis identity, which respects and preserves its traditions, even outside their homeland. This is true for both the Bugis of Nunukan and the Bugis of Tawau.

Also important in constructing Bugis identity is the establishment and strengthening of networks among Bugis. The strong networking among the Bugis in translocal and transnational movements provided space for them to strengthen their economic activities. For Bugis people, social organizations has been very important, especially away from the homeland. Social organizations maintained cultural traditions and provided a genuine bond among Bugis outside the homeland. In practicing traditions or performing certain rituals, as in wedding ceremonies or other events, they are able to express their being uniquely Bugis. Organizations have also helped Bugis face challenges, even problems with other ethnic groups.

Maunati (2009) notes that in Nunukan, Bugis people usually joined the organization called Kerukunan Keluarga Sulawesi Selatan (KKSS), with headquarters in Samarinda, the capital city of East Kalimantan, and with offices in many areas. According to informants, the KKSS helped create close bonds among members and mediated to resolve internal or external conflicts. People from different ethnic groups join this organization, like the Bugis, Toraja, Makassar, Mandar, and so forth. In addition, Haba (2005) also claims that the Bugis have established a social organization in Nunukan which has various functions, including resolving conflicts.

In our interviews with Bugis and Tidung informants in Nunukan, we learned about a slight misunderstanding between the Bugis and the Dayak (mostly the Tidung) due to competitions for local government projects (Maunati 2009). At that time, the Bugis people were not reacting to avoid a repeat of the conflict between the Dayak and the Madurese in West Kalimantan⁵⁾ and also in Central Kalimantan. According to the Bugis informants, during the night when the Dayak Tidung and other Dayaks rallied along the main road of the city, the Bugis just kept quiet. The conflict was settled when organizations, including the KKSS, intervened, which led to the Bugis paying traditional fines. The KKSS, the Dayak organizations, some public figures, and the local government officials made an effort to maintain peace in order in Nunukan during that time (Maunati 2009).

A Communication Forum was established in 2008 in Nunukan as a platform for organizations to talk and avoid potential conflicts. According to information gathered during our fieldwork in Nunukan in 2009, this Forum is one of the branches of a similar Forum in Samarinda (Maunati 2009), established to avoid potential conflicts in East Kalimantan after the riot between the Dayak and the Madurese in Central Kalimantan (Ju-lan and Maunati 2004).

When the Bugis people experience any threat, their bonds grow stronger and they collectively show their identity. However, in different contexts, they also sport contested identities as they also originate from sub-groups like Bone, Pinrang, Wajo, and so forth. These sub-groups have also established organizations in Nunukan. For instance, a Bone organization member reports that his group tries to solve internal problems, but relies on the KKSS for issues of communal concern. Sub-group identities have also appeared in certain contexts and situations. In terms of a larger national identity, we can also delineate Bugis identity as a collective from the Bugis of Indonesia or the Bugis of Malaysia. This is also true with the Lun Dayak and Lun Bawan in the Indonesia-Malaysia border, which

5) For information on conflicts see Effendy, Chairil (1999), Solusi Tragedi Sambas. *Forum Keadilan*, 11 April, (01): 38; MacDougall, John A. 1999. *Classes on Indonesian Borneo Kill 114. Nos. 1563-1565, May 4, 1999*. John A Macdougall ed. Maryland USA: Indonesian Publications, Indonesian News Service.

acquired differing identities because of the geographic demarcation (Maunati 2007; Ardhana, et. al., 2004).

The organizations of sub-groups like Bone, Pinrang, and Wajo, to mention a few, generally limit their functions by focusing on social and cultural aspects. For example, in dealing with wedding ceremonies, circumcisions, or funerals, they assist each other—a way of upholding shared traditions and connecting with the past (Maunati 2010).

In Tawau, Bugis people also join several organizations. Ito (2002) explains that Bugis people usually participate in organizations that also open to Moslem Malays. Ito (2002: 27-28) lists down five organizations under this category: (1) Persatuan Sahabat Pena Melayu, established in 1936 in Tawau; (2) Persatuan Kebangsaan Melayu Tawau, established in 1946, reformed in 1992, and renamed Persatuan Kemasyarakatan Melayu Tawau. Old generation Bugis joined this organization, while the young associated with the Persatuan Kebajikan Bugis Sabah; (3) Persatuan Keluarga Sulawesi, established in 1976. This organization is composed of Bugis, Mandar, Makassar, and Toraja or Menado peoples. It closed down in 1984 due to protests by the Indonesian Embassy regarding the use the name of Sulawesi; (4) Perhimpunan Keluarga Indonesia Sabah dan Sarawak, established in 1978 under the control of the Indonesian Consulate in Kota Kinabalu. It closed down in 1990. Its branches could be found in Tawau and Sandakan. In Tawau, members were mostly people from Sulawesi; (5) Persatuan Kebajikan Bugis Sabah, established in 1985 (Ito 2002: 27-28).

