ABSTRACT: Government policy on banning the "Arat Sabulungan" tradition in Sioban Village, South Sipora Subdistrict, Mentawai Islands District, West Sumatra, Indonesia has occurred since 1954. Since the banning of the "Arat Sabulungan" tradition, it eliminates the local wisdom of the Mentawai people. This is due to the policy of the Mentawai regional government, which abolished tradition. The occurrence of controversy between local governments and Mentawai people, who still carry on the tradition, whereas for the Mentawai people, the "Arat Sabulungan" tradition is very important in the life of Mentawai people. The historical method is used in this study with a qualitative and an ethnographic approaches. The results of this research show that the abolition of "Arat Sabulungan" tradition was the coercion form of the government. However, indigenous peoples in Mentawai Islands are still active in carrying out the "Arat Sabulungan" traditions in cultural, ritual, and ceremonial customs. "Arat Sabulungan", as belief system, has still existed in the life of the Mentawai indigenous people. Besides other factors, such as their very strong ties to customary law, even though Protestantism, Islam, and Catholicism have become the official religion of the indigenous Mentawai people since 1954, but they still carry out the principles of living in the "Arat Sabulungan" tradition in daily life. Until now, there is still no new customary law system that is able to replace the position of "Arat Sabulungan" that they have upheld. They still think that "Arat Sabulungan" tradition is a belief system; and principles of tradition are still relevant to the culture and legal ideals of the Mentawai people.
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INTRODUCTION
Mentawai people, who live in the Mentawai Islands, have customs and religions that are different from the Minangkabau people in Padang City, West Sumatra Province, Indonesia. Minangkabau is identified with Islam, while Mentawai people mostly adhere to Protestant Christianity 50%, Catholicism 35%, and Islam 15% (BPS Kabkep Mentawai, 2010; Ayun, 2018; and Firdaus, 2018). Mentawai people have the tradition of Arat Sabulungan, whose rituals use tattoos in the process. However, the government policy abolished the Arat Sabulungan tradition, because it was considered a tattoo of self-harm that performed rituals (Coronese, 1986;
This tradition as an ethnic or endigenous symbol in various regions of the Indonesian archipelago. Tradition is a particular ethnicity that can be maintained in certain regions. But, sometimes, tradition is considered a problem for the government. Along with the process of extinction of tattoos, which is a ritual art of Arat Sabulungan, due to the insistence of the dominant culture outside. This influence can also be referred to as “coercion” culture (Schefold & Beierle, 2000; Delfi, 2013; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a, 2017c and 2018).

The root of all traditional Mentawai cultures is Arat Sabulungan, which is used as a living guide for the Mentawai people. But, in 1954, Arat Sabulungan was abolished from the Mentawai islands, especially in Sioban Village, South Sipora Subdistrict, and all the ceremonial equipment was destroyed by the Police (Sihombing, 1979; Mulhadi, 2007 and 2008; Henry, 2012; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a).

The condition of Mentawai traditional culture is naturally shaky, everything related to Arat Sabulungan, one of them is tattooed, displaced. The exhortation of the outside culture driven by the government, to eliminate the Arat Sabulungan tradition, was caused by the opinion that the indigenous Mentawai customs hampered the development process that was being promoted by the government at that time (Roza, 1994 and 1997; Henry, 2012; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a).

For the Mentawai people, tattoos are the spirit of life. Tattoos have four positions in the Mentawai community, one of which is to show identity and differences in social status or profession. Sikerei shaman tattoos, for example, are different from hunting experts. Hunt experts are known for drawing captive animals, such as pigs, deer, monkeys, birds, or crocodiles. Sikerei is known from stellar tattoos all over the body. Besides that, tattoos also have a function as a symbol of natural balance. Therefore, objects such as stones, animals, and plants must be enshrined above the body. However, in its development in the Mentawai islands, especially in Sioban Village, South Sipora Subdistrict, the meaning and function of traditional Mentawai tattoos has changed or expanded meaning, so the existence of tattoos in Sioban Village, South Sipora Subdistrict is threatened with extinction (Loeb, 1929; Ermayanti, 1988; Lindsay, 1992; Henley & Limapornvanich, 2001; and Krutak, 2013).

