

Evaluating Reconciliation Process of Post-Reformation Interethnic Conflict in Sampit, Indonesia

Wahyu Arif Raharjo,^{1*} Indah Fitriyani¹

¹*Department of International Relations, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,
Universitas Wahid Hasyim, Semarang, Indonesia*

Abstract

Interethnic conflict in Sampit erupted amidst the post-Reformation era in Indonesia between the Madurese and Dayak people, which caused casualties and displacements. Peaceful coexistence is prevailing between both people in Sampit nowadays, but discussion about this reconciliation process is still rare, and its significance is in understanding the region's transformation. This study evaluates the reconciliation process as a stepping stone toward positive peace by examining the reconciliation process of interethnic conflict in Sampit using Hamber's model of reconciliation, exploring whether it supports conditions for positive peace. This study employs library research followed by descriptive qualitative analysis of existing literatures, journal articles, reports, and documents on this case study. It argues that the Declaration of *Tekad Damai Anak Bangsa* operates as conflict resolution, with victory secured by the Dayak people as the indigenous people. The absence of truth-telling or mutual acknowledgment of events, compounded by the exodus of most Madurese, left reconciliation incomplete. Justice and litigation processes were passed to preserve the current non-conflict situation, resulting in a reconciliation dominated by the Dayak community. Although reconciliation has occurred at the leadership level among ethnic and government figures, critical grassroots issues like truth-telling, displacement, and justice remain unresolved. It has created a fragile peace, where lingering resentment and unresolved grievances could threaten the region's stability. The study highlights the importance of addressing these underlying issues to transform the prevailing negative peace into sustainable positive peace.

Konflik antar etnis di Sampit meletus di tengah era pasca-Reformasi di Indonesia antara etnis Madura dan Dayak, yang menyebabkan jatuh-

*Corresponding Author: Wahyu Arif Raharjo (w.arifraharjo@unwahas.ac.id), Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Wahid Hasyim, Jl. Menoreh Tengah X No. 22, Sampangan, Semarang, Jawa Tengah 50232, Indonesia.

nya korban jiwa dan harus mengungsi. Saat ini, kedua etnis tersebut hidup berdampingan secara damai di Sampit, namun diskusi mengenai proses rekonsiliasi ini masih jarang, dan hal ini sangat penting untuk memahami transformasi di wilayah tersebut. Penelitian ini mengkaji proses rekonsiliasi konflik antar etnis di Sampit dengan menggunakan model rekonsiliasi Hamber, untuk melihat apakah model tersebut mendukung kondisi perdamaian yang positif. Penelitian ini menggunakan studi kepustakaan dengan analisis kualitatif deskriptif terhadap literatur, artikel jurnal, laporan, dan dokumen yang ada mengenai studi kasus ini. Penelitian ini berargumen bahwa Deklarasi “Tekad Damai Anak Bangsa” telah berfungsi sebagai resolusi konflik, dengan ke-menangan diperoleh oleh masyarakat Dayak sebagai penduduk asli. Tidak adanya pengungkapan kebenaran atau pengakuan bersama atas kejadian-kejadian yang terjadi, diperparah dengan eksodus sebagian besar orang Madura, membuat rekonsiliasi tidak sempurna. Proses peradilan dan litigasi dilewatkan untuk mempertahankan situasi non-konflik saat ini, sehingga menghasilkan rekonsiliasi yang didominasi oleh komunitas Dayak. Meskipun rekonsiliasi telah terjadi di tingkat kepemimpinan di antara tokoh-tokoh etnis dan pemerintah, isu-isu akar rumput yang kritis seperti pengungkapan kebenaran, pemindahan, dan keadilan masih belum terselesaikan. Hal ini telah menciptakan perdamaian yang rapuh, di mana kebencian yang masih tersisa dan keluhan yang belum terselesaikan dapat mengancam stabilitas kawasan. Penelitian ini menyoroti pentingnya menangani masalah-masalah mendasar ini untuk mengubah perdamaian negatif yang ada menjadi perdamaian positif yang langgeng.

Keywords: conflict; interethnic; Madura; negative peace; reconciliation; Sampit

Introduction

Reconciliation processes of interethnic and communal conflicts in Indonesia have been problematic since many still need to be completed. Some rely on the traditional mechanism that embraces local ownership of the process. However, it has ignored several important components of reconciliation for the future sustainability of peace in the region. It is exemplified in North Maluku, where *hibualamo*, a so-called grassroots reconciliation initiative, involved mostly only North Halmaherans elite circles and its supporters, ignoring truth and accountability of violence among local communities, thus disregarding the determining component of reconciliation (Duncan, 2016). Similarly, political aspirations in the post-conflict Poso regency in Central Sulawesi were mainly neglected due to the government’s preference for physical and operational rehabilitation, leading

to the region's vulnerability to terrorism as a result of failed reconciliation (Nasrum, 2016). Both cases suggested that the government approach and local grassroots initiative were crucial in instilling a local sense of belonging in the reconciliation process; however, its practice demands elaborate evaluation in implementing positive peace in post-conflict societies.

One of the most notorious cases of conflict in Indonesia is in Sampit, a city in Central Kalimantan that nowadays doesn't seem to leave any impression that 20 years ago, a horrifying interethnic conflict occurred in this region. Looking at recent news about Sampit, not a single of it talks about interethnic violence between Dayak and Madurese people that once dominated the headlines in the early 2000s. A monument of peace known as "Tugu Perdamaian Sampit" still stands in the city, symbolizing peace among elements of Kotawaringin Timur's society, where Sampit is located. Furthermore, the Index on Urban Tolerance released by Setara Institute indicates that Sampit is not included in the least tolerant city in Indonesia (Setara Institute, 2023), which indicates that the city fares relatively well in terms of interethnic relations.