Other forms of Bugis networking are closely linked to business. Bugis residing in Nunukan engage in business with other Bugis in Tawau. They share traditional culture, which gives them common ethnic identity, but differ because of their national identities. There has been a dynamic interplay between integrating cultural mainstream and keeping the Bugis tradition because of the translocal and transnational movements. These movements strengthened the networking among Bugis of different nationalities. This strong network showcased in the stories of Mrs. Ani and Mr. Amir, two subjects of our previous studies. Mrs Ani, a Bugis lady of

Nunukan, has close relations with other Bugis in Tawau, especially because she has siblings who live there. She always buys goods from Tawau. In the beginning, it was her sister who introduced her to buying goods in Tawau. She eventually knew how to trade with people from Tawau well and has since expanded her business networks.

On the other hand, Mr. Amir, a young fish collector, has 5 Bugis bosses in Tawau. In Nunukan, he works with his father, and contacts a boss who employs 15 Bugis fishermen to catch tuna, and another 5 Bugis to catch shrimps. Catchers of shrimp collect around 3 to 5 times a month, while fishermen collect twice a month. He pays the fishermen prior to their setting on the sea. At that time, tuna was paid for at Rp20,000/kg. Mr. Amir owns a ship which cost up to Rp100 million. In Tawau, Mr. Amir sells fish to Bugis people and his “bosses” who originate from the same hometown in South Sulawesi. The Yamaker market in Nunukan and the fish market in Tawau are usually populated with Bugis people who trade and collect (*pengepul*) (Maunati 2009).

Business networking with other Bugis is also important for the Bugis of Sebatik, Nunukan Regency. Many Bugis people stay in Sebatik Induk. They moved here in several stages. Many of them used to stay in Malaysia prior to settling down in Sebatik. Bugis in Sebatik Island have engaged in fishing but have largely depended on Tawau, as may be seen in the pattern of trade between Tawau-Sebatik Island. In the evening, when the water starts flowing upstream to the river in the local river port, small boats return from Tawau bringing many goods. The boats await the tide to flow so they can move towards the port where customs officers calculate the charges. The traders, porters, and boat owners are usually Bugis. Traders usually bring Sebatik crops like bananas, vegetables, and fish to Tawau (Maunati 2010). Networking with the Bugis of Tawau has been very important for the Bugis fishermen.

The Bugis have also been classified as noble or common people, as could be found among the Bone people. According to an informant from Nunukan, Bugis people recognize the stratification in their groups. Noble families have specific traditions. In marriage,

women are not allowed to marry men from a lower class. The Bugis in Nunukan and Tawau still follow Bugis wedding traditions. According to several informants, the Bugis still follow the most important traditions marking milestones in life like weddings and the *sunatan* (circumcision) for young boys, as they used to do it in South Sulawesi. Mr. Masrun is from South Sulawesi, but he grew up in Tawau, where most of his family reside. Today, he lives in Nunukan, but often attends wedding ceremonies in Tawau. He told us that in Tawau, Bugis people still practice traditional wedding ceremonies, only shortened so people can go back to their responsibilities. In Tawau, his family members work in offices, thus it is hard to leaves and spend time for full wedding ceremonies as in South Sulawesi. Despite the shortened ceremonies, the essential rituals remain, including the proposal, as well as the use of the Bugis language and wearing of traditional Bugis clothing. Bugis dances are also performed and the bridesmaids wear special Bugis clothes. However, not all guests wear traditional Bugis clothes as they usually come from different ethnic groups. According to Bugis informants, these practices are kept despite their being away from the homeland (Manunati 2010).

In Nunukan, traditional Bugis weddings have been important markers of identity. Bugis weddings in Nunukan usually put up traditional platforms decorated with very colourfully, according to preserved their traditions. Relatives from everywhere, including South Sulawesi, are invited, upholding customs and traditions, and maintaining relations with the homeland (Maunati 2010).

In Nunukan, Bugis can be called Bugis by outsiders but they themselves refer to their sub-groups, like Bone, Wajo, and so forth. In Tawau, Bugis people come in different names, like Bugis Malay, Bugis Sabah, and Bugis Indonesian or Malaysian. Of course, these could be contested. For example, Bugis Sabah refer to themselves as Bugis Sabah, especially when dealing with the local government. At different times, they claim to be Bugis Indonesian when disputes in the Malaysia-Indonesia border arise. In Tawau, Bugis who hold Malaysian Identity Card refer to themselves as Bugis Sabah. Descendants of early migrants usually refer to themselves as Bugis Malay (Ardhana and Maunati 2009).

