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ABSTRACT

The resurgence of nationalism in the shape of neo-nationalism and right-wing political parties in Europe and the United States at the end of the twentieth century, followed by similar tendencies in other parts of the world, raises the question of why nationalism is regaining favor again. According to classical nationalism viewpoint, the nationalism term is used to conceptualize the nation-state as the modern state formation that emerged since the 18th century. Though it retains the same ambiguity as classical nationalism, the rise of neo-nationalism in contemporary politics is intriguing and increases interest in studying nationalism, which fails to distinguish between state-nationalism (statist nationalism) and cultural-nationalism (cultural nationalism), each with its own vision and ideals. It is also necessary to define the differences between the two types of nationalism, including the debates over Geerzt and Sidel about the future of nationalism in post-colonial countries.
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INTRODUCTION

The rise of neo-nationalism and right-wing parties in Western Europe towards the end of the twentieth century rekindled interest in nationalism that had been fading for some time. In the last decade, there has been a surge in interest in studying nationalism, due to mainly the new political leaders who have used nationalism as a campaign theme. However, despite proliferation of interpretations of what nationalism is, the study of nationalism has yet to produce a comprehensive and thorough assessment or analysis.

The study of nationalism is sometimes regarded as scientifically underdeveloped (Jaffrelot: 2003) because its epistemological foundation is not yet firm. There is no single coherent and unified theory of nationalism consistently capable of explaining the various empirical manifestations of nationalism. Craig Calhoun (1997) and John Hall (1999) (in Jaffrelot: 2003), claims that existing theories of nationalism have remained stuck in the pre-analytic stage, namely social science based solely on typologies.

According to Llobera (1999), nationalism studies are frequently locked in normative or moralistic assessments that only provide analysis in the form of superficial historical or ethnographic accounts based on two or three isolated situations. The theory of nationalism is methodologically inadequate because it has not been able to comprehensively answer these principal questions: (1) what is the origin (genesis) and evolution of the idea of "nation" in Western Europe and its diffusion throughout the world; (2) how is the spatial-temporal
explanation of various structures, ideologies, and movements of nationalism in modern times; and (3) how to elucidate the origins (genesis) and evolution of the idea of "nation" in Western Europe and its diffusion throughout the world; (Llobera, 1999: 21).

Gans (2003) proposes a solution, dividing two different nationalist factions must be the first step in resolving nationalism. There are two types of nationalism: culture-based nationalism (cultural nationalism) and state-based nationalism (state-based nationalism) (statist nationalism). On the one hand, cultural-nationalism believes that nationalism's aim is to defend, protect, maintain, and pass on a group's cultural and historical heritage so that it can be passed down to future generations. In this instance, the state is only an instrument or a venue for achieving the vision and goals.

State-nationalism, on the other hand, maintains that the state's goal is to fulfill political principles for its citizens, such as democracy, economic success, and distributive justice. In order to assist the fulfillment of these ideas and goals, cultural homogeneity is favored and thought desirable. However, state-nationalism is primarily concerned with how culture is used to support the existence and achievement of state aims, rather than the preservation or sustainability of culture. Contrasting viewpoints like these are frequently confusing in the study of nationalism, making it impossible to distinguish between the two varieties of nationalism methodologically.

How successful is this separation between cultural-nationalism and state-nationalism, and how may it help explain nationalism research? This article aims to describe and apply Gans's (2003) viewpoint, with a particular emphasis on explaining the current challenge of nationalism in Indonesia, the complexity and fragility in Indonesian nationalism methodically, as there is in the discourse of nationalism itself?

**Classical Nationalism Debate**

According to Gans (2003:28), culture does not have to be synonymous with ethnicity. Language, tradition, and history are examples of common cultural heritage. Ethnicity, on the other hand, refer to social relation that connected by kinship within the same family tree. Cultures and ethnicities frequently overlapping or are identical, but this is not always the case. Germany's naturalization policy as an example. Turkish immigrants were denied naturalization as German citizens for a long time due to their ethnicity, despite the fact that the next generation was born and raised in Germany and was socialized with German culture.