However, Sampit in 2001 went viral across Indonesia for its sadistic videos of headless torso paraded on the street during the early 2000s. The event erupted when Indonesia's diverse society reacted to weakening Jakarta's central government, thus creating public grievances and chaos across the archipelago. What began as isolated conflicts escalated when stereotypes about the identities of the Madurese and Dayak people intensified tensions between the two ethnic groups. As a result, violent conflict was inevitable among the two groups, raids seeking each other members of ethnic groups were rampant across the city, as well as refugees fleeing the persecution to neighboring provinces.

A gap exists in the literature focusing on the reconciliation process of this inter-ethnic conflict in Sampit in 2001. A descriptive analysis of the event itself suggests that the conflict is a result of communication failure between Dayak and Madurese (Intani et al., 2022), its relations with Kaharingan local religion (Sholeh, 2022), its chronology and how deprivation has caused frustration among them (Alexandra, 2020). Meanwhile, the effectiveness of conflict

resolution has been explored, arguing that conflict resolution was considered successful (Alexandra & Nurhayati, 2014), using a natural local approach process (Suryani, 2012) that emphasizes the integrative synergy model (Basit et al., 2023). Some discussion covers various ways Madurese adapts, survives, and continues living (Rosyidi, 2018; Yogaswara, 2016). The articles discussed how the Madurese exodus uses collective memory to forget and remember the conflict, resolving the issue of identity among them. Assessment of conflict potential and its mitigation are explored by Anggraini (2023) using cultural literacy, while Sarmita (2014) discussed how a transmigration program may contribute to increasing tension between two ethnicities. Does that mean that reconciliation have been successful in transforming conflict into peace? (Patji, 2003; Triwibowo, 2015).

This paper aims to specifically explore the process, result, and existence of, if any, reconciliation of the Sampit conflict to prevent it from re-emerging. In conflict studies, post-conflict reconstruction involves both resolution and conflict transformation that reconciles conflicting parties. Such reconciliation builds communication and cooperation between parties to remember and resolve memories and trauma with consolidation in facing the future as reconciled parties (Kelley et al., 2019). Assessment of reconciliation is crucial as it provides an overarching picture of how memories were resolved and people reconnected.

This research represents a critical endeavor to closely examine the potential for ethnic conflict within Indonesia's growing populist political landscape. This paper is written during campaign period of Indonesia's nation-wide Presidential and Parliamentary Elections 2024, when the risk of identity politicization is high. Prior research indicates that politicization of political, cultural, religious, and sectarian identities is still rampant across the archipelagic nation (Ardipandanto, 2023; Mas'udi, 2023; Sebastian & Arifianto, 2021). However, each region possesses different vulnerabilities and resiliency to identity politics and ethnic conflict, so assessment for such a condition is necessary.

This research was conducted using the case study method on Sampit interethnic conflict in 2001 to explore the reconciliation process of conflict.

A qualitative approach was used by perusing secondary data in the existing journal articles on the relevant subject that covers the topics of 1) the escalation of the Sampit conflict, 2) the conflict resolution attempt and process by government and community leaders, and 3) post-conflict relations between Madura and Dayak in the region. The primary data collected in this research are existing literature discussing the context, process, and aftermath of the Sampit conflict, published in both English and Bahasa Indonesia. Government regulations, especially at the Kalimantan Tengah provincial level, as well as documents of TDAB-BK (*Tekad Damai Anak Bangsa di Bumi Kalimantan*) as the joint statement of peace between Madura and Dayak community, are analyzed. The researcher will gain insights into the reconciliation process between conflict resolution and post-conflict relations by exploring these components. The geographical scope of this study is limited to include only the conflict that erupted in Kotawaringin Timur Regency and Sampit city area in Central Kalimantan. This study excludes other regions of Central Kalimantan, as Sampit was where the conflict originated, rendering clashes in different areas derivative.

This paper aims to assess the implementation of reconciliation in the aftermath of the Sampit conflict in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. To comprehensively understand the context, it will first explain the nature of the conflict situation, its chronology, and how it was resolved. Using Hamber's model of reconciliation, this paper will then move to analyze the reconciliation process that occurred in Sampit, from engaging conflict parties in reconciliation, the truth-finding process, efforts in reaching justice, and further preventing relapse to analyze how the reconciliation and conflict transformation was conducted (Hamber, 2009).

Hamber's Model of Reconciliation

This model exists on the assumption that attention is imperative in building peaceable relations. Reconciliation is a process that covers a range of activities within which conflicting parties overcome clashing and broken relations. The process consists of 5 stages, namely: 1) A common ground of vision is constructed, which entails segments and members of society at each

level, from elite to grassroots, to develop a plan of an entangled, fair, equal, and diverse community together regardless of differences in arguments, ideology, ethnicity, and other related background. 2) Recognition and solving past relations include dealing with and finding the truth, healing pain and suffering, apologizing and forgiving, and justice. Institutional commitment to uncovering even the most painful truth must exist and work effectively, usually through truth commission. Subsequently, the commission facilitates mending the relationship through forgiveness, acceptance, and sometimes justice when necessary. 3) Transforming the relationships between conflicting parties that develop into positivity. A community plan should manifest in the active role of individuals, groups, communities, leaders, and other parties in reconstructing integration within the community. 4) a change in attitude is a reflection of commitment toward peace. It creates a new culture for the new community by developing respect for differences and human rights and a new culture of peace. 5) the last step is to adjust social, economic, and political systems (especially equality) to serve a peaceful future (Hamber, 2009).