The Bugis in Tawau, considered to be Bugis Malay, are the descendants of early migrants to Malaysia. Those Bugis who migrated during the 1960's and obtained Malaysian IC are often considered Bugis Sabah. The so-called Bugis Sabah, according to informants, obtained their ICs during the process of clarifying their status. This group has been using the Bugis language for communication with fellow Bugis and still maintains Bugis traditions. It is only their citizenship that makes distinguishes them from the Bugis of Nunukan who used to stay in Malaysia and finally settled in Nunukan. Often, they are family. This group has different benefits from those of the so-called Bugis Indonesia, contemporary migrants in Malaysia (Ardhana and Maunati 2009).

As mentioned earlier, many Bugis have been successful in business. For instance, a Bugis family is known to own public transport buses as well as a restaurant. People often talked about Bugis as dominating public transportation in Tawau. Bugis people who hold ICs have the opportunity to get loans from banks to engage in business. Apart from transportation, the Bugis also dominate the fish market in Tawau. Historically, Bugis people played an important role in developing Tawau. While interviewees claim that the Chinese still hold fort in certain economic activities, the Bugis have already significantly taken part in the economic life of Tawau (Ardhana and Maunati 2009).

In Nunukan, we may find contested identities, like Indonesian Bugis and Bugis belonging to sub-groups like Bone, Enrekang, or Wajo. In Sabah, we may encounter Bugis Malay, Bugis Sabah, and Bugis Indonesia. In Johor, there may also be found multiple identities for Bugis people. The identity of Bugis in Johor, Malaysian Peninsula, also shows fluidity and contestation. The Bugis in Johor often identify themselves as Bugis but in different contexts and situations they claim to be Malay. Bugis is also not a single identifying term, but may include other terms such as "*Bugis Totok*", "*Bugis Ancur*", *Bugis Sabah*, *Bugis Indonesia*, and so forth. In addition, the Bugis are also a stratified community, composed of noble families and commoners. Bugis is not the only an identity presented by the community. In certain situations, Bugis identity reemerges in Johor when there are a good number of Bugis around.

Some informants say that this is related to the rise of the Prime Minister of Malaysia who is of Bugis descent. Those who have so far referred to themselves as Malay, at some point also admit to be originally descended from a Bugis family.

The Malaysian Peninsula is known as the home of many different migrants; from India, China, Indonesia, and Cambodia, to mention a few. Minangkabau, Bugis and Javanese have been inhabitants of the Malaysian Peninsula for a long time. The Malaysian Peninsula has been thriving in multiculturalism and identity has always been one of its major concerns. The Bugis have become an important group in the development of the multicultural society in the Malaysian Peninsula since the Bugis arrived. The Bugis' different times of arrivals in history have been associated with the contestation of the identity. It is important to have an in-depth understanding of it, as to be illustrated below.

In the Malaysian Peninsula, three groups have been known as the important inhabitants: the Malay, Chinese, and Indian. The Malay compose the majority of the population. Chinese and Indians migrated to Malaysia over a long time. In 1991, Malays in the peninsula compose 58.3% of the total population, while the Chinese had 29.4% and the Indians (including Pakistanis, Bangladeshis and Sri Lankans) around 9.5% (Andaya and Andaya 2001). In terms of work, Malays usually engaged in government jobs, as well as the military and police, although today, they expanded to other industries. Citing from Information Malaysia (1998)⁶, Musa (2000:144) reports that Malaysia is a multi-ethnic state, with a population of 59% Malay and other indigenous peoples, 32.1% Chinese, 8.2% Indian, and 0.7% others. Identification of Malay in Malaysia could differ from other countries which is also home to Malays. In Malaysia, to be Malay is to be Moslem, a similar formulation offered by Andaya and Andaya (2001).

Those who have been categorized as Malay are not fixed if we look at the Census. According to Hirschman (1987), in a Census during the colonial times, the Malay constituted many groups, with

6) Cited from Information Malaysia (1998), *Year Book*. Berita Publishing Sdn.Bhd. Malaysia, 1998.

the Bugis often included. Meanwhile, in the Census of 1911, the Bugis were included in the category of Malay and allied races. However, the Census of 1931 categorized Malaysians by race, thus the Malays and the Bugis were split. After Malaysian Independence, the Census of 1970 and 1980, the old categories of Malays and Indonesians were used, but the category of Bugis was taken out. It is also important point out that during colonial times, the Malay category was at the bottom of the list. After independence, it has emerged to be the first (Hirschman 1987).