The process of extinction of tattoos, which is a ritual art from Arat Sabulungan, is caused by the exhortation of the dominant external culture. From the background of the problems described above, this matter is interesting to study related to Arat Sabulungan tradition or tattoos as an ethnic/indigenous identity in Sioban Village, South Sipora Subdistrict, Mentawai Islands District (Rosa, 2011 dan 2013; Faizah, 2013; Krutak, 2013; and Listiati, 2015).

Based on the background of the above matters, in 1954, a meeting of three religions was held, namely Protestant Christianity, Islam, and Arat Sabulungan. At the meeting, Arat Sabulungan was officially removed and the Mentawai people were required to choose one of the religions at the time, namely: Protestantism or Islam. With the abolition of Arat Sabulungan, the Mentawai culture began to be threatened, especially the tattoo culture in Sioban Village, South Sipora Subdistrict (Naim, 1977; Abidin, 1997; Delfi, 2005 dan 2013; and Giffar, 2016).

Because Arat Sabulungan is the essence of essential culture, this change occurs because the policy issued by the government means to overhaul the mentality of all cultures in the Mentawai islands (Coronese, 1986:37; Delfi, 2013; Giffar, 2016; and Yulia Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a and 2017c). In connection with this, the purpose of this study is to analyze the improvement of government policy on the prohibition of Arat Sabulungan tradition in Sioban Village, South Sipora Subdistrict.

To make the research focused, it can be formulated into the basic questions of the research. They are: (1) Why does Arat Sabulungan artificial tradition as an ethnic/indigenous identity?; and (2) What are the solutions to overcome the problems?

On the Government Policy. Policy is
basically decisions or choices of actions that directly regulate the management and distribution of natural, financial, and human resources for the public interest, namely the people, the population, the community, or citizens (Colley & Price, 2008; Rizal, 2009; Gupta et al., 2011; and Indriati, 2015). Some circles define policies only as official documents, such as legislation and government regulations; and some define policies as guidelines, references, strategies, and action frameworks that are chosen or defined as a government outline or roadmap in carrying out development activities (Hardee et al., 2004; Rizal, 2009; and Indriati, 2015).

Government policy in the Arat Sabulungan tradition is an analysis of the study of the prohibition of tattoo traditions in Sioban Village, South Sipora Subdistrict, Mentawai Islands District. The government is not only in the sense of government, in the sense that it only concerns the state apparatus, but also governance that touches various forms of institutions, both private, business, and civil society (Zakaria, 1996; Schefold, 1998; and Delfi, 2015).

Public policy analysis is the science that produces information relevant to public policy. Public policy analysis products are advice. The policy taken will have certain social costs and benefits. This policy can be relatively beneficial to a group and is relatively detrimental to other groups. Policy problems consist of market failure, government failure, and distribution problems. Policy problems are influenced by external factors that are mainly influenced by globalization; and internal factors that are mainly influenced by human capabilities. Public policy is influenced by social, cultural, economic, and environmental factors. To help make public policy alternatives, a policy model can be used (cf. Persoon, 2004; Fafard, 2008; and Kamaruddin, 2013).

**On the Value Change.** This change in value for tattoos is very much influenced also by the cultural constructions adopted by the community. Tattoos that were originally only used as symbols of power and social standing, until finally tattoos, were used as fashion trends. So, the assessment that the tattoo is good or bad depends on the existing social conditions (Hammons, 2010; Cesare, 2011; and Larsen, Patterson & Markham, 2014).

According to Selo Soemardjan (1981), social change is all changes in social institutions in a society that affect its social system including values, attitudes, and behavioral patterns in society (Soemardjan, 1981:56). Existing community groups will experience change. This is in accordance with the perspective of the evolutionary theory of society, which will always experience a change from the traditional lifestyle to a more complex life (cf. Soemardjan, 1981; Ranjabar, 2015; and Saebani, 2016).

Pertaining the conceptual framework for this study, see graphic 1.

**METHOD**

This type of research is a qualitative approach using an ethnographic method (Thorne, 2000; Larsen, 2007; and Reeves, Kuper & Hodges, 2008), especially an ethnographic method to knowing in depth about government policies on Arat Sabulungan tradition. Interviews were also done with Head of South Siberut Subdistrict, Sioban Village Head, Matotonan Village Head, Mentawai Community Leaders; and Padang Pariaman District Officials in West Sumatera, Indonesia. This is all based on the perspectives of the community, who owns the tradition. This interviews have been carried out since 2017.

