The Impact of Audit Reports on Auditor Change – Verification of the Determining Factors for Auditor Change in the Portuguese Context

Paula Heliodoro, PhD
Instituto Politécnico de Setúbal
Campus do IPS, Estefanilha
2914 - 503 Setúbal | Portugal

Abstract

This study discusses the dynamics of the interaction between state and society in the reconstruction of national identity on the community of Indonesia-Malaysia border in Sambas District, West Kalimantan, since Independence until the Reform Era. The research approach is qualitative with the ethnographic methods. The results of the study explained that the idea of nationalism and national identities are not fixed and final. Dynamically, interpreted and constructed through negotiation, contestation, domination, and a compromise between the state and local communities, in a long period of time, and within the framework of political, economic, and socio-cultural.

Keywords: nationalism, political identity, cultural identity, border community.

1. Introduction

The process of formation of the nation-state in Southeast Asia is a consequence of the division of territory in the colonial territories in the 19-20 century, when colonial rulers divided the territory of Southeast Asia based their political and economic interests, without the involvement of their colonial subjects. Factors cultural, religious, linguistic, mobility patterns, formations of social relations and traditional trade networks do not become the principal basis for the determination of the state border. As a result, the boundaries of countries in Southeast Asia do not intersect with cultural boundaries exactly. This also applies to the Indonesia-Malaysia border in Kalimantan. Territorial boundaries separating Indonesia and Malaysia on Borneo Island is the colonial legacy, as a result of an agreement between the British and the Dutch ruling in Borneo at the time to share a territory between them.

The emergence of the nation-state as a political reality, causing communities on both sides of the state border 'forced' to affiliate and identify themselves on national identity (politics) are different. Seen from the point of political interest, the border region is considered as a point of contact between national sovereignty and the interests of neighboring countries so placed as prone areas, a frontier that must be protected from external threats. As a result, cross-country mobility that often does members of the community at the border was interpreted as a symptom that is distorted and is regarded as an indication of the erosion of a sense of nationalism.

However, the presence of countries with territorial limits as a political reality, it seems not necessarily be a 'social fact' that can only replace or eliminate norms and cultural values as a pattern of behavior, which guide the residents of local communities in the border in behavior and social relationships between them. Country's physical borders cannot remove socio-cultural reality that already exists. Until the present time, the individual and social units located between the boundary line still continue sliced it, especially in terms of migration, trade, and kinship. The orientation of the public space outside the border into the Indonesia (Malaysia) is not due to the erosion of a sense of nationalism or the charm of the neighboring country, but formed due to natural formations that determine the survival of a community. Human mobility is often formed because the commodity chain is always looking for the shortest path from the supply to the market, regardless of whether these natural formations 'compliance' on territoriality state or not.

Search history of the process of creating a formal border between Indonesia and Malaysia brings us to the pragmatic logic behind the policy of the British colonial government and the Netherlands. When the boundary line defined by the London Convention, in June 1891, the negotiators is aware that the line they charge is still tentative.

Border community identity issues become a crucial issue in the study, particularly those related to ethnicity and nationality, which is politically and culturally involving two different countries - Indonesia and Malaysia. In the context of political (nation-state), a part of the border community of citizens with political identity or nationality were considered complete and fixed. The identity distinguishes and separates with other citizens. While culturally (ethnicity), the formation of the nation-state does not mean separating the cultural boundaries that historically have been present before the political boundary is formed. Consequently, the difference does not reflect perberdaan ethnic nationality; national identity is not congruent with cultural identity. This condition occurs because the ethnic communities as socio-cultural reality have been present long before the emergence of the nation-state. Implications Further, the presence of the state as a political reality does not necessarily restrict social relations, culture, and economy that have been built within the framework of ethnic relations in the community at the border. In addition to the historical and socio-cultural, economic and political dimensions, also influence the cultural identity and nationality. Undeniably, a sharp imbalance in the dynamics of development between Sarawak and West Kalimantan became the crucial factor that can contribute to changes in orientation and social identities of population at the border.