It should manifest in recognizing structures of social, economic, and political relationship that leads to sentiment while also ascertaining equality and justice between various groups within the community.

Sampit Riot: Causes, Dynamics, and Resolution

Before its manifestation in the 2000s, the potential for violent interethnic conflict lies within deep-seated inter-ethnic sentiment in Kalimantan. Madurese people are transmigrant. From densely populated Madura Island across Surabaya in Java Island Dayak, indigenous people have resided in Borneo for centuries. Madurese are migrants who dominated informal economic sectors as the government granted them lands when they migrated to Kalimantan (Ruslikan, 2001). Most Madurese work in non-formal sectors such as trade, farmers, and laborers, whose salary come from their physical labor, yet they have been able to grow their existence in Sampit society.

Meanwhile, Dayak comes from a gatherer culture, developing to become a civil servant in modern society (Intani et al., 2022). The tension between Indigenous (Melayu and Dayak) occurred several times prior to mass violence, from individually separated conflicts that occurred for several decades before the riot involving murders, local skirmishes, house fires, and riots in Sambas, Sanggau Ledo and Landak in West Kalimantan in 1997 (Davidson, 2009). Because of these isolated cases, a growing typical stereotype spread among Melayu and Dayak people in Kalimantan against Madurese. Madurese in Kalimantan were notoriously stereotyped as trouble-makers, neglecting the rule of law, their thuggery life, and land-grabbers. At the same time, for Madurese, local indigenous Dayak were known as lazy, unmaterialistic, yet vengeful people (Intani et al., 2022).

Amidst this rising tension, cultures of violence in these societies in their history have exacerbated the risk of violent conflict. Madurese society is known for its 'carok' culture, a one-on-one duel using culprits, a local iron-bladed weapon, to resolve disputes, predominantly involving women, misunderstanding, inheritance, belief, theft, and debt problems (Rokhyanto & Marsuki, 2015). Dayak people, on the other hand, have a long history of violence known as *Hakayau* (beheading), *Hapumu*, and *Hatetek*. This tradition was well-known until it was unanimously ended through Tumbang Anoi Peace in 1894, attended by all Dayak tribes (Sumiatie et al., 2022). These factors, in turn, led to isolated cases of conflicts (Triwibowo, 2015).

It was initially a series of individual but reciprocating conflicts, added by misunderstanding each other's culture and speculations that led from interethnic sentiment. The Sampit conflict started on February 17 2001 when there was rising speculation that Dayak people had murdered five Madurese in Padat Karya Street. Exasperated Madurese mob retaliated by attacking, killing, and burning Dayak Maanyan people in several places across Sampit, causing 24 casualties, and then walking around the city yelling, '*Mana orang Dayak?*' On February 19, hundreds of Madurese people claimed victory by declaring Sampit the Second Sampang a Madurese

City. As other Dayak people were informed of this attack, they reacted by coming from all directions. They were spontaneously enraged and then massacred the Madurese population on February 20 2001, causing the deaths of hundreds of Madurese. In the next few days, tribal and cultural leaders acted, unfortunately, further exacerbating the conflict between the two groups (Alexander, 2005). Police force and army troops were deployed, but both were too late to deter the violent character of this conflict as mobs had outnumbered police and troops.

The government did help by sending more police and army to help and providing places for shelter, but they were very anxious to remain neutral in the conflict, letting the mob continue the action. The conflict lasted until February 22, when the Madurese group was severely defeated and requested the Bupati (regent) of Kotawaringin Timur to evacuate them. Fearing mass killing by Dayak people, approximately two thousand Madurese were evacuated by passenger ship, leaving the regency to Madura, Java, and neighboring provinces in Kalimantan. As Madurese ran away to surrounding regencies, the violence spread to Palangka Raya, Central Kalimantan's capital. Local police and the national government reacted by providing warships to accommodate a massive flow of evacuees of up to 34,000. Despite the defeat, a lynch mob of Dayak people continued to burn houses and kill hundreds of people they claimed to be Madurese (surprisingly, Dayak people never failed to distinguish Madurese from people of other ethnicities). The riot lasted until February 25 (Alexander, 2005).

The aftermath of this conflict saw 1,284 deaths across Central Kalimantan, 1,192 houses were burned, 748 others were destroyed, and approximately 80,000 people were displaced from their homes (Varshney et al., 2008). Both parties indeed committed many crimes against humanity, including trespassing, killing, burning houses, and many more. There are plenty of things to settle after the conflict ended. The conflict started de-escalating in early March as few Madurese left the province. On the other hand, the clear evidence that the Dayak had won the conflict made these Dayak people stop the violence.

Reconciliation: Timeline and Result

The reconciliation process began on 20-22 March 2001 when the Declaration of *Tekad Damai Anak Bangsa di Bumi Kalimantan* (TDAB-BK) was held in Nam Centre Jakarta. The event was attended by several figures of the Dayak tribe community from the four provinces in Kalimantan, namely East, West, South, and Central Kalimantan, as well as religious figures from Central Java, in addition to the officials, Governor of South Kalimantan Syariffudin Basri, the Governor of Central Kalimantan Asmawi Agani, the Governor of East Java Imam Utomo, and the Minister of Home Affairs Hari Sabarno participated in and supported the peace efforts (Susanto, 2019). TDAB-BK agreed that there are seven causes of conflict: 1) errors in the distribution of economic development, 2) ineffective human resources policy, 3) the occurrence of cultural localisations or ghettos, (4) weak law enforcement, 5) inadequate and inconducive security, 6) overlapping sense of justice and poverty (Suryani, 2012).