The German government, on the other hand, permitted ethnic Germans living in other areas of the world to become citizens, even if they no longer adhered to German culture. For example, descendants of Germans who traveled to Romania, Russia, the Baltic region, Central Asia, and the Caucasus in the past. They are accepted as German citizens based on their ethnicity rather than their culture. Only recently has the ethno-nationalism-based policy been loosened. Gans favors the term cultural-nationalism to ethnic nationalism or ethno-nationalism, which are currently more widely used in the study of nationalism, because culture is not always associated with ethnicity.

Nationalism arose in Europe around the 18th century, coinciding with the emergence of the modern nation-state concept. In the current sense, the term "nation" (nation) is still
relatively new. The term "nation" was first used in Germany in the 15th century to refer to students who come from the same location or speak the same language, and who continue to exhibit their passion for their local nation/ethnicity when they move to a new campus (Ritter 1986: 295). The three primary themes of nationalism are sovereignty (sovereignty), unity (unity), and autonomy (autonomy), as well as the relationship between them, which refers to the people who live in a territory. Alberto Martinelli (2018: 14) defines the following:

“Nationalism can be defined as the ideology, or discourse, of the nation. It fosters specific collective movements and policies promoting the sovereignty, unity and autonomy of the people gathered in a single territory, united by a distinctive political culture and sharing a set of collective goals”

Nation is derived from the Latin term natio, which was derived from the word nascor (I was born). As Ritter (1986: 286) explains, a nation is defined as “a group of people born in the same place” (group of people born in the same place). Blood equality (descendants), ethnicity, place of residence, religious views, language, and culture were initially used to identify the essential aspects of nationalism. Nationalism arose and evolved into a concept (ism) that is utilized as the foundation for living in a state, society, and culture shaped by historical circumstances and socio-cultural dynamics in each country.

Academic nationalism began as a study (mostly outside the sphere of political science) aimed at explaining the emergence of the country, particularly as the notion of "nation-state" became the dominant state format in the modern age. The study of classical nationalism is primarily ontological in character, attempting to place logically "what" is nationalism, particularly by referring to its fundamental notion, the nation.

Similar issues can still be found today (Jaffrelot, 2003). Various academic studies on nationalism frequently begin with a theoretical debate about what a "nation" is, and how to define an entity in such a way that it merits the title of "nation." Is there a natural connection between "nation" and "territory"? There are also debates over whether nationalism should be classified as a distinct ideology (Freeden, 1998). Nationalism is frequently confused with a complex philosophy such as liberalism, socialism, conservatism, or fascism. Nationalism is often referred to as a "thin ideology" because it lacks typical political characteristics and programs.

Joseph Ernest Renan (1823-1892) work, “What is a Nation?” in 1882 (in French: Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?) is one of his most well-known works, and it contains a compilation of texts that investigate nationalism and national identity. Renan claims in his book that the nation is a "daily referendum," in the sense that people vote on shared concerns on a daily basis, and that the nation depends on what people remember and forget together. In other words, the nation and nationalism are social construct. Renan claims that “nationhood” already existed at the time he wrote, citing France, Germany, England, and Russia as examples.

Max Weber (1864-1920), a German historian, sociologist, lawyer, and political economist, had similar ideas, and his theories have affected social theory and research to this day. Along with Karl Marx, Auguste Comte, and Emile Durkheim, he is known as the Father of Sociology, yet he considers himself more of a historian. Weber's sociological perspective on
the country (nation) is non-empirical, emotive solidarity, and the domain of values. Weber used to believe that nation and ethnicity were synonymous, but he eventually changed his mind (Fabrykant, 2019). According to Weber, ethnicity's parameters are too broad to be utilized as an analytical category, hence the term "ethnic group" gets biased when used in conjunction with the term "nation," and is thus incorrectly applied to sociology. Then Weber attempted to define "nation" by excluding religion, language, and tradition (custom) as foundations for nation creation. Finally, Weber came to the conclusion that "nation" is linked to political power. Nation refers to a feeling (phantos) of a powerful political community, which may be founded on a common language, religion, culture, or historical memory; and that the nation might be regarded as an entity that already exists or as something that is still a wish.