In connection with that, this study intends to understand and interpret the national identity of local border communities in Sambas District, West Kalimantan, since Independence until the Reform Era, within the framework of the relations between the cultural interests and political interests. How the idea of nationalism and national identities did are constructed and reconstructed at the border? How is the interaction of the state and society in the reconstruction process in the border nationalism since independence until the reform era?

2. Research Method

The focus of research is more emphasis on the process so that the research approach used is qualitative ethnographic methods. Researchers trying to understand the process of reconstruction of identity in the border area, which focuses on the interactions between the state and local communities. How the existence of countries with different policies and programs present in the border, as well as interacting with local communities that are in it, thus enabling cooperation and negotiation, which in turn is able to deconstruct and reconstruct the social fabric together.

In addition, this study also explores and observes, economic relations and cultural cross-border inter-community that allows the formation of a common identity as unified ethnic communities, who grew up in the top two areas of different countries. Focus observations were made on the potential interaction space up the meaning of identity. This public space is represented in the market, schools, health institutions, and other public service institutions, policies and programs that represent the state and the internal dynamics of border communities.

In the process of this study, researchers position themselves as part of an active community life watching, listening, feeling, thinking, and discussions with a number of sources regarding the reality of life on the border. Then, respond to, record, recording, and photographing the events that took place in the field. In certain circumstances, researchers are also actively involved in community activities, as the media to be able to enter people's lives in more depth.

3. Reconstruction of National Identity in Theoretical Perspective

Giddens (2003) suggests that social identity is formed because of individual consciousness as a member of a social group, which include the values and emotions are important inherent in the individual members. Social identity associated with the basic rights, obligations, sanctions, which in a certain collectivity, shaping role. The use of standardized signs, particularly with regard to age and gender bodily attributes, is fundamental in all societies, even though there are so many cross-cultural variations can be noted. Thus, social identity is not biological inheritance but constructed and reconstructed through social interaction in the community.

According to Castells (2010), the construction of identities uses building material of history, geography, biology, production, and reproduction of institutions, collective memory and personal fantasies, the apparatus of power, and religious teachings.

In connection with it, there are three forms and origins of identity building: the identity of legitimacy (legitimizing identity); introduced by the dominant institutions of society to extend and rationalize their domination face social actors. Identity resistance (resistance identity); developed by the actors who are in a position stigmatized by the logic of domination, so the defense and survival they are based on different principles, or opposed to those who propagate public institutions. Identity project (project identity); the new identity is constructed by social actors on the basis of cultural material available on them to change their position in society and transform the social structure as a whole.

The explanation above shows that social identity is formed through a process of social dynamic and dialectical, involving negotiation and contestation among the actors with a variety of structures or social forces that arise in the community, or in other words, the construction of identity is a product of the negotiation process actors with social situation or external forces competing. As stated by Giddens (1990) that in modern society people must shape and reshape it to be able to cope with the changes that occur in the environment. Due to the new conditions constantly, arise around the individual who should be reasonable. Individuals must manage and attach meaning to the world which is inherently unstable.

In the context of a community at the border, an understanding of the identity of the interesting and significant, especially in relation to nationality as the embodiment of the sovereign nation-state. National identity into a political bond primary and fundamental loyalty of its members. Therefore, other identities such as ethnicity, religion, region, family, class and gender, should be subject to the primary loyalty of citizens towards the state-nation. The question is how far the nationalities into a collective identity that can give meaning to thoughts, feelings, and actions for the community at the border? In the midst of everyday reality they are faced with the practice of socio-cultural, economic, political and constructed by the force of local, national, and global. How contestation between these forces responded to and understood by the people, who then formed their national identity or nationalism?

Ernest Gellner (1983), one of the leaders of modern theories, see nationality as something fluid and constructed by economic and political interests. Industrialization and capitalism are behind the emergence of nationalism and the nation. Nation is a product and consequence of transition from agrarian to industrial society. Industrialization requires and brings with it new forms of organizing society that relied on uniformity of culture. Therefore, for Gellner, nation is a society with a high culture (high culture) were implanted in particular, standardized, based on education and cultural literacy. By means of a centralized education "low culture" is transformed into "high culture". The education system is removing regional cultural differences and scored resident in the same national community. Thus, the nation, nationalism and the state is merely a consequence of industrialization motion. Therefore, the idea of nation and nationalism save the instrumental-manipulative agenda. Meanwhile, the state is a buffer and guards the agenda instrumental-manipulative.