The research was carried out in
Sioban Village, South Sipora Subdistrict, Mentawai Islands. Data collection techniques used are observation and in-depth interviews by making interview guidelines, and recording devices. Information obtained from the results of observations and interviews will be written in the field notes. Here are two field notes used, namely: objective notes and effective records (Suzuki, 1958; Sjamsuddin, 2007; Daliman, 2012; Towner, 2016; and Windiani & Nurul, 2016).

In addition, the validity of the data is tested by using the method and source triangulation, so that the data can be truly trusted valid. Data analysis in qualitative research is the process of arranging data sequences, organizing into a pattern, and category and basic unit description, in line with S.J. Taylor & R. Bogdan (1984) and also A.L. Strauss (1987), who explained that data analysis in qualitative research is a process that details formal efforts to determine themes and formulate a hypothesis (cf Taylor & Bogdan, 1984; Strauss, 1987; Bryman & Burgess eds., 2002; and Reeves, Kuper & Hodges, 2008).

Thus, it means that the writers analyze data, in this case, is to organize, sort, group, code, and categorize them. The flow in analyzing this data is by reducing, analyzing reports, and verifying reports. Lastly, the writers use the documentation studies in the implementation of the *Arat Sabulungan* traditional ceremony; and makes it in the form of a documentary film (cf Atkinson & Flint, 2001; Charmaz, 2006; Henry, 2012; and Panjaitan, 2017).

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

*Mentawai Government Policy Against the Ban on Arat Sabulungan Tradition in Sioban Village, South Sipora Subdistrict.*

The policy of the Mentawai government, after 1954, was to create a program implementation strategy by developing a series of settlements by conducting the PKMT (*Pemukiman Kembali Masyakarat Terasing* or Resettlement of Isolated Communities). PKMT is considered by the government as a form of isolated development and welfare of the people (Erwin, 1997; Delfi, 2015; and Panjaitan, 2017:52-53).

Their homes are built in accordance with uniform designs in areas categorized beside rivers or beaches. They are forced to leave their *uma* or house. *Uma* is a relationship for cultural ceremonies, rituals, and storage of all that is sacred. Their *uma* is a type of “long house” built to house all clans (eight or more nuclear families) at one time, which is very necessary during the ceremony. *Uma* is also the term used when referring to the whole group and ancestral land to move (Nooy-Palm, 1968; Roza, 1994 and 1997; Rudito, 2005; and Hernawati, 2007). See figure 1.

However, due to this program after five years, this settlement was removed from the government project. The local government instead maintains cultural progress and change. Besides that, starting to enter
logging companies began to appear throughout the Mentawai Islands. This is the beginning of forest destruction and local cultural traditions (Mitchell & Tilson, 1986; Zakaria, 1996; Erwin, 1997; Persoon, 2003; Eindhoven, 2009; and Panjaitan, 2017).

For the Padang Pariaman District government, which used to be the capital of the Mentawai District, stated that the central government policy in 1954 was considered appropriate to abolish the Arat Sabulungan tradition (Persoon, 2002; Delfi, 2013; Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a; and Giffar, 2016). This was the reason, according to Rosihan Anwar, Head of the Padang Pariaman District Administration Office, that Arat Sabulungan was a body tattoo conducted by the Chief of Sekerei tribe; and this is considered to be hurting themselves, so that this tradition is naturally prohibited (cf Persoon, 1987; Ermayanti, 1988; Henley & Limapornvanich, 2001; and interview with Respondent A, 13/6/2017).

Almost all of the interviewees stated that the policy of the central government was the right policy, because the Arat Sabulungan was a tradition that was indeed worth abolishing if it would hurt the owner of the tradition. This is like what Elfis Candra, as Respondent B, posted in an interview, as following here:

Thus, the policy of the central government is considered to be a natural occurrence of the abolition of this tradition, because it is considered as hurting the people who own tradition (interview with Respondent B, 20/6/2017).

However, from the description that the writers revealed above, this is in contrast if seen from the implementation of tradition and how important of Arat Sabulungan is for the Mentawai people, because this is ingrained for them. If viewed...
historically, the tradition of *Arat Sabulungan* is the most important thing in every breath of life of the Mentawai people (Coronese, 1986; Reeves, 2009; Delfi, 2013; Krutak, 2013; Giffar, 2016; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a and 2017c). See pictures 1, 2, and 3.