Hans Kohn (1891-1971), an American philosopher and historian of Czech-Jewish ancestry, was another figure in classical nationalism philosophy. He wrote extensively on nationalism (1965, revised and reprinted 1982) from A History of Nationalism in the East (1929) to Nationalism: Its Meaning and History (1950). The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origins and Background (1944), which dealt with the dichotomy of Western and Eastern nationalism and was later reissued in 2005, is his most well-known major work. Kohn draws a notable distinction in that book, claiming that Western nationalism is civic nationalism and Eastern nationalism is ethnic nationalism. The Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, the United States, and France were among the countries analyzed by Kohn. According to Kohn, "nationalism" has existed since the beginning of time, and he explains its evolution from the time of the Jews and Ancient Greece, through the Roman Empire, the Middle Ages, the Age of Enlightenment, and the Reformation era in Europe, to the contemporary "era of nationalism."

The development of the nation-state concept as the most dominant modern state format to date is intertwined from classical era nationalism. The nationalism discourse serves at least two significant functions in relation to the nation-state. First, nationalism was formed as an uniting narration, in the sense of organizing and coordinating collective actions aimed at strengthening relationships between various groups in society. In this scenario, nationalism's narrative aims to elicit an individual's devotion to his homeland as a core identity. These types of narratives comprise a distinct discourse in classical nationalism, such as love for the homeland, patriotism, national interest, and so on. Second, nationalism emerged as a discourse on national sovereignty that calls for centralization through geographical unification and language, culture, and tradition uniformity. In the sense of overcoming or shifting the culture and regional/local identity that previously colored pre-modern society, nationalism discourse assumes a hegemonic position.

Following Gans (2003)'s categories, it is obvious that the classical nationalism debate has failed to distinct a clear line between state-nationalism and cultural-nationalism. The aspirations of nationalism, which are founded on the primacy of the state as the embodiment of the highest collectivity in a society, have not been clearly distinguished from cultural aspirations, which regard the state as a place to conserve and pass on specific cultural values. The essential question here is whether ethnicity and nation are one and the same thing or whether they should be distinguished. Remnants of this discussion can still be seen in contemporary nationalism studies, particularly when considering ethno-nationalism.
The Problem of Contemporary Nationalism

The rise of the nation-state as a modern state idea goes hand in hand with nationalism. The Puritan Revolution, or the English civil war of 1642-1651, between supporters of parliament and supporters of the monarchy, gave birth to a constitutional monarchy system that covers the Commonwealth of England, Ireland, and Scotland. Another view is that the Dutch Republic, also known as the United Provinces of the Netherlands, was the first "country" in the modern sense. It was a federation of seven provinces that existed from 1588 to 1795, before eventually becoming the Kingdom of the Netherlands (Netherlands) as we know it today (Israel, 1995). In 1581, the seven provinces revolted against Spain and declared their independence. The commercial lines of the Dutch West India Company (GWC) and the Dutch East India Company (VOC), the latter of which colonized Indonesia, were controlled by the federation of these republics (or at that time it was called Dutch East Indies).