In contrast to Gellner, Anderson (2006) defines the nation as an imagined political community and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. Further, Anderson (2006) explained that the emergence of the nation and nationalism is an instrument of socio-cultural integration of new communities has been devastated by the rapid industrialization, modernization and advancements in technology. Transition from pre-modern to the modern society is characterized by a general secularization process; standardize the concept of time and the discovery of commercial print. The process of making nationalism becomes possible. The first process has transferred loyalty religious community destined to be a community that is the nation.

The second process has opened the scope of imagination in a relatively homogeneous, in which an individual can identify with an unknown mass of the same nation. The advent of print-capitalism, especially books and newspapers, has created a standardized language and offer a clear picture of the world is rooted in everyday life. Such processes have successfully created the nation, which is an imagined political community as something that is inherently limited and sovereign (Anderson, 2006).

Meanwhile, Smith (1991) defines the nation as naming human populations that share the region's history, myths and historical memories together, mass, public culture, a joint economic and legal rights in common, and tasks for all members. Therefore, the nation as a community that is formed on the basis of similarity of myth and memory, as well as ethnic is also a territorial community.

However, in the case of ethnic community relations with the region could be only a historical and symbolic. Whereas in the case of a nation, it is physical and real, the country has a territory. In other words, the nation always needs ethnic elements and the nation cannot be understood without the myths and shared memory of a territory. Furthermore, Smith defines nationalism as a doctrine of the nation, not the state. Although in practice, a free nation that often requires its own state to protect and preserve the culture, but it is not an absolute requirement (Smith, 1991).

Castells (2010) respond to critical theories of nationalism above, according to him does not fit with contemporary practice today. The growing nationalism in this millennium is precisely characterized by the weakening of the nation-states that exist, so that the social theory which assimilates the nation and nationalism in the construction of modern nation-state is irrelevant. Nationalism and nation has a life of its own, independent of the state, though embedded in the construction of cultural and political project.

In the context of border communities, Diener and Hagen (2010) Explains that the borders of a country cannot separate the process of modernization in a country with neighboring states without any real impact on the population that is in it. Border is an area of transition and meetings. State boundaries are seen as the dividing line between countries, sites of cultural interaction, exchange, and hybridism. Therefore, the border population is largely influenced by and participating in cross-border interactions in economic, social, or cultural interaction. Transnational interactions manifest in a variety of ways. For residents of the border, such as the interaction cross-border trade, smuggling, labor migration, socializing, and visiting friends and relatives on the opposite side is the main characteristic of the everyday life of their transnational. Furthermore, ethnicity or cultural level high among people in the adjacent border plays an important role to understand the strategy of the local border (Skeldon, 1999).

Thus, the border is not a site to divide people into a separate room, and the identity of the opposing group, but the site for interaction between individuals of various backgrounds, hybridization, creolization, and negotiation. Although it offers the opportunity for cultural exchange, the border region is also often a conflict of cultural sites (cultural animosity) and ultimately military conflict. Border control is always a contested domain in which groups of local, national, and international negotiating a relationship of subordination and control. Therefore, although the international border is a state structure, but does not mean that the state can guarantee the security of their borders from foreign influence. In many cases, the central government cannot control the border region so that the relationship between power and identity at the border as well as between the border and the respective countries is problematic (Hasting and Donand, 2010).

According to Ishikawa (2010), the political forces and the local culture is influenced by the strength of international borders of other countries so as to provide a particular political configuration limits that could make their relationship with the government is very problematic. This condition can occur, because the borders are imaginary lines (notional lines) on the map and in the field that provide a sharp demarcation between the two regions and two sovereignty. They are also located at the heart of what could be called the border zone, the area on both sides of the border where the proximity of different places in things such as currency, laws, citizenship, and commodity prices have a major influence.