The Mentawai people always look for the ultimate truth from their ancestors. They interact with nature and know what nature really wants. This is where the importance of the *Arat Sabulungan* tradition for the Mentawai people, because this tradition always reflects the form of nature that is considered to have life and life. *Alam* or nature is considered to be able to provide something useful for humans and can at times be angry if this tradition is lost in the land of Mentawai. So, the Mentawai people, in their actions, are always controlled by abstinence (Reeves, 1999 and 2009; Firdaus, 2018; Pakan, 2018; interview with Respondent B, 20/6/2017; and interview with Respondent C, 27/6/2017).

**Improvement of Government Policy on the Elimination of Arat Sabulungan Tradition.** The abolition of *Arat Sabulungan* tradition is almost the same as that of coercion, but indigenous peoples are still actively practicing the cultural heritage, rituals, and ceremonial customs which are limited to a very small population of indigenous groups, mainly located around *Sarereiket* and *Sakuddei* areas in the South Siberut, Mentawai Islands (Coronese, 1986; Ermayanti, 1988; Reeves, 1999; Henley & Limapornvanich, 2001; Hammons, 2010; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017c).

*Arat Sabulungan* belief still has existence in the life of the Mentawai indigenous people. This tradition still exists in the village population, who live on Siberut Island. There is a far inland in this island. Besides other factors, such as their very strong ties to customary law. Even though Protestantism, Islam, and Catholicism have become the official religion of indigenous Mentawai people since 1954, nevertheless they still carry out the principles of life in the *Arat Sabulungan* tradition in daily life (Schefold & Beierle, 2000; Delfi, 2005 and 2013; Reeves, 2009; Panjaitan, 2017; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017c).
Until now, there is still no new customary law system that is able to replace the position of Arat Sabulungan that they have upheld. They still believe that Arat Sabulungan is largely relevant to the culture and legal ideas of the Mentawai people (Johansen, 2008; Delfi, 2013; Zulfa & Kaksim, 2014; Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a; interview with Respondent C, 27/6/2017; and interview with Respondent D, 3/7/2017).

This was a problem in 1954. This belief was banned by the government in that time. The government ordered one of the five religions was officially recognized by the government, at that time only two religions were entered in Mentawai Islands, namely Protestant and Islamic religion (Schefold, 1998; Cohen, 2001; Mulhadi, 2007 and 2008; Delfi, 2013; Panjaitan, 2017; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a). But these efforts turned out to produce results. These efforts still also have to be followed by a variety of tactics and strategies until the end of the 1970s, making the Mentawai people overwhelmed to maintain their consistency, slowly they begin to abandon their beliefs and accept them (Panjaitan, 2017; Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017b; Ayun, 2018; interview with Respondent E, 10/7/2017; and interview with Respondent F, 17/7/2017).

The government and missionaries share the same opinion in the Arat Sabulungan, that is a form of a religious tribal system that exists in Mentawai Islands, so it is not appropriate to live or be embraced by the Mentawai people today. Therefore, it is not wrong to be removed from the lives of the Mentawai people. In this effort, it seems very obvious that the government and missionaries are collaborating (shoulder to shoulder) to eliminate the influence of Arat Sabulungan from the Mentawai earth. At the present time, the majority of Mentawai people embrace Protestant Christianity, and some are Catholics and Muslims. Even so, most of the Mentawai people in Siberut are still adhere to their original religions, namely Arat Sabulungan (Rudito, 1993:62; Mulhadi, 2007; Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017c; interview with Respondent A, 13/6/2017; and interview with Respondent B, 20/6/2017).

Arat Sabulungan, for the Mentawai people, is an integral part of other schools of belief or kebatinan, and the juridical basis for the abolition of Arat Sabulungan coincides with the elimination of other forms of belief or kebatinan in Indonesia (Mulhadi, 2008; Agnes, 2013; Delfi, 2013; and Resmarias, 2015). In the 1945 Constitution, there is only one chapter on religion, if indeed the name of kepercayaan or “belief” has its own meaning outside of religion, certainly in Chapter XI, it is not only called “Religion” but “Religion and Belief” (cf Hamidi & Abadi, 2001; Mulhadi, 2007 and 2008; and Rahmah & Sudrajat, 2009).