However, the true nationalist movement did not emerge until the end of the 18th century, with the American Revolution (1775-83) leading to the establishment of the United States of America and the French Revolution (1787-1799) resulting in a modern France that was no longer an empire. After World War I, the nationalist movement sparked the Spring of Nations Revolution in continental Europe, which gave rise to a number of nation-states, the unification of Italy as a nation-state in 1861, and the foundation of a number of new nation-states in Central and Eastern Europe. The nation-state became the model of the contemporary state as a result of these nationalist movements, displacing the monarchical system in popularity. Of course, the nationalist movement blossomed and inspired various resistance movements in colonial territories throughout Asia, the Middle East, and Africa in the early twentieth century, as well as producing a number of nation-states, the most of which still exist today.

Many academics utilize the same framework to examine the history of nationalism's evolution, which may be divided into roughly two waves. First, the power of an absolute monarchy or monarchy was supplanted by European nationalism, which emerged in the 17th century with the formation of modern countries that promoted equality and democracy. This sort of nationalism is a historical product of sociopolitical changes in mainland Europe (and America), giving rise to the concept of nationality based on citizen equality (civic nationalism). Second, the ex-colonial countries' nationalism. Initially, this sort of nationalism arose as a reaction to European colonialism and imperialism in these areas. New States, as defined by Clifford Geerzt, are countries that emerged from the breakdown of colonialism in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East during the middle of the twentieth century.

In practice, during the classical era, the language of nationalism was successfully deployed as a method of organizing the people, for example, when an invasion from abroad occurred. As seen in the battles between European countries throughout the nineteenth century, as well as the two world wars involving countries outside Europe in the first part of the twentieth century, or vice versa, provides as justification for aggressive expansion. In this "classic" period, nationalism appears to be a new language that unites society's diversity, and it appears to culturally replace the noble elite (aristocratic) culture's exclusive values as well as parochial local cultural values. The practices of nationalism try to create a new symbol that
gives a unified identity to varied groups in society using numerous strategies and means, such as basic education, ceremonial activities, and the construction of major monuments (Martinelli, 2018).

However, following World War II, the nationalist discourse appeared to be fading. Nationalism barely resurfaced near the end of the twentieth century, particularly in the aftermath of the Soviet Union's collapse (1922-1991) and huge political changes in Eastern European countries. Through the memory of previous limits and common identities, cultures, and ideologies, Russia and the new states of the former Soviet Union are attempting to reorganize and seek uniting linkages. Because of the same ideological canopy under communism, extreme nationalism has spread worldwide and has been driven by latent conflicts that have not come to the surface. Small-scale battles erupted between groups vying for their own brand of "nationalism."

Anti-immigrant sentiment swept Europe at the close of the twentieth century, with nationalist parties in Germany, France, and England gaining favor in their individual countries by pushing anti-immigrant themes. Vladimir Putin was able to solidify power in Russia thanks to nationalist sentiments. In Central Europe, particularly Poland and Hungary, nationalist movements arose. The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh and a related women's group called Sangh Parivar, as well as the leadership of Prime Minister Narendra Modi, who is linked with the Bharatiya Janata Party, whose membership is based on ethnicity, have helped to strengthen Indian nationalism. In Myanmar, Thailand, and Sri Lanka, Buddhist nationalism blossomed.

The rapid resurrection of nationalism as an idea, movement, or party ideology from the end of the twentieth century to the present raises many problems. Why is it happening now, what are the causes that are driving it, and what are the ramifications for societal change? To separate it from traditional nationalism, the term "neo-nationalism" was coined afterwards. It shares many of the same traits as traditional nationalism, but it differs from it in terms of its "reactionary" nature. Neo-nationalism is referred to as reactionary since it arose in response to the vast process of globalization's political, economic, and socio-cultural developments (Eger and Valdez, 2015). Right-wing populism, anti-globalization movements, nativism (indigenous politics), protectionism policies, anti-immigrant policies, dislike of outsiders (xenophobia), and so on are all examples of neo-nationalism as a political movement.