Social reality on the border indicates there is a contestation of economic, political, socio-cultural, and inter-community, both nationally and internationally, in order to give space for local community members to negotiate and construct their social identity back in accordance with the situation at hand and the calculation of particular interest. Thus, the social identity of local communities at the border will be constructed continuously, and the dynamics of social situations that took place in the border area will serve as the basis of social identity reconstruction.

Related to the construction of nationality, Brown (2000) distinguishes three models of nationalism with the assumptions and a different vision: civic nationalism, nationalism ethno cultural and multicultural nationalism. Civic nationalism offers a vision of integration, namely the establishment of Community nationals alike; ethnocultural nationalism offers a vision of a community bound together by belief in ancestral and ethnic cultural similarities; and multicultural nationalism offers a vision of community that appreciates and supports cultural autonomy and equality of status of the component ethnic groups.

4. *The Reconstruction of Nationality Since independence until the Reform Era*

The reconstruction of nationalities in the border take place on an ongoing basis and through the process of social dynamic, where the presence of the state is represented by a set of institutions, apparatus, infrastructure and development programs, negotiated and contested in the daily practices of local communities so that the existence of nation-states become an integral part of our thoughts, feelings, and actions of people on the border. Thus, there are two interrelated aspects of the state, namely the state as contained in the local daily practice and the state as a source of power that is monolithic.

The analysis of the national reconstruction in this study was classified into three post-independence period Indonesia: Old Order, New Order, and the Reformation Era. This classification is very important to look at the chronology of the dynamics, and developments that take place in the process of nation-state formation on the border. How the state present at the border with a set of institutions, apparatus, infrastructure and programs, to negotiate and compromise its existence so that it blends and becomes part of the fabric of public awareness in it.

4.1. The National Reconstruction of the Old Order Period (1945 -1966).

Initial period of state formation and Indonesian nationalism, which was initiated by the state, takes place largely unnoticed in the remote border until the early 1960s, when the Federation of Malaysia was still protected by the former colonial masters, England (Jones, 2002; Subritzky, 2000). In the Old Order, the country is still in a transitional period of colonial rule. Therefore, the nation-building project greater priority on maintaining the territorial boundaries of geopolitical intervention of neighboring countries (the UK-Malaysia). Consequently, the formation of the nation-state was projected and constructed through a military approach that aims to anticipate and defend the territorial sovereignty of the state of the intervention. However, on the other hand, the emphasis on territorial defense had ignored the existence of the communities in the border, so that the negotiation process needed to build the idea of the nation-state from the bottom (state formation from below) does not work, because it let loose the presence of institutions and the state apparatus as a mediator dissemination of national values. The formation of the nation-state and nationalism is a political project constructed by national elites without involving local people in the border.

The reconstruction of the nation-state in the border district of Sambas, starting from the events of the Indonesia-Malaysia confrontation in the 1960s. Although the area is not the center of the conflict and the citizens in it are not involved in the incident, but they are in the territory of geopolitical Indonesia where the ongoing process of state formation. However, the presence of military forces as the state apparatus is not a part of the interests of local communities, so that they do not want to get involved in the conflict between the countries. This happens because of the existence of nation-states have not been constructed in the forum of public awareness on the border, which has historically and genealogically have been in the area before the presence of the state. They live as a community-based cultural and ethnic Dayak occupy territory beyond the geopolitical boundaries of the state, so the idea is something foreign country and not being part of the collective interests that must be fought by them. The presence of the state does not create any significance for the local community, so that a sense of belonging (sense of belonging) to the nation-state is not constructed in the imagination of the public, which has implications for the gap between the political identity as an Indonesian citizen with a collective identity as a community of the border (Dayak).citizen with a collective identity as a community of the border (Dayak).

Not construted of national ideas in the imagination, feeling, and social practices, strongly associated with the formation of the nation-state at the time of this elitist, manipulated, and politicized by the intelligentsia to mobilize support. Formation of nation-states do not begin with a persuasive approach that allows the ideas of nation-states can be negotiated and constructed from the bottom through the role of educational institutions, mass media, books, and civil society (civil society), but rather through a repressive approach by deploying the army (political apparatus) to strengthen the domination of the country at the border. The implication, nationalism border communities are not oriented to the interests of the nation-state, but rather reflect the ethnic-based cultural ties.