It was only after 33 years of independence, in 1978, that the authorities arbitrarily paralleled “religion” with “belief” that in the 1945 Constitution no one knew him. In this context, Mohamad Hatta, well known as Bung Hatta, as one of the proclaimers of Indonesian independence, who was still alive at that time, when the horrendous “flow of belief” was raised, confirmed to the PPP (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan or Political Party of Development Unity)’s delegation that what was meant by the word of kepercayaan or “belief” contained in Article 29, Paragraph 2 of the 1945 Constitution, was “belief” in religion (Jones, 2005; Ahsan, 2017; and Aryono, 2018).

The 1945 Constitution, so Bung Hatta knew exactly what the words meant, based on his explanation, it could be said that the New Order government (1966-1998) had twisted the meaning of the 1945 Constitution. In addition, the forced “flow of belief” into the GBHN (Garis-garis Besar Haluan Negara of Broad Outlines of the Nation’s Direction) showed that the New Order government had committed blasphemy, violating the Republic of Indonesia’s Presidential Decree No.1 in 1965; and violated Article 156a of the Criminal Code, because the New Order government had done an action “with the intention that people do not adhere to any religion, which is based on the Supreme Lord” (Hatta, 1983; Hamidi & Abadi, 2001; and Noer, 2002).

Unlike Bung Hatta, Koentjaraningrat (1981) distinguished between “religion” and “belief”. According to him, religion
is all religious systems that are officially recognized by the state. A term used to refer to religions that are officially recognized by countries, such as Islam, Catholicism, Protestantism, Buddhism, and Hinduism. Whereas “belief” has a distinctive meaning, that is all religious systems that are outside that category or not yet recognized by the state as “religion” (*cf* Hatta, 1983; Koentjaraningrat, 1981:137 and 141-142; Noer, 2002; Bandung, 2009; and Call, 2012). Actually, the suggestion that this “flow of belief” be stopped was implied in the President Soeharto’s speech in 1978, which essentially said that:

[…] the school of belief is not a religion and must be returned to the followers of its religion. Do not let this flow of belief lead to a new religion. But seeing its development, from 1973 until now, the flow of belief has flourished, so it is very worrying (Soeharto, 1991).

The abolition of Arat Sabulungan’s belief is not related to government policy pertaining to the elimination of beliefs or kebatinan schools, which are considered disturbing religious life, society, and nation. This movement began during the Soekarno administration, through the Prime Minister Ali Sastroamidjojo, served in 1953-1955, namely the establishment of an Interdepartmental Committee on Beliefs in the Community, abbreviated as “Interdep Pakem Committee”, with Decree No.167/PROMOSI/1954 (Mulhadi, 2007 and 2008; Delfi, 2013; Panjaitan, 2017; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a).

The Committee was chaired by R.H.K. Sosrodanukusumo, Head of Office of the Attorney General’s Investigation Center at the Supreme Court, with the following duties: (1) to study and investigate the form, style, and purpose of beliefs in the community along with the ways of marriage that occur in the community; and (2) consider proposing to the Government, the Regulations/Laws which regulate what is stated in Article 1 above and limit it to the tranquility of decency and welfare in a democratic society in accordance with the provisions in Article 33 of the Provisional Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (*cf* Baso, 2004; and Mulhadi, 2007 and 2008).

Based on Decree No.167/PROMOTION/1954, the government of the Republic of Indonesia, through the Attorney General’s Office, conducts supervision, investigation, and even prohibition on all forms of existing and developing beliefs in the community, which are deemed incompatible or contrary to the provisions of the government at that time, which only recognizes some religions. The presence of these belief streams along with the ways in which their marriages have also caused unrest among the public, so the government was forced to bring them to order (Baso, 2004; Mulhadi, 2007 and 2008; Delfi, 2013; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a).

That is why at the peak there were actions that led to coercion, so that the community was told to choose one of the official religions recognized by the government. This condition was also experienced by the Mentawai people with the Three Religions Meeting in 1954, which essentially ordered the Mentawai people who still adhered to Arat Sabulungan (within three months) to renounce their beliefs and choose one of the government-recognized religions, at that time there was only Islam and Protestant religion (Mulhadi, 2007 and 2008; Delfi, 2013; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a).