The rebirth of nationalism in European countries (and later the United States) around the close of the twentieth century can probably be traced back to one factor: immigrants. As a result of globalization and improved transportation and communication, an increasing number of people from developing countries are migrating to industrialized countries and settling down as residents, eventually becoming citizens. Armed conflicts that cause civilians to flee their nations and seek asylum in other countries that are prepared to welcome them may potentially be driving this flood of immigrants. One of the most popular locations for immigrants is Europe (besides perhaps Australia, Canada, the United States, and Latin American countries). On the one hand, the presence of immigrants is a humanitarian issue that developed countries, which are thought to embody high civilization and human rights, must address. However, from a sociological standpoint, the presence of immigrants becomes an issue for the local community, particularly when the number is big enough to disrupt the population composition of a place.

When there is a significant "cultural divide" between natives and immigrants, the
integration process and the integrity of social values within the same community become more challenging.

In this atmosphere, as natives’ worry about the presence of immigrants grows, politicians begin to seize the chance. The issue of immigrants was therefore utilized as an electoral commodity to obtain votes, and it was further sharpened by inserting the element of "nationalism" as the entrance point, sometimes known as right-wing nationalism.

Neo-rhetoric nationalism's can be described as a political response to numerous developments, shocks, and difficulties that occur on a global scale (changes in international political and economic institutions), as well as their local consequences. Worries, anxiety, disappointment, and even frustration over the various uncertainties and risks that arise as a result of globalization - both real and only perceptual or opinion uncertainties and risks - elicit a response and coalesce into motivated collective movements such as political, cultural, or economic movements, using "nationalism" as a point of reference.

On the one hand, neo-discourse nationalism's can be described as conservative because it aims to restore or at least maintain the status quo as it existed prior to the rise of globalization. Neo-rhetoric nationalism's can also be described as defensive, as it attempts to defend itself against perceived "attacks" that threaten the status quo and establishment. Finally, neo-rhetoric nationalism's can be described as aggressive because it aims to identify "enemies" and launch counter-attacks, which are typically directed against minority groups and/or "foreign parties" deemed to be interfering in a country's internal affairs. The strongest bulwark is nationalism, which serves as a language to legitimate the status of "original citizens" or "majority groups," which are distinct and distinct from parties considered adversaries or rivals.

Whether you like it or not, the growth of neo-nationalism has forced the study of nationalism to advance. Among others, Etherington (2003) proposes a reexamination of nationalism in connection to national and territorial identities. Globalization, which has been often regarded as a catalyst for the growth of neo-nationalism, is a worldwide phenomenon, according to Etherington, that is directly tied to geography and territory. Globalization penetrates national borders, calling into question the nation-relevance, state's and raising de-territorialization and re-territorialization as a dualistic process that relativizes territorial limits that are deemed fixed and defined in the nation-state idea. Similarly, "national identity" is linked to how nationalism responds to globalization, as well as postmodern reactions that follow the flow of post-nationalism concepts. Globalization poses basic problems regarding "national identity," with a wide range of positive and bad outcomes. As a result, it's critical to understand the fundamental relationship between nationalism, national identity, and land (Etherington, 2003).

It is impossible to comprehend contemporary nationalism without taking into account its spatial dimension. All nationalist programs revolve around territories, hence maps and mapping are critical components of nationalist strategy. That is, in a society built on nation-states, an ethnicity can only feel entirely protected if it is successful in forming its own nation-state. However, according to another interpretation, nationalism has nothing to do with location (territories), but rather with time, which is an ideology that connects the past, present, and future. The presence of the "state" has an effect on its relationship to space. Meanwhile, the concept of the state is linked to space, specifically the certainty of the limits within which its
authority is exercised. However, because the modern state is almost always a nation-state, spatial connections are just as significant as temporal connections. Globalization has shattered this confidence, prompting a variety of responses, including a resurgence of nationalism (Etherington, 2003: 31).