By June 4 - 7 2001, the Central Kalimantan People's Congress (*Kongres Rakyat Kalimantan Tengah* or KRKT) III organized a General Assembly. The result of this meeting was that KRKT unanimously agreed 1) to accept the outcome of the TDAB-BK negotiations, 2) to accept the central government as a mediator in the settlement of the conflict, 3) reject the use of violence, 4) readiness to accept back Madura refugees under the prerequisite that Madurese people are ready for peace and apologize to the people of Dayak tribes, the Parliament, and 5) the DPRD immediately prepare a draft on the occupation, and the legal process and human rights are carried out fairly (Patji, 2003; Susanto, 2019).

On August 22, 2001, the Great Assembly of Refugees of Central Kalimantan (*Musyawah Besar Pengungsi Kalimantan Tengah* or MBPK) was held in the Ketapang District Building, Sampang Regency, East Java (Suryani, 2012). The meeting was held on the government's initiative in the peace and reconciliation process of the Sampit conflict. Various parties attended the meeting, including government officials, religious figures in East Java, and the security apparatus. The result of these discussions is the

willingness to make peace with the tribe of the Dayak, the apology to the Dayak Tribe, the readiness to adapt and behave well with the Tribes, and the replacement of the Madura Family Union (*Ikatan Keluarga Madura* or IKAMA) organization with the Council of Honour of the Citizen (*Dewan Kehormatan Warga Madura* or DKWM).

Furthermore, on September 25, 2001, the Central Government, as a mediator appointed by the two sides, made a national policy to visit the National Coordinating Agency for Disaster Management and Refugee Management (BAKORNAS PBP) by conducting a limited hearing led by Vice President Hamzah Haz and also conducted a Coordination Meeting with Ministers on September 28, 2001, to formulate the appropriate policy (Susanto, 2019).

The central government then established a national policy to deal with the refugee victims of conflict through three steps: first, the return of the victims to Sampit, and second, the empowerment of conflict survivors to return to everyday life. Third, redirecting if the first and second steps fail by opening new settlements. The provincial government has also established a policy based on national policies issued by the central government through BAKORNAS PBP. The provincial government issued regional regulations on handling conflict populations in the Central Kalimantan Provincial Regulation No. 9 of 2001 on November 6, 2001 (Suryani, 2012). The contents of this regulation relate to the authority of *Tokoh Adat* in peaceful efforts to tackle the issue of this inter-ethnic case. *Tokoh Adat* is an important part of the success of the peace agreement.

On the 1st and 3rd of February 2002, the Mufakat's resolute meeting organizing team organized the Malang Congress in Batu, East Java. This Congress is being held as a manifestation of commitment to resolving the conflict. The Congress was attended by a representative of the Kalimantan through Letter of Assignment No. 300/078/KEB/Kesbang with the appointment of 26 representatives and 29 associates (Susanto, 2019). The result of this meeting was to accept the results of the TDAB-DK, which had been organized on the initiative of the Central Government in settlement of

the interethnic conflict in Kalimantan, 1) accepting the return of the Madurese affected by the conflict back to their cities of origin if the situation has begun to be safe and conducive, 2) the process of law enforcement and supremacy continues to be publicly, and 3) acknowledgment of the actual truth to facilitate the resolution of problems in conflict.

The result of this reconciliation attempt is manifested in Regional Regulation (PERDA) No. 5 of 2004 on the Treatment of Population Impact of Ethnic Conflict (*Penanganan Penduduk Dampak Konflik Etnis*). Article 7, paragraph 2a states that Madura citizens are obliged to adhere to the local cultural values and customs and leave the culture of violence. As immigrants, it is appropriate that the values of the cultural Dayak people be lived “*di mana bumi dipijak di situ langit dijunjung* - where the earth is inhabited in the sky” so that there is no conflict between cultures (Susanto, 2019).

Challenges and Achievements of Reconciliation

Common Ground of Vision: *Tekad Damai Anak Bangsa*

A shared vision between the Madurese and Dayak communities did emerge; however, it must be understood within the context of Dayak's victory in the interethnic conflict and the subsequent displacement of most Madurese from the conflict area. A shared vision for future peace in Central Kalimantan was formalized through the TDAB-BK, with leaders from the respective ethnic groups effectively representing their communities. The national government served as the mediator between the conflicting parties. The agreement outlined a collaborative approach between civil society and the government to address these issues, restore normalcy in Central Kalimantan, and foster mutual cultural respect (*Tekad Damai Anak Bangsa* 2001). While this agreement officially ended the conflict and the accompanying violence, it was reached only after most of the Madurese population fled Central Kalimantan.

TDAB-BK represents a significant milestone in the reconciliation process, though it is not without limitations. Its importance lies, first and foremost, in the active participation of ethnic leaders, who play a crucial role in shaping

the behavior and attitudes of their respective communities. Among the Dayak, a communal, ethnic group deeply rooted in the *habaring hurung* philosophy, which emphasizes mutual assistance and cooperation for collective livelihood (e.g., *handep* for communal work and *harubuh* for collective rice harvesting), such leadership facilitates the dissemination of agreements reached during the convention (Suswandari et al., 2022). Similarly, within the hierarchical Madurese society, leadership is centered around ulama (Islamic religious scholars), as demonstrated by institutions such as BASRA (*Badan Silaturahmi Ulama Madura*), which hold significant influence (Jannah, 2019; Kosim, 2012; Mukhlishi & Rasyid, 2018; Romadhon, 2020; Syamsuddin & Sholeh, 2005). The participation of these leaders in the MDAB-BK not only represented their communities' aspirations but also signaled hope for the effective dissemination and implementation of the agreement. This is evident in the return of approximately 16,000 refugees to Central Kalimantan, facilitated by efforts to uphold commitments such as ensuring the safety of evacuees upon their return (Vianny et al., 2013).