Bugis identity is really multiple and contested identity. In Sabah, Malaysia, Ito (2002) argues that Bugis are composed of three groups: Malay Bugis, Sabah Bugis, and Indonesian Bugis. In our study in Sabah, we also found similar categorizations, but the Bugis Malay is usually referred to as one who resides in the Malaysian Peninsula (Maunati 2010a). This also explains why the Bugis who have been residents of Sabah before migrating to the Malaysian Peninsula were referred to as Bugis Sabah. There have been many waves of Bugis migration in Malaysia. As mentioned, Nurhan notes that (2009) Bugis people have migrated to many places, including the Malaysian Peninsula since the fall of Somba Opu and during colonial times. The contemporary movements have also been identified. Those who have been in Malaysia for a long time and succeeding generations often blended with the Malay people through intermarriage, but often refer to themselves as Bugis Malay or even as Malay in certain situations. This also applied in terms of citizenship. In the Malaysian Peninsula, especially in Johor, the Bugis people referred to themselves as Malay Bugis, *Bugis Ancur*, *Bugis Totok*, Bugis Sabah, and Bugis Indonesia.

The incorporation of Bugis in the Malay category has been supported by the data from the Census in the colonial period. Based on interviews, the equal treatment of Bugis and other Malays during the colonial period brought a feeling of unity with the other Malays. Participation in the struggle for independence assisted the process of integration of the Bugis with the Malays. This made them and their descendents Malay.

This story is different from that of contemporary migrants.

Contemporary migrants are often referred to as Indonesian Bugis. Unlike the Bugis in Sabah who are often categorized into three categories—Malay Bugis, Sabah Bugis and Indonesian Bugis—in Johor, the Bugis have often been combined with Malays, with and their Malay identity often dominating, except in circumstances when Bugis identification is necessary. Some Bugis refer to themselves, and are referred to as “*Bugis Ancur*” because they have been incorporated into Malay ways of life and do not practice Bugis traditions in a proper way. Some of them do not even not speak Bugis language any more. Some of the Bugis are categorized as “Bugis Totok,” or those who still use the Bugis language and practice Bugis traditions and culture. They mostly live in the Johor area, especially Pontian⁷⁾. In interviews with several Bugis informants, we learned that the Bugis of Pontian, Johor, referred to as Totok Bugis, are indeed “pure Bugis” as they have been very active in Bugis activities.

Bugis people in the Malaysian Peninsula have a long history and the Sultan Muda of Johor is known to be of Bugis descent (Noorduyn 1988).

An interviewee in Pontian, Johor, told us that his ancestors moved to Pontian in 1915. Since his ancestors belonged to nobility, they did not come empty handed. They were able to own large areas of land and passed them on to their children. There were other stories of Bugis arriving in Johor from other informants. Some also say that most noble Bugis families migrated to Johor. Because of their social status, they had knowledge, leadership, and property from South Sulawesi. They had social and economic capital to start up in Johor. One Bugis descendant reported that his ancestors first stayed in a small island, Pulau Pisang, near Pontian town. This island used to be bigger in size but subsequently diminished due to sea water erosion. The family’s lands subsequently shrank along with the process of erosion. Being Bugis, he attempts to maintain traditions and culture in order despite living in a different country. He collects Bugis customary clothing, ceramic jars, agricultural equipment and so forth as to reiterate his Bugis identity in the host

7) Some live in Selangor and Klang.

country.

Interviews with the Bugis of Pontian tell of how they arrived in the locality and how they succeeded in economically. The Bugis of Pontian are proud of their heritage because of their affinity with Malaysian Prime Minister Datuk Seri Najib Tun Razak, who is of Bugis descent, as well as several other sultans, including the Sultan of Johor. Bugis organizations maintain traditions and promote social and cultural interests. Organization meetings would always be a feast of traditional Bugis food. There are also efforts from the Bugis community to preserve Bugis arts and dance.

As mentioned, many Bugis in Pontian came from noble families and had an upper hand in things, as well as resources that could be passed on to the next generation. This enabled them to settled down easily and thrive economic conditions. They have also been entrusted leadership by the community. In an interview, one informant's grandfather, who is of noble descent, was asked to lead in many occasions as he was among the "haves" in Pontian area.

The Bugis nobles have also been concerned with upholding culture and traditions, passed on from generation to generation. Traditional wedding rituals are still practiced by many Bugis of Pontian, though it is not as long as it used to be in Sulawesi. The adjustment was done to accommodate people's current lifestyles. For the Bugis, being Malay in Malaysia is simply a matter of being Moslem. Identity comes in several layers, and their ethnic identity connects them to Bugis ancestral traditions.