The focus countries are very concentrated on the security and control of the territory, causing community rights as a citizen (citizen rights) to meet the needs of education, health, economy, and other public services, unnoticed by the state. In fact, the existence of such services is a highly strategic media to integrate the community with the national structure. In the absence of these services, the community grew as a cultural community that is separate from the state and seeks to meet their needs independently (self-sufficient).

Absence of the country to facilitate the needs of society reinforces the collective identity of border communities as a community-based cultural Dayak ethnic group, which exists beyond the geopolitical boundaries. Relationships are socio-cultural and economic interwoven between them and regardless of state control. Relationships and social order that is built in it becomes a necessity and social necessity for them in order to guarantee the continuity of life as a community system. Traditional trade, labor relations, kinship, marriage, ceremonies, etc., take place as a social reality in border communities.

In summary, the process of state formation in this period took place as political activity is focused on the defense of territorial control state, regardless of population in it. In this context, for the border communities, nationalism is understood more as a reaction rather than action and tend to be cultural rather than political, so the orientation is more on maintaining the existing culture and institutionalized not establish or maintain a state. This led to a collective identity as border communities are not integrated with the political identity (of Indonesia), so that nationality and ethnicity are two separate entities and each berkontestasi at the border. In this situation, more border residents identify themselves as a community of cultural (ethnic Dayak) rather than political community (nation Indonesia or Malaysia). Formation of the nation and nationalism at the border does not show continuity as described by Smith (1991) that the existence of the nation-state is rooted in the community pre-modern natural kinship that has its own authenticity, but the two entities are separate and independent.

4.2. The National Reconstruction of the New Order Period (1967 -1998)

Transition to the New Order regime in general did not bring significant changes in the management of the border. Border management policies are still based on the security approach and put the border region as "backyard" of the state, so it does not become a priority. Therefore, the physical-spatial and socio-economic conditions of the people do not show significant changes. They still remain the areas isolated from the center of the country and with limited access to education, health services, and markets. The development of infrastructure and public services for the people of the border is still a concern and the priority of the New Order government. Despite the wealth of natural resources in the border form vast forests, continue to be exploited by the state through forest concessions (HPH), which is run by businessmen and military elites. At this time, the country's presence on the border is still an elite project of national enforced through apparatus (especially the military) and does not provide adequate space for civil society participation, which enables the notion of nationality, grows as a form of public awareness.

At this time, the security approach is not oriented to the defense of state sovereignty of another state intervention, but more oriented towards the control and integration of border communities with the Unitary Republic of Indonesia (NKRI). To create national integration, then the "development" be used as a key strategy in the formation of the nation-state and nationalism. The key principle in the New Order regime is a strong unitary state idea: the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI). In this case, the military played a dominant role as the primary enforcer of national unity. The military developed a dual function doctrine that emphasizes the role as the guardian of national sovereignty and the regulatory, political, economic, and ideological state. Under Soeharto, entrenched military in civil affairs, and they have a number of permanent seats in parliament. Military officers also held the top spot in all levels of government, districts, and provinces, and played a key role in state-owned companies and private businesses. For example since the mid 1960s until the late 1990s almost all the governors and regents in West Kalimantan Province, has a military background (Eilenberg, 2012).

The concept of the state as an entity continues to be strengthened and enriched through various practices, images, and symbols, maps of the area, border posts, passport, military ceremonies, and flag. The relationship between the state and the people of Indonesia during the Soeharto regime, took a state-centered approach. In addition, impose state control over the power of local problems. State authorities widely use the rhetoric of the state locally in legitimizing acts of government, but also as a pretext not to act at all. At the same time, local people often use the rhetoric of development of the country in order to justify the economic progress through illegal activity. To work creatively and play with rhetoric and symbols of the state is a common practice and is often used for local benefit.