Secondly, the TDAB-BK marked the official end of violence and established a mutual commitment to a peaceful future, presenting a shared vision for both parties. Declaring an official end to the conflict and demonstrating a collective agreement for peace was crucial in curbing ongoing violence, as sporadic and unorganized clashes continued to erupt across Central Kalimantan beyond February 2001. This formal declaration was intended to signal to society that ethnic leaders were united in their directive to end hostilities, thereby discouraging further outbreaks of violence. Moreover, the agreement articulated a vision for a peaceful future, encouraging both communities to begin repairing relations. By setting a precedent for reconciliation, the convention provided a framework for individuals and groups to reimagine the potential for peaceful coexistence within a unified society. This aspirational aspect of the TDAB-BK played a pivotal role in fostering dialogue and reshaping interethnic relations in the aftermath of the conflict.

Thirdly, despite differing perspectives between the two parties, the convention successfully established a common ground regarding the root

causes of the conflict and the envisioned pathway toward a peaceful society. The Madurese, as reflected in the stance of BASRA (*Badan Silaturahmi Ulama Madura*), largely attributed the Sampit conflict to religious tensions. In contrast, non-Madurese communities in Kalimantan predominantly viewed the conflict as a purely interethnic dispute (Basit et al., 2023). Despite these divergent interpretations, the convention achieved consensus on key points emphasizing the importance of peace and mutual forgiveness between the two groups. It shared acknowledgment of the need for reconciliation laid a foundation for rebuilding trust and fostering coexistence, demonstrating the convention's significance as a step toward sustainable peace.

A closer examination of the convention's content, process, and dynamics reveals significant limitations in the resulting agreement. First, the TDAB-BK reflects the unequal power dynamics inherent in the aftermath of the conflict, emphasizing the Dayak victory and imposing asymmetrical terms on the Madurese. This imbalance is most evident in the requirement for the Madurese to issue a formal apology, a stipulation that implicitly assigns them primary blame for the bloodshed, violence, and destruction. The codification of this demand within the TDAB-BK underscores its role as a prerequisite for reintegrating the Madurese community into Central Kalimantan. This requirement is particularly contentious, as it disregards the dual nature of the conflict's casualties, which included both Dayak and Madurese victims. By framing the Madurese as solely responsible, the agreement obliges them to apologize and implicitly holds them accountable for the harm they suffered. Such provisions highlight the inequitable nature of the negotiation process, suggesting that the agreement was shaped by the dominance of one party over the other rather than fostering a balanced and inclusive framework for reconciliation.

A second major shortcoming of the agreement lies in its failure to address the reconciliation mechanisms. While the TDAB-BK emphasizes the importance of an apology, it does not provide for processes such as truth-telling or justice for both parties. This omission highlights the absence of dialogue and justice mechanisms at the grassroots level, which are essential components of meaningful reconciliation. Reconciliation requires truth-

telling and fact-finding to address collective trauma, rebuild relationships, and ensure justice, preventing unresolved grievances and unprocessed trauma from causing community relapse. The lack of these foundational elements in the TDAB-BK represents a missed opportunity to establish a sustainable and inclusive framework for peace.

Recognition and Solving Relations

The second stage of reconciliation, acknowledging and dealing with the past, existed but at a very shallow level and followed the context in which Dayak won the conflict. Victims in Refuge established the Forum for Victims and Families of the Central Kalimantan Riot, known as FK4, to help displaced Madurese recover from conflict. FK4 has pushed Madurese's side to propose an apology, which they did, and LMDD-KT, as the representative of Dayak ethnic groups, has embraced this apology and forgives them (Cahyono, 2007). Unfortunately, there was no apology from Dayak's side, who had committed just the same violence against Madurese. Furthermore, trauma healing, which is a pivotal aspect in dealing with the painful past, was facilitated by *Nurani Dunia*, a NGO working in Central Kalimantan, and this does not cover displaced people in other provinces, which comprised the majority of them (Brown et al., 2005).

Commissions that should have handled truth-telling, dialogue, and justice forums were never established, thus hindering mending relations. Reconciliation should be conducted through remembering past events and recognizing and revealing the truth so all parties can move toward the future and heal trauma. Dayak leaders have proposed a reconciliation committee to Vice President Hamzah Haz. However, the actual forums never happened (Faisal, 2002). The attempt at reconciliation and preventing future conflict was conducted by Dayak tribes' performing rituals of *penyeimbangan bumi* (balancing the earth). On the national government level, such a commission should have been created when Bill No. 27 of 004 on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was signed but discarded by the Supreme Court (Widayati, 2017).

The truth about what happened during the conflict has become a significant debate, and the dominating version has been the winning parties'

version. There are at least two versions of the story: the LMDD-KT and the White Book version by Sofyan Tinggang. LMDD-KT's version emphasized crimes and chaos caused by Madurese in many aspects of Sampit's daily life before the conflict. In contrast, the white paper version explains that the riot was initiated by a Dayak named Fedlik Asser. Tinggang's book was never published because people from LMDD-KT ripped apart the draft, and the Dayak people widely denied this second version of the story (Yogaswara, 2016). It further created confusion about the truth about the real story, especially as there was no verification and confirmation on a societal scale in Central Kalimantan, and neither was the truth-telling process by either party. It indicates that there was no clarity, which may have blundered the peace situation, suggesting that only negative peace has persisted in Sampit until now.