The positioning of space for nationalism changes on a spatial-level level as a result of globalization, particularly local-regional-national dealings with the global globe. This, among other things, leads to the emergence of a new school known as post-nationalism. Individual identities are produced and reproduced through social relations in a hierarchical-spacial realm, according to post-nationalist rhetoric. In addition to the cultural features that link it to the consciousness of time, national identity gives a sense of belonging and awareness of individual space in order to obtain a tangible place. However, because territoriality is neither eternal or certain, it must be continuously maintained, and it must always be produced and reproduced, this consciousness of nationality necessitates an active attitude. The importance of the notion of "national homeland" and the different new interpretations given to it in the context of globalization must be revisited in the study of nationalism. In addition to other factors such as language, culture, myth, and history, territoriality is the most important factor in determining national identity (Etherington, 2003: 34).

The debate above shows that the discourse of contemporary nationalism is currently moving in two different directions. The first is neo-discourse, nationalism's which transfers civic nationalism to ethno-nationalism, deviating from (classical) nationalism. Neo-vocabulary nationalism's often conjures up ethno-nationalism, with its many implications on dominance and violence towards perceived outsiders. Second, there's the post-nationalism debate, which focuses on fundamental questions about how nations, identities, and territories interact. Post-nationalism does not dismiss the value of nationalism (in the traditional sense), but instead attempts to provide a language of new interpretations more suited to the conditions of globalization as a feature of today's world.

Nationalism in Indonesia

Jaffrelot (2003) has underlined the centrality of the notion of identification and differentiation from The Other in the ideology of nationalism, among other things. Fundamentally, "nationalism," according to Jaffrelot, must be understood as an ideology that emphasizes one's identity over the Other (Others). Neo-emergence nationalism's in Europe and abroad in the modern era can be considered as a confirmation of this fundamental premise.

The history of nationalism in colonial countries, including Indonesia, demonstrates the same concept. This principle of distinction and identity development is notably visible in the "intelligences," or indigenous people who have received Western education, in the setting of colonized nationalism. These early nationalist individuals saw nationalism as a sort of resistance against the invaders as The Other, which was frightening because it ruled and oppressed me on the one hand, but also impressed me because of its progress and high civilization on the other. As a result, it's understandable that educated people are hesitant to just emulate the West. They aim to generate an image of their own culture while taking the greatest features of Western civilization, for example, by picturing a Golden Age in the past as
a pillar of pride that fosters self-esteem and nationalism, using a romantic-idealist approach. The efforts of Soekarno and M. Yamin to make the eras of Sriwijaya and Majapahit a reference for Indonesian nationalism can be exemplified by the efforts of Soekarno and Moh. Yamin to make the eras of Sriwijaya and Majapahit a reference for Indonesian nationalism can be exemplified by the efforts of Soekarno and Moh. Yamin to make the era.

Nationalism created the path for the colonized nation to battle to escape colonialism by establishing a "us versus them" perspective, namely between us—the colonized—and those—the colonizers. It is unavoidable that the emergence of nationalism as a "ideology" among colonial nations stimulates the nation-building process (the development of a sense of national identity), which in turn becomes a political movement. Nationalism is represented in the establishment of nationalist groups or movements, which entails public mobilization and open and covert socioeconomic battles with colonialists as the Other. Cooperative and non-cooperative ways have been known throughout the history of the Indonesian nation as a reflection of the conflict with the Other, specifically the dispute over whether the colonized party should or should not work with the colonizer in obtaining the objective of liberation or independence. When violence erupted in the form of an independence war, the process of increasing nationalism and strengthening the concept of nationhood (nation-building) achieved its pinnacle. When the Dutch dispatched troops to retake their colonies that had been lost during the Japanese occupation, for example, nationalism played a significant role.