Maintaining tradition may be illustrated in several ways. For instance, among the most important Bugis traditions is the complex wedding ritual. Abdul Hadi bin Ambok Ing Tang (2009) reports that there have been variations in the traditional wedding processes of the Bugis based on being a member of nobility or "*Anak Arung*" (descendants with specific names like Datu, Petta, Bauk, Keraing, Aung, Ufu, and Andik) or mid-level nobility or "*Tau Deceng*" (descendants with specific names like Daeng, Ambok, and Indoki). For these two groups, wedding ceremonies require certain rituals. The first one, "*Mapasek –Pasek/ Mammanuk – Manuk/ Mabbajah laleng / Mattiroh,*" concerns finding out whether the girl is single,

whether the proposal is accepted, and whether there is *kasiratang* or *sikappuk*, or equality in terms of rank and status between the parties. In “*Maddatah/Massuroh*,” a proposal or wooing ritual is performed with readings of *pantun* and offering of 7 strings of betel leaf, 7 betel nuts, 7 *gambir* seeds, 7 packs of chalk, 7 packs of tobacco, 1 ring, a pair of clothes and a woven sarong. In “*Mappetuh Adah*,” relatives wearing traditional Bugis clothing gather and share *barongkoh* as decide on the wedding date, as well as the marriage goods dowry in accordance with social status. There are also the “*Mengantarak Passiok*,” “*Mappadak/ Mattompah*,” “*Macce onrak Falaming*,” “*Mappisauh*,”; “*Mappacih/ Tuang Pennih*,” and the “*Mattaduk Majjajjarang; tenth, Mappareh Dewatah*.” During the wedding ceremony, the rituals are as follows: “*Mattagauk/ Mappigauk*,” “*Maddupah botting*,” “*Mattaluttuk*” (the ritual climbing of stairs by the bride and groom), “*Kawing*” (wedding ceremony), “*Ipasikarawai*” (ritual of holding for the newly-weds), “*Mappalluang*” (ritual for race stands), the banquet ceremony, “*Mappameccok*” (ritual for giving money as gift to the bride’s family, the best men staying overnight for 3 days, “*Mapparolah/ Marolah*” (ritual for bringing the bride to the house of the groom), and “*Mappasewah Adah*”. After the wedding ceremony, there are three rituals: “*Mpassilih*,” “*Marolah Wekkeduah*,” and the visit.

Bugis informants from Pontian report that parts of these rituals are still practiced by descendants of high and middle ranking noble families in Johor. One informant told us that his family still practices certain rituals to reiterate his family’s nobility and value traditions. His mother had to study at home with teacher to avoid her mixing with people of lower status. It is customary for Bugis women from noble families to not marry men from lower classes. Fortunately, this tradition is no longer practiced in Pontian.

Bugis traditions have easily marked Bugis identity and descent. In the case of Mr. Rachman, a laudable effort to preserve Bugis traditions was his establishment of a Bugis Museum in Johor. As manager of the museum, Mr. Rachman has paid serious attention to Bugis culture. The museum displays several items, including newspaper articles with headlines like “Preserving the Bugis culture,” “Abdullah bina museum Bugis pertama,” “Integrating into

the mainstream,” and “Najib, Rosmah dirai penuh adat kebesaran diraja Gowa.” Photographs of Prime Minister Najib and Najib wearing traditional clothes also appear in the articles. Several photographs of traditional Bugis houses are also on display, as well as other artifacts like musical instruments, pottery, household equipment, ceramic plates, agricultural implements, traditional wedding clothes, silver jewelry, a traditional bed, Bugis woven sarongs, and so forth.

He has also attempted to write the life stories of Bugis people and emphasize on their journey to Johor. He has also created a tree connecting several important Bugis people, as well as collected precious materials that are important for the Bugis.

He admits his anxiety when he thinks about the future of the Bugis Museum. He told us that it will be hard to find a successor since working in the museum needs passion. However, his family does not waver in upholding Bugis traditions. His own house in Pontian is designed in the tradition; Bugis way. It is decorated with Bugis cultural artifacts like traditional wedding clothes. He is married to a lady from South Sulawesi, who is still an Indonesian citizen though they already live in Pontian Johor.

Bugis identity may also be observed in the way the Bugis come together in social organizations. This became strong marker since Datuk Seri Najib Tun Razak was appointed Prime Minister. In Johor, Bugis people have not always shown their Bugis identity, especially those who have been blended in with the Malay mainstream. Nevertheless, many Bugis people refer to themselves as Bugis and have joined Bugis social organizations. Other people also refer to the Bugis of Johor, especially those who reside in Pontian, as “real Bugis.”