In the early 1960s, the military is given full rights over productive forests near the border with Sarawak and Sabah, Malaysia, for political and security reasons. In 1967, this arrangement was formalized by the Department of Forestry to give the PT. Yamaker (Yayasan Maju Kerja), an Indonesian military cooperative, the forest concessions (HPH) with an area of 1 million hectares along the border with Malaysia − 843,500 hectares in West Kalimantan and 265,000 hectares in East Kalimantan. PT.

Yamaker not the only players involved in timber management in the border zone. Some forest concessions active as well and most of these concessions are under the management or owned by the military (Obidzinski, 2006; Smith, 2003). Therefore, it is undeniable that neglect border areas of priority development are part of the planning, because behind this, New Order regime with its military foundation exploited the forest for their economic and political interests.

As it happened during the Old Order, nationalism border communities did not experience the shift, based on the cultural identity, even showing a tendency than as a result of repressive measures carried out by the New Order government. Based cultural identity is increasingly finding its position as a form of resistance against the oppressive domination of state power and treats people unfairly.

National development, which became the key word in development projects (nation building) under the New Order, only an ideological discourse (developmentalism) that are not realized in the form of a real border. Instead of building access and infrastructure facilities to encourage social mobility border communities, the New Order government in the exploitation of natural resources and forests in the name of national development, which ironically does not improve social and economic conditions of local communities. Limited opportunities and access to resources at the border ultimately reinforce practices of socio-cultural and cross-border traditional economy, which basically has existed a long time as a consequence of a system in border communities. Cross-border illegal trade, illegal migrant workers, illegal logging, and illegal border crossers, an unusual activity that takes place at the border. These illegal activities were intensified when Malaysian economy is growing and shows high gap with Indonesia, particularly on the border. The grounds of cultural and ethnic similarities, people on the border take advantage of these opportunities to meet their basic needs by promoting cultural relations and economic ties with residents in Malaysia.

Cultural reasons become rational argument for border communities to perpetuate social relations and cross-border economic, amid limited access within the country. They actually know that his actions are contrary to the rules of the state, but the act was done solely in order to guarantee the continuity of its existence that is not met by the existing system (Indonesia). Thus, economic and cultural orientation of border communities from Indonesia to Malaysia, not because of a lack of a sense of nationalism and ethnic similarities reasons, but rather a survival strategy to ensure the continuity of their existence.

Thus, the formation of the nation-state takes place as a process of domination (top down) which gives a central role in the political apparatus (military and law) and does not involve civil society. By implication, the state and society are two separate entities and compete. New Order government prefers repressive ways to disseminate the ideology of the country at the border and did not attempt a persuasive approach by empowering civil society to strengthen the glue and ideas of the state as a form of consciousness without violence, or consensual hegemony.
The drastic changes in the political and economic crisis and the fall of President Suharto from power in 1998 with the rapidly changing dynamics of local politics at the border. In an effort to redistribute political and economic power is more evenly and give back to the district authorities, government reform has initiated a national program of decentralization. Regional autonomy is the main topic, and a new law resulted in a series of reforms that provide increased autonomy over the local district government sectors, such as forestry. One of the initial goals behind the strengthening of regional autonomy is to reduce the separatist movement in regions rich in resources, previously marginalized and thus prevent a possible outbreak of the country.

4.3. The National Reconstruction in the Reform Era (1998-Present).

In the reform era, the government demonstrated a commitment to building a border area oriented at improving the welfare and empowerment of local communities, by providing a foundation and direction of regional development policies that prioritize the development of the border region to adhere to the principle of decentralization and regional autonomy. Through the facilities and physical infrastructure, promoting state and negotiate ideological interests to the public. A power relation still characterizes the relationship between the state and the people on the border. The presence of an institution, apparatus and program development become an important means to negotiate and strengthen the ideas of nationhood. The construction of educational facilities, health care, economic facilities and physical infrastructure, not merely to meet the basic needs of society as a citizen, but as a means to publicize the ideology of the state to the public. State internalizes the ideological build systems and institutions to be able to glue or strengthen its hegemony. Institutional mechanisms such as schools, churches, political parties, mass media, and so is the 'hands' of the ruling group to determine the ideology that dominates.