Clifford Geerzt's ideas on the future of nationalism in ex-colonial countries have a lot of sway. The diversity perspective, in his opinion, is the fundamental assumption in dissecting the rise of nationalism in developing countries (Geertzel, 1973). Geerzt's thesis might be described as a "diversity thesis," implying that in these new countries, the problem of variety is seen as important to nationalism. According to Geerzt, the nature and extent of social diversity in their cultures, as well as how leaders handle that diversity, influence the destiny and future of nationalism in the New Countries. Geerzt's perspective on the "New Countries" was important and widely accepted in history, anthropology, and political science research. Nationalism is viewed as more of an internal problem in this country, with little to do with foreign connections. In the case of Indonesia, the sort of civic nationalism that emerged during the independence movement and ensuing period was one that accepted variety and equal rights for everyone, without denying the disparities between the majority and the minority.

John T. Sidel, who wrote more than forty years after Geerzt, contested this notion. Several conclusions can be taken from a comparative historical study of nine (nine) Southeast Asian countries (Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Vietnam, and Thailand) (Sidel, 2012). First, the issue of diversity, with its attraction to "essentialism" and "epochalism," as well as the struggle between "primordialist sentiments" and "national politics," has little impact on Southeast Asia's development of nationalism. Even the three countries with the most diverse and "fragile" foundations of nationalism (specifically, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Laos), according to Sidel, have had a lengthy history of experience in strengthening national relationships (nationhood). According to Sidel, these countries are unlikely to be divided or disintegrated in the same way that Yugoslavia was. It was concluded that nationalism's future in Southeast Asia was secure and well-established, with only small disruptions from separatist movements that could be easily suppressed. The sole difference is
East Timor's separation from Indonesia, which is an exception that must be examined independently.

Second, according to Sidel, the external factor that determines the development of nationalism in Southeast Asian countries from independence to the end of the 1980s is not a problem of "national integration" dealing with "internal" tensions in the form of ethnic diversity, but rather a problem of "national integration" dealing with "internal" tensions in the form of ethnic diversity. The key, according to Sidel's theory, is how the new countries (re)integrated into the global capitalist economic system and responded to the political order that split the Western and Eastern blocs during the Cold War. Thailand and the Philippines followed a similar path to full integration with the Western bloc, relying on historical ties to their former occupiers. Burma and Indonesia, at various times, had a similar stance, namely, attempting independence while refusing to join the global capitalist economic system. However, Burma maintained its "isolationist" stance, whereas Indonesia chose to integrate into the West in the post-Soekarno era (the New Order era). According to Sidel, a similar theory can explain the success of Malaysia's federation on the one hand, and the failure of Indochina's federation on the other. The difficulty of managing "internal variety," as Geerzt's thesis suggests, is less essential than reintegration into the world capitalist economic system and political split during the Cold War era in determining the fate of nationalism in these countries.

Third, the post-colonial countries of Southeast Asia's formation of nationalism is also influenced by the colonialists' historical heritage, which influences how state building is carried out. Various colonial historical experiences, according to Sidel, have resulted in different issues between mainland Southeast Asia (Mainland) and the islands (Island). Exclusive and essentialist types of nationalism arose in mainland countries such as Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. On the other hand, a more inclusive and open nationalism has emerged in the archipelagic countries of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Singapore.

It was also explained that varied experiences during the colonial period shaped geographical boundaries, identities, and institutions in countries. Thailand inherited absolute centralization from the Chakkri dynasty, the Philippines inherited a decentralized democratic system during the American colonial period, Indonesia inherited the incorporation and bureaucratization of local aristocracy during the VOC or Netherlands East Indies period, and Burma and Malaya were built using a mix of direct and indirect government models. Similar to Indochina, which was occupied by the French during the British occupation. The legacy of colonial history, according to Sidel, determines how new states respond to issues such as the presence of immigrant minorities and their descendants (Chinese, Indian, and Arab), the categorization and reconfiguration of ethnic and religious differences, the choice of national languages, and nomenclature and boundaries that separate groups. Nationalists in these countries attempted to form their own nation states after independence, although most of the conditions and materials that underpin nation-state creation were not produced by them, but were inherited from the colonial past.