Identity is fluid and not fixed. Many people of Bugis descent embody Malay identity and Malaysian citizenship but maintain their Bugis identity in certain contexts. Cultural negotiation happens here for the Bugis people who have performed translocal and transnational movements and this has influenced the construction of fluid and multiple identities.

III. Conclusion

The long history of Bugis migrations to different parts of the world, including Australia, Africa, Malaysia, and parts of the Indonesian Archipelago have been widely discussed. Bugis movements have come in many waves, which contributed to the construction of multi-identities. Aside from this, the three ends of the Bugis people who migrate shaped the construction of the contested identities. It had become important to care for culture and traditions in order to survive. Networking among the Bugis has also gone beyond national boundaries, due to translocal and transnational movements. As they moved to different locations, they upheld Bugis traditions and thus continuously marked their distinct identity.

In Nunukan, the Bugis reiterated their identity by preserving Bugis wedding traditions and creating solidarity in groups. Sub-groups like Bone, Wajo, Enrekang, and so forth also forged additional social organization. Social stratification has also enabled the upholding of different traditions. Meanwhile, the association of the Bugis of Nunukan with the Bugis of Tawau has lent an interesting facet of Indonesian national identity. The Bugis were seen in this paper as fluidly playing with multi-identities depending on contexts and situation, which may easily remind of Eriksen's (1993) relevant argument.

In Tawau, Ito (2002) has categorized Bugis into three groups: the Malay Bugis, Sabah Bugis, and Bugis Indonesia. In our studies, we also found similar categorizations, but the Bugis Malay were usually those who reside in Peninsular Malaysia, while the Bugis who have an IC from Sabah, Malaysia were referred as Sabah Bugis. Historically, Malaysian census lumped Bugis together with the Malay and allied races (Hirschman 1987). Hirschman (1987) further notes that in the Census of 1970 and 1980, the Bugis were not distinguished but were included with Malays, Malaysians, or Indonesians. The descendants of the Bugis who migrated in the seventeenth century have blended well with the Malays, thus they were often thought to be Bugis Malay or simply Malay, as in the case of Johor Bugis, which benefitted economically because of being Malay. The current Prime Minister's Bugis background has inspired Bugis organization,

as per our fieldwork in 2011. This has also brought Bugis pride in further preserving cultural traditions. Also, in Johor, we found “real Bugis,” “Bugis totok,” or “Bugis ancur” who did not speak the Bugis language, unlike many Bugis totok.

Bugis Totok have been upholding Bugis traditions and have even maintained family heirlooms. They have also kept in touch with fellow Bugis in South Sulawesi and often attended ceremonies like weddings and circumcisions. If in the past, experts often argued that immigrants did not connect with their homeland, today, a lot of re-connections have been made. Kivisto (2001) notes that contemporary migrants are now closely connected with the homeland. In the case of Bugis in Johor, as well as those in Tawau and Nunukan, advanced communication and transportation systems have enabled touching base with the homeland. Translocal and transnational movements have compelled Bugis to strengthen and widen their networks among Bugis of different groups. These movements did not erode certain cultural traditions that mark Bugis identity. Cultural negotiation has been at work as the Bugis integrates with the mainstream, widen and strengthen social network, and preserve important elements of their culture.

References

- Abdul Hadibin Ambok Ingtang. 2009. Sejarah, Tradisi dan Budaya Bugis di Negeri Johor. *Tarikh*, 4 Mac 2009, bersamaan 7 Rabuilawal 1430H. Projek Pemugaraan Pendokumentasian Yayasan Warisan Johor.
- Acciaioli, Greg. 2004. From Economic Actor to Moral Agent: Knowledge, Fate and hierarchy Among the Bugis of Sulawesi. *Indonesia*, 78: 147-178.
- Ammarell, Gene. 2002. Bugis Migration and Modes of Adaptations to Local Situations. *Ethnology*, 41(1): 51-67.
- Andaya, Barbara Watson and Leonard Y. Andaya. 2001. *A History of Malaysia*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: PALGRAVE.
- Ardhana, I Ketut et al. 2004. *Border of Ethnicity and Kinship: Cross*

Border Relations between the KelalanValle Sarawak and the Bawan Valley, East Kalimantan. Jakarta: Research Center for Regional Resources - the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (PSDR-LIPI) in collaboration with Sarawak Development Institute (SDI).