For those who do not heed the order, the government through its peace maintenance will destroy and burn all means of worship, including all accessories (symbols) that smell primitive. The pressure, threats, and coercion continued until the end of the 1970s, as stated by Reimar Schefold (1998) following here:

… in the Soekarno era, the Mentawaians hardly corresponded to the image of the Indonesian national personality, and everything was tried to adapt to it as soon as possible. In 1954, a decree was promulgated prohibiting their tradition religion, which was said to be heathen; all the inhabitants were given three months to decide whether they wanted to covert to Christianity or to Islam. Anyone who does not choose within this period is threatened with punishment by the mission teachers, and his equipment was burned ….

At the same time, external features such as glass beaded jewelry, the long hair, loincloths,
tattoos, and the custom of chiseling the incisors to a point were forbidden as marks of Indonesian primitiveness (Schefield, 1998).

On the other hand, Soekarno’s political will to change the way of life of the Mentawai people towards Indonesia’s national personality, that is equal to that of other Indonesian people, is considered very good. But, some people view acts of extermination and burning of cultural objects as excessive actions, because they are genuine basic personality suppression by deliberately eliminating the characteristics (identity) of the Mentawai people to immediately adopt the national personality desired by the authorities, which is not necessarily in accordance with the Mentawai people at that time (Zakaria, 1996; Hauser-Schaublin ed., 2013; and Ayum, 2018).

The issuance of Decree No.167/PROMOSI/1954, actually, does not stand alone, but is a follow-up to the provisions of Article 18 and Article 43 of the 1945 Constitution. Article 18, for example, states that the authorities give equal protection to all recognized religious associations. Whereas Article 43 states that the authorities supervise all religious associations, and the associations should obey the law including unwritten legal rules (Baso, 2004; Mulhadi, 2007 and 2008; Delfi, 2013; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a).

From the sound of Article 18 above, it is clear that the authorities only provide protection to all recognized religious associations. Not including other beliefs that are outside the official religion of the government. If the religious association carry out practices that threaten the stability of the state, even though the alliance or association is related to one of the religions recognized by the government, it will be destroyed because it is considered not to obey the unwritten law and law. So, the provisions of Article 43 of UUDS (Undang-Undang Dasar Sementara or Provisional Constitution) 1950 are very elastic and have a very wide range in accordance with the wishes of the authorities (Mulhadi, 2007; Sudarto, 2017; and Erl, 2018).

Sociologically and juridically, the formation of this committee was initially a means of controlling the many emerging forms of belief in society, along with various forms of marriage in some areas carried out by followers of the faith in their own ways. But, politically, the presence of a variety of beliefs, plus a very strong element of regionalism (cf. Geertz, 1973; Hufford, 2005; Mulhadi, 2007; and Sudarto, 2017).

Concern (fear) of the authorities will appear undermining or threatening the stability and integrity of the NKRI (Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia or Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia). To streamline these countermeasures efforts, in 1958, the Attorney General’s Office formed the Section of the Religion and Community Belief Movement, which later, in 1960, the institution was upgraded to become the Bureau of Religion with the task of coordinating the task of overseeing the belief streams in the community along with other government agencies for religious and public order purposes (Mulhadi, 2008; Delfi, 2013; Faizah, 2013; and Indriastuti, 2017).

In order to create peace in the community, this institution was later expanded to become a national reach, established in each province and district, through circular of the Department of Prosecutor’s Office, Central Bureau No.34/Pakem/S.E./1961, dated on 7 April 1961, concerning instructions for the establishment of Batasan Pakem (Customary Restriction) in each province and in the regions. This letter was signed by the Minister or Attorney General, Mr. R. Goenawan, and was addressed to all High Prosecutors/Coordinators of the State Court Prosecutors throughout Indonesia. Among the tasks of the Pakem Division are to follow, pay attention, monitor the movements and developments of all religious movements, all schools of belief or kebatinan, examine or study books of religious brochures or schools of belief, both from within and overseas, for the sake of public interest and order (Baso, 2004; Mulhadi, 2007 and 2008; Delfi, 2013; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a).

In the Attorney General’s Instruction No.1/Instr/Secr/1963, dated on February 5, 1963, concerning Settlement of Problems in the Field of Prosecutor’s Expertise, further
explained the tasks of Pakem. These tasks have the core of supervision directed at the symptoms that can hinder the course of development, such as: (1) teachings/movements that can cause public order/security disturbances; (2) teachings/movements that can harm the followers or society in general in the mental/spiritual and material fields; and (3) in the event that a religious movement/belief stream shows signs and tendencies towards error, the Pakem Team must take precautionary measures (Baso, 2004; Mulhadi, 2007; and Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017a).