The role of the school as a planting medium is shown explicitly state ideology, particularly at secondary school level. The involvement of the military apparatus to control the implementation of education through extra-curricular activities. School cooperates programmatically with the military conduct national awareness education and defends the country. An overemphasis on the role of national integration, have ignored the importance of human resource capacity building and community empowerment as the ultimate goal of education. By implication, the school was built without supported by the availability of learning tools, the quantity, and quality of adequate teachers. In the ideological level, the opening of public access to higher education, on the other hand was able to change the public's conception of the nation-state.

Thus, education is a very central instrument to promote national values. As noted Gellner (1983) that the nation is a society with a high culture (high culture) were implanted in particular, standardized, based on education, culture and literacy supported by specialist personnel and maintained by the learning institution specialized, dedicated and professional. However, the low quality of education and the limited support facilities at the border economy has not been able to empower the local community potential, which is really the ultimate goal of regional autonomy and decentralization. Aspiration and public participation at the border to determine the objectives and priority needs, yet significantly accommodated in regional development.

Development of border regions is still dominated by national interests, as shown by the establishment of the National Agency for Border Management (BNPP) in 2010, which is responsible for managing and coordinating the development of the border region.

All empirical findings above, particularly with regard to the availability of public access to education, health, and economy, as well as supporting infrastructure, further confirms that nationalism is strongly associated with the fulfillment of the rights of society as a citizen (citizen rights), which in reality is still not significant unmet at the border. However, the contribution of education only affects the cognitive knowledge and practices of formal nationality. In the most fundamental aspects, namely the feeling of belonging (sense of belonging) to the nation did not show a significant effect. In fact, the feeling of belonging to a nation is one of the essential meanings of nationalism. National identity is not only presented in the imagination and the use of national symbols, such as the use of language, currency, possession of identity cards, but that is very important is the psychological identification that integrates the individual and society in the national identity.

5. Conclusion

Historical differences between the formations of the nation-state as a political entity with the existence of society as a cultural entity, has implications for the lack of compatibility between the limits of geo-political and geo-cultural border. The existence of the community as a cultural entity that preceded the birth of the nation-state, an obstacle for the development of the nation-state effort to integrate the interests of political and cultural interests in national identity. Nevertheless, the political and cultural identity is not a social category that permanent and final, but constructed and reconstructed through a series of interactions between the state and the community on an ongoing basis include; negotiation, contestation, and even dominance, thus creating a social construction typical of community identity.

In the Old Order, the existence of the nation-state is still in a transitional period from colonial rule to a new form of the Indonesian state. Therefore, the construction of the nation-state on the border oriented to defend the country against possible intervention of foreign countries (Malaysia / British). Formation of the state is a top-down by giving a very big role for the institutions and the military apparatus, so the idea into something foreign countries and its existence is not known by the public, because they are not involved in the initial process of formation of the country. By implication, the state and society into two separate entities and are not integrated.

During the New Order, approach to defense and security is still a central role in nation-building program. However, the focus is more oriented to the control and integration of border communities in the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI). Centralized national development policy is the main strategies implemented by the government in the development program of the nation and nationalism is integrated. To achieve these objectives, the state did "militarization of politics" by applying a policy of "the dual functional of armed forces", which gives a role to the military as a defense force and socio-political. The implication, the role and military presence at the border is very dominant to embed and constructing national identity and nationalism to the border communities.

However, the dominance of the state through the military apparatus is not accompanied by the provision of facilities for the fulfillment of collective needs of society as a citizen (citizen rights), so that their rights will be education, health care, and economic resources marginalized, and they are isolated geographically from his land own. By implication, the construction of the nation-state and nationalism only an elite project is not constructed in thoughts, feelings, and actions of society. The existence of the state is only recognized as the owner's political authority over the territory, but it is not a collective identity that is important to the community.

In the era of the Reformation, decentralization and regional autonomy is a basic foundation in implementing development programs based on local strengths nation. But in its implementation, the country with the presence of a set of policies, institutions, regulation, and infrastructure development has not brought change in welfare, especially in fulfilling the people's collective rights adequately. Increased public education and for access to the modern employment sector significantly influence their perception and participation on state programs. However, nationalism has not been able to build a society that is reflected in the attitude of partiality or sense of belonging to the state. Orientation of nationalism is more cultural than political.