- Ardhana, I Ketut and Yekti Maunati. 2009. The Bugis Diaspora in the Tawau District of Sabah, East Malaysia: Challenges and Trends in the Context of Managing Multicultural Society. Paper presented at International Conference of IFFSO (International Federation of Social Science Organizations) on "Global and International Migration-Realities of Labour Movement and International Marriages," Chiang Mai, Thailand on 21-23 November 2009.
- Barth, Fredrik. 1989. The Analysis of Culture in Complex Societies. *Ethnos*, 54(3-4): 121-142.
- Bayar, Murat. 2009. Reconsidering Primordialism: An Alternative Approach to the Study of Ethnicity. *Ethnic and Racial Study*, 32(9): 1639-1657.
- Burton, John. 2007. Book review, Mixed Relations: Asian-Aboriginal Contact in North Australia. *Pacific Affairs*, 80(2): 409.
- Eller, Jack David. 1999. *From Culture to Ethnicity to Conflict: An Anthropological Perspective on International Ethnic Conflict.* The United States of America: The University of Michigan Press,
- Eisen, Daniel. B. 2016. Book review on Multiple Identities: Migrant, Ethnicity, and Membership. *Contemporary Sociology*, 44(6): 855.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 1993. *Ethnicity & Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives.* London and Boulder, Colorado: Pluto Press
- Haba, John. 2005. Potensi Konflik Etnik di Daerah Perbatasan Nunukan. *Dari Entikong sampai Nunukan; Dinamika Perbatasan Kalimantan Malaysia Timur (Serawak-Sabah).* Riwanto Tirtosudarmo and John Haba, eds. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
- Hall, Stuart. 1992. The Question of Cultural Identity. *Modernity and its Future.* Stuart Hall, David Held, and Tony McGrew, eds. 274-316. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Open University.

- Hirschman, Charles. 1987. The Meaning and Measurement of Ethnicity in Malaysia: An Analysis of Census Classification. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 46(3): 555-582.
- Information Malaysia. 1998. *Year Book*. Malaysia: Berita Publishing Sdn.Bhd.
- Ito, Makoto. 2002. The Nature of Bugis Migration and Their Networks. *Making of Multicultural Sabah*. Koji Miyazaki, ed. 21-30. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Culture of Asia and Africa.
- Ju-Lan Thung and Yekti Maunati. 2004. Part A: The (Re) construction of the "Pan Dayak" identity in Kalimantan. *The (re) construction of the 'Pan Dayak' Identity in Kalimantan and Sarawak: A Study on Minority's Identity, Ethnicity and Nationality*. Jakarta: PMB-LIPI.
- Kahn, Joel S. 1995. *Culture, Multiculture, Postculture*. London, Thousand Oaks, and New Delhi: SAGE Publications
- King, Victor T. 1982. Ethnicity in Borneo: An Anthropological Problem. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, 10(1): 23-43.
- King, Victor T. and William D Wilder. 2003. *The Modern Anthropology of South-east Asia*. London and New York: Routledge Curzon.
- Kivisto, Peter. 2001. Theorizing transnational immigration: a critical review of current efforts. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(4): 549-577.
- _____. 2002. *Multiculturalism in a Global Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Kuncoro, Wahyu. 2016. Masjid Nurul Islam: Social Networking in a Religious Space. *Border Twists and Burma Trajectories: Perceptions, Reforms, and Adaptations*. Samak Kosem, ed. Chiang Mai: Center for Asian Studies, Chiang Mai University.
- Lineton, Jacqueline. 1975. Pesompe 'Ugi': Bugis Migrants and Wanderers. *Archipel*, 10: 173-201, http://www.persee.fr/doc/arch_0044-8613_1975_num_10_1_1248, (Accessed March 30, 2016).
- Maunati, Yekti. 2000. Contesting Dayak Identity: Commodification and the Cultural Politics of Identity in East Kalimantan. PhD Dissertation. La Trobe University.