Both restorative and retributive justice were conducted but flawed on many levels. The national government took care of restorative justice by providing Madurese refugees with compensation in the form of money and rice, resetting them both in Kalimantan and other parts of Indonesia and building their capability for entrepreneurship (Suryani, 2012). Regarding retributive justice, those who provoked the mob during the conflict have been brought to court and received verdicts, but those who acted never attended the hearings. Eighty-four suspects provoking mass during the conflict were prosecuted in the Regional Court of South Kalimantan (Faisal, 2002). Most criminals were never brought to court and remain free until now, while the pain of victims was never acknowledged except through an apology by Madurese. Meanwhile, the pain experienced by Madurese has not yet been recognized.

Transformation of Relationship

Surprisingly, the transformation of interethnic relations has been built at the grassroots level, but this is highly ineffective. In 2003, a reconciliation meeting was held by Madurese clerics, Banjar leaders, Dayak leaders, regional parliament members, and an organization of displaced Madurese called *Batang Media Centre* (BMC) (Brown et al., 2005). However, this

initiation was ineffective since not many parties were represented in this meeting. Furthermore, no forum for reconciliation at the grassroots level exists. People have not talked about their experience and pain during the conflict, and trauma healing has only been conducted on a limited number of occasions by NGOs and UN envoys (Brown et al., 2005). The TDAB-BK agreement mentioned that ‘reconciliation should be manifested at all levels,’ but it seems this has not reached the implementation level (Ruslikan, 2001).

Based on agreements on TDAB-BK, what happened in Sampit was not intended to transform the relationship but merely for peaceful coexistence. Madurese are allowed to settle back in Central Kalimantan only if they obey the rules and conditions as the losing side of the conflict, further manifested in Regional Law of Central Kalimantan No. 9/2001. In this regulation, reconciliation means repatriating the population concerning their equality rights to coexist peacefully in Central Kalimantan, and respect for local philosophy and culture must be recognized. Repatriation is allowed under the following conditions: living peacefully, being accepted by the surrounding people, and respecting local cultures and values.

The absence of truth-telling mechanisms and comprehensive post-conflict justice in the reconciliation process has perpetuated negative sentiments against the Madurese community. Relationships between the two ethnic groups were left unhealed, as the TDAB-BK merely required an apology from the Madurese without providing platforms for both communities to engage in meaningful dialogue, address collective trauma, and process their shared history. This lack of structured forums for interaction and healing prevented the development of mutual understanding and the resolution of lingering grievances. As a result, trauma and resentment have likely persisted unaddressed, leaving society vulnerable to renewed tensions. It was evident in recent incidents in Banjarmasin and Baamang, where crimes involving individuals of Madurese ethnicity reignited broader ethnic sentiments against the perpetrators’ identity. These occurrences underscore the enduring impact of unresolved grievances and the necessity of incorporating truth-telling and relational healing into post-conflict frameworks to achieve sustainable peace (Susanto, 2022).

Meanwhile, the primary strategy in transforming the relationship for remaining Madurese is to submit to the philosophy of “*di mana bumi dipijak di situ langit dijunjung.*” Madurese remaining in Central Kalimantan were expected to respect local Dayak culture as indigenous to the land.

Change in Attitude and Commitment to Peace

As a result of the conflict, the Madurese people changed their attitude. Madurese, who resettled back in Central Kalimantan, has become more respectful of local cultures and no longer promotes violence as they were in their homeland. It is also because the provincial government has attributed ‘*demang.*’ With the revision to Regional Regulation No. 14/1998, *demangs* have been promoted to become local supervisors of civil society, monitoring Madurese people and assessing Madurese resettlement in the village (Patji, 2003). Since then, Madurese people have become more submissive to local values. There is also a widespread rejection of reconciliation among Madurese since they see themselves as victims of riots, not the perpetrators. Among those who returned to Sampit, 80% were accepted into the community (Suryani, 2012).

Mass media also adjusted to become more sensitive to conflict-prone issues. Local media like Radar Sampit admitted that people are aware of conflict-sensitive issues and are trying to avoid speculation since this might trigger a riot (Suryani, 2012). Unsurprisingly, the author also experienced difficulties finding the correct chronology as this paper was written. Editors of daily newspapers are also more selective in releasing criminal news by being very careful with the labels and identities of those involved in the crime scene. As a promotion of peace, these media outlets have published more news on how well Madurese has been engaging in daily life back in Sampit as the conflict has been resolved (Suryani, 2012).

Adjustment of Social, Economic, and Political Systems

Many Madurese consciously accepted the result where Dayak people gained prominence, which was also reflected in the changes after the conflict. As the Dayak people are accepted as the indigenous people of Central Kalimantan, thus their culture should be promoted in its land. The legal

implication is enacting several regional regulations from provincial and regency governments of Dayak culture in everyday life. It includes Regional Regulation of Central Kalimantan No. 16/2008 about Institutionalization of Dayak Culture, Regional Regulation of Central Kalimantan No. 9/2001 about Management of Population Affected by Ethnic Conflict, Regency Regulation of Barito Utara No. 7 of 2002 about Management of Displaced People Affected by Ethnic Conflict, Regency Regulation of Palangka Raya City No. 15 of 2003 about Managing Impact of Ethnic Conflict, Regency Regulation of Kapuas No. 11/2003 regarding Repatriation of Conflict-Affected Population, Regency Regulation of Kotawaringin Timur No. 5 of 2003 about Management of Conflict-Affected Population. These regulations obliged everyone to promote ‘*Belom Bahadat*,’ a basic philosophy of Dayak people across Central Kalimantan, and the understanding of ‘respecting the Indigenous culture of the land you step on.’ A Dayak concept named *Huma Betang* is also included in this philosophy, which can be understood as a principle of equality, collective action, helping each other, and respecting each other (Suryani, 2012).