As a result, according to Sidel's argument, nationalism (in the Southeast Asian countries he researched) is mostly determined by the process of state-building, economic power accumulation, and international relations. In contrast to Geerzt's thesis, which emphasizes internal factors such as "ethnic diversity" and the development of "national character" as
determinants of nationalism development in the New Countries, the scope of this study is broader and includes post-colonial countries in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East.

As we enter the twenty-first century, it is obvious that nationalism faces fresh problems (particularly in “New Countries”), as indicated by the emergence of numerous socio-political turmoils and dynamics that appear to resuscitate Geerzt's thesis. One clue is the reemergence of the "diversity" problem as a critical issue in many developing countries that were previously thought to have achieved nationalism. The disintegration of Yugoslavia is the greatest evidence of nationalism's vulnerability in a number of emerging countries.

Sidel disagreed, believing that nationalism in ex-colonial countries had already reached the stage of establishment by the end of the twentieth century. In other words, nationalism in these countries has a bright future. Only two criteria, democracy and decentralization, are taken into account by Sidel in the case of Indonesia (Sidel 2012: 135). According to Sidel, Indonesia does not have any outstanding national integration issues as it enters the first decade of the twenty-first century (as experienced by the authoritarian regime of Burma). In reality, in current era, Indonesian nationalism is considered as resurgent in a more inclusive and elastic form, notably in the context of democratization and decentralization, which addresses the concerns of state oritarianism and centralization, which were formerly quite restricting during the Suharto era.

It is clear from this that the study of nationalism and its evolution outside of Europe is still a contentious topic. In general, the investigation must be placed in two historical contexts: (1) When striving for independence, nationalism refers to efforts to break free from colonialism and stand as a sovereign country; and (2) Following independence, nationalism became more preoccupied with how to build or maintain the newly formed state's integrity. The dispute between Geerzt's and Sidel's theses focuses on the second phase, which concerns the future or integrity of nationalism in former colonial countries in the modern era, particularly the case for nationalism in Indonesia.

In terms of current Indonesian politics, Aspinal claims that all mainstream politicians in Indonesia, as well as in other nations, are nationalists, differing only in degree. He cited Prabowo Subianto and Joko Widodo as presidential candidates in 2014 and 2019, respectively, who both support nationalism and have populist political styles. Because his nationalist messages were delivered with rage and emotion, Prabowo was seen as unique. Blaming foreign entities for planning to exploit Indonesia's natural resources, and making Indonesia a pawn nation, among other things (Aspinal, 2015: 73). It can be seen that there is still uncertainty or confusion because state-nationalism and cultural-nationalism are indistinguishable. In other words, the contemporary study of nationalism faces a difficulty in being able to resolve such uncertainties in order to elevate its position as a really rigorous academic research.

CONCLUSION

Because each has different objectives and values, the explanation of this paper demonstrates that nationalism must be divided between cultural-nationalism and state-nationalism. It can be seen that the discourse of nationalism is still often confused between the two versions in the debate between classical nationalism (represented by civic-nationalism)
and contemporary nationalism (represented by the rise of neo-nationalism with reactionary, anti-immigrant, and xenophobic nuances). Why is nationalism promoted, in the first place? Is it for the country's integrity, such as homogenization and the establishment of a national culture, particularly through nation-building? Alternatively, by viewing the state as merely a vessel, nationalism is utilized as an instrument to carry a certain cultural identity that is to be maintained and handed on to the next generation.

By clarifying this distinction, it becomes clear that the dispute over the future of nationalism in ex-colonial countries between Geerzt's thesis and Sidel's thesis is largely decided by the perspective utilized, especially whether to adopt the perspective of state-nationalism or cultural nationalism. The post-Reformation problem of Indonesian nationalism may thus be traced back to differences in thinking between those who support state-nationalism and those who highlight cultural-nationalism.
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