- _____. 2007. Bab V: Dinamika Etnisitas dan Identitas: Kasus Masyarakat Perbatasan Kalimantan Timur, Sarawak, dan Sabah. *Dinamika Etnisitas dan Hubungan Ekonomi pada Wilayah Perbatasan di Kalimantan Timur: Studi Kasus di Wilayah Krayan dan Long Pasiah*. Jakarta: Proyek Kompetitif, LIPI.
- _____. 2008. Etnisitas di Nunukan (Ethnicity in Nunukan). *Etnisitas, Pengembangan Sumberdaya Lokal dan Potensi Perdagangan International dalam Rangka Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Nunukan Kalimantan Timur*. Jakarta: LIPI Press.
- _____. 2009. Etnisitas di Pulau Nunukan dan Sebatik. *Etnisitas, Pengembangan Sumber daya Lokal dan Potensi Perdagangan Internasional dalam Rangka Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Nunukan –Kalimantan Timur*. Jakarta: LIPI Press.
- _____. 2010. Etnisitas di Nunukan dan Sebatik. *Etnisitas, Pengembangan Sumber daya Lokal dan Potensi Perdagangan Internasional dalam Rangka Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Nunukan –Kalimantan Timur*. Jakarta: LIPI Press.
- _____ et al. 2010a. Kontestasi Identitas dan Diaspora Bugis: Sebuah Pengantar. *Kontestasi Identitas dan Diaspora Bugis di wilayah Perbatasan Kalimantan Timur-Sabah*. Jakarta: LIPI Press.
- _____. 2010a. Terbentuknya Identitas Diaspora Bugis: Tradisi dan Budaya Bugis. *Kontestasi Identitas dan Diaspora Bugis di Wilayah Perbatasan Kalimantan Timur-Sabah*. Jakarta: LIPI Press
- _____. Rethinking Cultural Identity and its Drivers in Present-Day Indonesia: A Case Study of the Dayak. *Suvannabhumi: Multi-disciplinary Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 3(2): 79-121.
- _____. 2012. Networking the Pan-Dayak. *Questioning Modernity in Indonesia and Malaysia*. Wendy Mee and Joel S. Kahn, eds. 91-111. Singapura and Jepang: NUS PRESS in association with Kyoto University Press. Kyoto CSEAS Series on Asian Studies 5, Center for Southeast Asian Studies,

Kyoto University.

- Maunati, Yekti and Betti Rosita Sari. 2014. Construction of Cham Identity in Cambodia. *Suvannabhumi: Multi-disciplinary Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 6(1): 107-135
- Musa, Ghazali. 2000. Tourism in Malaysia. *Tourism in South and Southeast Asia: Issues and Cases*. C. Michael Hall and Stephen Page, eds. 144-156. Oxford, Auckland, Boston, Johannesburg, Melbourne, and New Delhi: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Nurhan, Kenedi. 2009. Fokus Diaspora Bugis-Makassar dari Somba Opu. *Kompas*, January 19: 1&15.
- Noorduyn, J. 1988. The Bugis Genealogy of the Raja Muda Family of Riau – Johor. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 61(2): 63-92.
- Pelras, Christian. 1996. *The Bugis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher.
- Tirtosudarmo, Riwanto. 2005. Wilayah Perbatasan dan Tantangan Indonesia Abad 21: Sebuah Pengantar. *Dari Entikong sampai Nunukan: Dinamika Daerah Perbatasan Kalimantan, Malaysia Timur (Sarawak-Sabah)*. Jakarta: Sinar Harapan.
- Said, Nurman. 2004. Religion and Cultural Identity Among the Bugis (A Preliminary Remark). *Inter-Religio*, 45:12-20.
- Siburian, Robert and Yekti Maunati. 2013. Eksploitasi Sumberdaya Alam (SDA): Menunai Bencana dan Derita Masyarakat Lokal di Kalimantan Timur. *Roots of Conflict and its Resolution: The Exploitation of Natural Resources and the Making of a Megacity*. Yogyakarta: Pital.
- Stokhof, Malte and Oscar Salemink. 2009. State Classification and Its Discontents: The Struggle Over Bawean Ethnic Identity in Vietnam. *Journal of Vietnamese Studies*, 4(2): 154-195.
- Vertovec, Steven. 2001. Transnationalism and Identity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4): 573-582.
- Yu, Zheng and Zen Jing. 2015. Transnational Ethnic Flows and National Identity Construction: The Case of a Miao/Hmong Village. *Uncertain Lives: Changing Borders and Mobility in the Borderlands of the Upper Mekong*. Wasan Panyagaew and Bai Zhihong, eds. Chiang Mai, Thailand: The Regional Center for Social Science and Sustainable Development (RCSD), Faculty of Social Sciences, Chiang Mai University.

Wang, Lijung. 2007. Diaspora, Identity and Cultural Citizenship: The Hakkas in "Multicultural Taiwan." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(5): 875-895.

Internet

Majid, Abd. 2013. Falsafah Tellu Cappa.

<http://abdmajid.staf.upi.edu/2013/08/27/falsafah-tellu-cappa-2/>. 27 August 2013 (Accessed April 5, 2016).

<http://www.churchbenefits.org/Global%20Missions/UPG/Malay%20of%20Malaysia.icm>.

Received: Apr. 14, 2016; Reviewed: Oct. 16, 2016; Accepted: Dec. 1, 2016