In summary, the development of the nation-state initiated by the country since Independence until the Reformation era, very focused on the development of civic nationalism, in which nations are defined in terms of shared commitment and pride in the public institutions of state and civil society, which connects people with the area they occupy. Nations described as a form of life together united by a common culture, way of life, national character, which is owned by all citizens regardless of ethnic origin.

However, the approach of civic nationalism as a nation-state model of development is not working optimally on the border, because in practice, public institutions and state apparatus that can connect with the cultural community of the political community (state) are not optimally present at the border. Development of civic nationalism run through coercive military force, while the welfare approach is to prioritize the fulfillment of the rights of citizens (citizen rights) and the fulfillment of collective rights (collective rights) are not met adequately.

Nation-building program in an effort to realize the sovereignty of the country at the border does not produce an optimal response from the local community; instead, they maintain their cross-border cultural identity as a form of resistance to state policies which he considered unfair. This community resistance, basically not the rejection of the presence of the state, but rather a protest against the treatment of the country less to facilitate their needs.

Thus, the integration efforts of border communities within the framework of Indonesian nationalism depends on how far the countries are able to facilitate the rights of the individual (citizen rights) and collective rights (collective rights) them, so that in turn national identity became an important part of the collective consciousness of society adjoining with culturally-based identities. Development of the modern nation-state is essentially built upon two forms of civic nationalism and ethnocultural braid, and then crystallized in the form of multicultural nationalism.

6. References

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities* (pp.5-7; 37-46). Third Edition. London: Verso.

Brown, D. 2000. *Contemporary Nationalism: Civic, Ethnocultural & Multicultural Politics* (pp. 122-130). New York: Rotledge

Castells, Manuel. 2010. *The Power of Identity* (pp. 6-12; 30-35). Second Edition. United Kingdom: Willey-Blackwell Ltd.

Diener, Alexander C. and Joshua Hagen (eds.). 2010. *Borderline and Borderlands: Political Oddities at the Edge of the Nation-State* (pp. 1-14). United Kingdom: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Donnan, Hastings and Thomas M. Wilson (eds). 1999. *Borders: Frontiers of Identity, Nation and State* (pp.1-30). Oxford: Berg.

Eilenberg, Michael. 2012. *At the Edges of the State: Dynamics of State Formation in the Indonesian Borderlands* (pp. 235-257). Leiden: KITLV Press.

Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism* (pp. 53-62). Oxford: Blackwell.

Giddens, Anthony.1990. *The Consequences of Modernity* (pp. 36-45). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, Anthony. 2003. *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives* (pp.44-45). New York: Rotledge.

Ishikawa, Noboru. 2010. *between Frontiers: Nation and Identity in a Southeast Asian Borderland* (pp. 1-5). Singapore: National University of Singapore Press

Jones, Matthews. 2002. *Conflict and confrontation in South East Asia, 1961-1965.* (pp. 61-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Obidzinski, K., Agus Andrianto, Chandra Wijaya. 2006. *Penyeleundupan Kayu di Indonesia* (pp. 5-9*)*. Bogor: Center for International Forestry Research

Skeldon, Ronald. 1999. "Migration in Asia after the economic crisis," *Asia Pacific Population Journal* 14:3-24.

Snow, David. 2001. "Collective Identity and Expressive Forms". Center for the Study of Democracy, UC Irvine. http://escholarship.org/uc/item.

Smith, A.D. 1991. *National Identity* (pp. 19-42). London: Penguin.

Smith, J., et.al. 2003. "Illegal logging, collusive corruption and fragmented governments in Kalimantan, Indonesia". International Forestry Review 5(3), 293-302.

Subritzky, John. 2000. *Confronting Sukarno* (pp. 56-73). New York: St. Martin's Press Inc.

Wilson, Thomas M. and Hastings Donnan. 1998. *Borders Identities: Nation and State at International Frontiers.* (pp. 6-9). New York: Cambridge University Press.