Conclusion

Sampit, 15 years after ethnic conflict erupted in 2001, has learned a lesson, yet the reconciliation process remained questionable. Conflict management in Sampit merely reached conflict resolution to achieve peace while neglecting comprehensive and transformational justice. The conflict was resolved, and people of different ethnic groups now coexisted, but the truth remained unclear as people from different backgrounds had their different versions of the stories. On the other hand, at the grassroots level, there are minimum efforts to reconcile victims and perpetrators due to fear that the conflict will erupt again whenever the issues resurface. Furthermore, conflict resolution recognized the dichotomy that the Dayak people were the winners of the conflict, while the Madurese lost the battle; thus, they should submit to local culture. Thus, many victims are not pursuing the justice they deserve, and there is no direct apology from anyone committing violence during the atrocities. For the Madurese people, it also means difficulties for them to reintegrate into society, especially for those displaced from their

homes in Sampit. Deciding whether the reconciliation should be conducted is difficult, as this effort may relapse. However, justice is important, as many victims surely deserve it. Therefore, the author calls this process a skipped reconciliation as it lacks many important aspects of reconciliation.[w]

References

- Alexander, R. (2005). *Konflik antar Etnis dan Penanggulangannya* [Master Thesis]. Universitas Diponegoro.
- Alexandra, F. (2020). Analisis Akar Konflik Sampit melalui Teori Deprivasi. *Global and Policy Journal of International Relations*, 6(2), 127–140. <https://doi.org/10.33005/jgp.v6i02.1821>
- Alexandra, F., & Nurhayati, R. T. (2014). *Analisis Efektivitas Resolusi Konflik Sampit pada Tahun 2011* [Master Thesis]. Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta]. <https://etd.repository.ugm.ac.id/penelitian/detail/118317>.
- Anggraini, G. (2023). Cultural Literacy as Conflict Mitigation of Sampit Dayak and Madurese Muslims in Tanah Mas Sampit Indonesia. *Fikri: Jurnal Kajian Agama, Sosial dan Budaya*, 8(1), 82–93. <https://doi.org/10.25217/jf.v8i1.3393>
- Ardipandanto, A. (2023). Efforts to Prevent Abuse of Identity Politics in the 2024 Elections. *Info Singkat: A Brief Study of Actual and Strategic Issues*, 15(6), 1–5. [https://berkas.dpr.go.id/pusaka/files/info_singkat/Info Singkat-XV-6-II-P3DI-Maret-2023-203-EN.pdf](https://berkas.dpr.go.id/pusaka/files/info_singkat/Info_Singkat-XV-6-II-P3DI-Maret-2023-203-EN.pdf)
- Basit, A., Maftuh, B., Malihah, E., & Mufidah, N. (2023). Resolusi Konflik Etnis Antara Madura dan Dayak di Sampit melalui Model Sinergi Integratif. *Integralistik*, 34(2), 62–68. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/integralistik/article/view/43306>
- Brown, G., Wilson, C., & Hadi, S. (2005). *Overcoming Violent Conflict: Peace and Development Analysis in Maluku and North Maluku*. Crisis Prevention and Recovery Unit-United Nations Development Programme (CPRU-UNDP).
- Cahyono, H. (2007). Negara dan Masyarakat dalam Resolusi Konflik di Indonesia (Daerah Konflik Kalimantan Barat dan Kalimantan Tengah). *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 4(1), 71–78. <https://ejournal.politik.lipi.go.id/index.php/jpp/article/view/451>

- Davidson, J. S. (2009). *From Rebellion to Riots: Collective Violence on Indonesian Borneo*. NUS Press.
- Duncan, C. R. (2016). Coexistence not Reconciliation: From Communal Violence to Non-Violence in North Maluku, Eastern Indonesia. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 17(5), 460–474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14442213.2016.1206615>
- Faisal, E. (2002, April 5). Puluhan Dalang Kerusuhan Sampit Diadili di Banjarmasin. *Liputan* 6. <https://www.liputan6.com/news/read/31956/puluhan-dalang-kerusuhan-sampit-diadili-di-banjarmasin>
- Hamber, B. (2009). *Transforming Societies after Political Violence: Truth, Reconciliation, and Mental Health*. Springer US. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-89427-0>
- Intani, N. P., Nadzifah, S., Hakim, A. L., & Asy'ari, M. H. (2022). Perang Sampit (Konflik Suku Dayak dengan Suku Madura) pada Tahun 2001. *Jurnal Sosial: Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, 23(2), 14–18. <https://doi.org/10.33319/sos.v23i2.112>
- Jannah, H. (2019). Pondok Pesantren sebagai Pusat Otoritas Ulama Madura. *Jurnal Al-Hikmah*, 17(1), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.35719/alhikmah.v17i1.9>
- Kelley, D. L., Waldron, V. R., & Kloeber, D. N. (2019). *A Communicative Approach to Conflict, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation: Reimagining Our Relationships*. Routledge.
- Kosim, M. (2012). Kyai dan Blater (Elite Lokal dalam Masyarakat Madura). *Karsa: Jurnal Sosial dan Budaya Keislaman*, 12(2), 149–60. <https://ejournal.iainmadura.ac.id/index.php/karsa/article/view/139>
- Mas'udi, W. (2023). Identity Politics in the Practices of Current Indonesian Democracy: A Trigger of Declining? *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Democracy and Social Transformation (ICON-DEMOST 2023)*, 230–233. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-174-6_40
- Mukhlishi, M., & Rasyid, S. F. (2018). BASRA Ulama and Medina Porch of Madura; Portrait of religious freedom in Madura. *Al-Ulum: Jurnal Penelitian dan Pemikiran ke Islaman*, 5(1), 43–58. <https://doi.org/10.31102/alulum.5.1.2018.43-58>
- Nasrum, M. (2016). From Communal Conflicts to Terrorism in Poso, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia: A Shifting Terrain. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 11(2), 83–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15423166.2016.1194224>

- Patji, A. R. (2003). Tragedi Sampit 2001 dan Imbasnya ke Palangkaraya (Dari Konflik ke (Re)Konstruksi). *Jurnal Masyarakat dan Budaya*, 5(2), 14–34.
- Rokhyanto, R., & Marsuki, M. (2015). Sikap Masyarakat Madura terhadap Tradisi Carok: Studi Fenomenologi Nilai-nilai Budaya Masyarakat Madura. *El Harakah: Jurnal Budaya Islam*, 17(1), 71. <https://doi.org/10.18860/el.v17i1.3086>
- Romadhon, S. (2020). Kiai bagi Orang Madura. *Proceedings of 4th International Conference on Islamic Studies (ICONIS) 2020*, 35–42.
- Rosyidi, M. I. (2018). Komunikasi Kelompok dalam Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Kampung Kelbung Pasca Konflik Madura-Sampit. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 12(1), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.21107/ilkom.v12i1.3715>
- Ruslikan, R. (2001). Konflik Dayak-Madura di Kalimantan Tengah: Melacak Akar Masalah dan Tawaran Solusi. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan dan Politik*, 14(4), 1–12. <https://journal.unair.ac.id/MKP@konflik-dayak-madura-di-kalimantan-tengah--melacak-akar-masalah-dan-tawaran-solusi-article-2583-media-15-category-8.html>
- Sarmita, I. M. (2014). Potensi Konflik di Daerah Tujuan Transmigrasi (Kasus Sampit dan Mesuji). *Media Komunikasi Geografi*, 15(1). <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/MKG/article/view/11422>
- Sebastian, L. C., & Arifianto, A. R. (2021). *The 2018 and 2019 Indonesian Elections: Identity Politics and Regional Perspectives*. Routledge.
- Setara Institute. (2023). *Indeks Kota Toleran Tahun 2022* (Issue April). <https://setara-institute.org/indeks-kota-toleran-2022/>
- Sholeh, M. (2022). Konflik Muslim Madura vs Dayak di Sampit serta Diskursus Kaharingan sebagai Klaim Agama. *Nusantara: Indonesian Journal of Islamic Studies*, 2(1), 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.54471/nusantara.v2i1.14>
- Sumiatie, S., Arianti, S., & Susanto, Y. (2022). Explorasi Nilai-nilai Demokrasi pada Rapat Damai di Desa Tumbang Anoi Tahun 1894. *Anterior Jurnal*, 21(2), 13–19. <https://doi.org/10.33084/anterior.v21i2.3003>
- Suryani, D. (2012). Konflik dan Resolusi Konflik Perbandingan di Sambas dan Sampit. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 9(1), 143–158. <https://ejournal.politik.lipi.go.id/index.php/jpp/article/view/457>
- Susanto, D. (2019). *Interaksi dan Perubahan Sosial Budaya Pasca Konflik Antar Suku di Sampit Kalimantan Tengah (Kasus Kerusuhan Antara*

- Suku Dayak dan Suku Madura*) [Doctoral Thesis]. Universitas Negeri Semarang. https://lib.unnes.ac.id/35172/1/upload_didi_susanto.pdf
- Susanto, D. (2022). Dayak and Madura Tribe's Perception of Post Conflict in Sampit Central of Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Proceedings of the Borneo International Conference on Education and Social Sciences (BICESS)* 2018). <https://www.scitepress.org/Papers/2018/90247/90247.pdf>
- Suswandari, S., Armiyati, L., & Azid, N. (2022). Local Wisdom of Dayak Ethnic Groups in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Etnosia: Jurnal Etnografi Indonesia*, 7(1), 67–85. <https://doi.org/10.31947/etnosia.v7i1.20633>
- Syamsuddin, M., & Sholeh, N. (2005). Peran Ulama BASSRA sebagai Perekat Sosial Masyarakat (Studi atas Pembangunan Jembatan Suramadu). *Aplikasia*, 6(2), 155–174.
- Triwibowo, D. R. (2015, July 26). Napak Tilas Tumbang Anoi Diakhiri Deklarasi di Tugu Soekarno. *Kompas.Id*. <https://www.kompas.id/baca/utama/2019/07/26/napak-tilas-tumbang-anoi-diakhiri-deklarasi-di-tugu-soekarno>
- Varshney, A., Tadjoeddin, M. Z., & Panggabean, R. (2008). Creating Datasets in Information-Poor Environments: Patterns of Collective Violence in Indonesia, 1990–2003. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 8(3), 361–394.
- Vianny, O., Isnawati, S., & Hardiyanti, E. A. (2013). *Return Migration, Determinan dan Dampaknya terhadap Migran: Studi Kasus Return Migration Suku Madura ke Kalimantan Tengah* [Student Essay]. Universitas Gadjah Mada Yogyakarta.
- Widayati, K. (2017). Pelaksanaan Pemenuhan Hak Korban Pelanggaran Hak Asasi Manusia Genosida Berdasarkan Undang-Undang No. 26 Tahun 2000. *Jurnal Legalitas*, 2(2).
- Yogaswara, H. (2016). Meneruskan Hidup setelah Kerusuhan: Ingatan Kolektif dan Identitas Etnis Madura Pasca Kekerasan Antaretnis di Kota Sampit, Kalimantan Tengah. *Masyarakat Indonesia*, 42(1), 105–113. <https://ejournal.lipi.go.id/index.php/jmi/article/view/664>