Actually, there is no recognized and unrecognized religious term or official and unofficial religions in Indonesia. This misperception occurred because of the Minister of Home Affairs’ Decree, in 1974, concerning the filling of a religious column in a KTP (Kartu Tanda Penduduk or Identity Card) that only stated the five religions. But, the Decree was annulled during the time of President Abdurrahman Wahid (2001-2002), because it was considered to be contrary to Article 29 of the 1945 Constitution concerning religious freedom (Eindhoven, 2007 and 2009; Mulhadi, 2007; Sihombing et al., 2008; and Sudarto, 2017).

As an illustration, in the mid-September 2004, the USA (United States of America) Department of Foreign Affairs issued a report on the level of international religious freedom. Data made in the Spain, on 1 July 2003 to 30 June 2004, and shows that Asia dominates the “black list” of countries with a low level of freedom of variety. In the report, China, North Korea, Myanmar, Vietnam, Cuba, and Laos are categorized as very alarming countries, which practice authoritarianism and totalitarianism in controlling and limiting the religious freedom. China, for example, is accused of carrying out repressive actions against Tibetan Buddhist Monks, Uighur Muslims, Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Falun Gong sects. While Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan are categorized as countries that are hostile to minority groups or unofficial religions. These countries are considered apprehensive, because they continue to be involved in various systematic violations of religious freedom (Donnelly, 2005; Wilde, 2008; and Sudarto, 2017).

Meanwhile, Indonesia, Bangladesh, India, and Sri Lanka are classified as countries that ignore social discrimination or torture against religious minorities (AI, 2016; and Skanthakumar & Juanda eds., 2016). Especially for Indonesia, discrimination, among others, appears in policy in which the government only recognizes 5 major religions. People who do not embrace the “official religions” often get discriminatory treatment from the state, such as in marriage and birth registration (Fasya et al., 2015; Puspandari, 2015; and AI, 2016).

Indigenous groups or traditional religious adherents, such as Sikerei, should not be treated discriminatively, because they are considered “non-religious”, while all forms of public services often make religion a “key”. That is without mentioning “official religion”, people will have difficulty obtaining civil rights, such as service to get the KTP (Kartu Tanda Penduduk or Identity Cards), marriage records, and so on. Various legal discriminations above were tried to be eliminated through Law No.23 of 2006 concerning Population Administration (Ermayanti, 1988; Binawan, 2011; Crouch, 2012; and Agnes, 2013).

This can be seen in Article 2 of Law No.23 of 2006, which recognizes or grants rights to each resident, without distinguishing status, religion, citizens, etc., to obtain: (1) population documents; (2) the same services in population registration and civil registration; (3) protection of personal data; (4) legal certainty over ownership of documents; (5) information regarding data on the results of the population and civil registration of the person and his/her family; and (6) compensation and restoration of good names as a result of errors in the registration of residents and civil registration, and misuse of personal data by the implementing agency (Syahayani, 2017; and DHI, 2013).1

Although juridically the existence of the “belief” stream or aliran kepercayaan/kebatinan, including traditional beliefs, has not received its proper place in Indonesia, nevertheless the presence of Law No.23 of 2006 has provided a glimmer of hope for followers of the “belief system” to breathe a sigh of relief, at least they can enjoy civil rights that have not been fully enjoyed like the followers of major religions in Indonesia (Crouch, 2012; Presiden RI, 2013; Syahayani, 2017; Yulia, Zulfa & Kaksim, 2017b; and Ayun, 2018).

**CONCLUSION**

The Arat Sabulungan tradition, as an ethnic or indigenic identity, can survive in the face of the Mentawai government policy. This tradition can understand and interpret the surrounding environment, which consists of patterns of interaction of humans, animals, plants, soil, water, air and also man-made objects. The results of this understanding are used to encourage the realization of actions that arise from people as members of the Mentawai ethnic community.

**Arat Sabulungan** is a tradition that lives in a society that includes a religious system that believes in supernatural things, such as spirits and spirits that inhabit this whole universe, be it plants, animals, soil, and artificial objects human, so that is also the cosmology of the Mentawai people. **Arat Sabulungan** cannot be equated with “belief stream” or aliran kepercayaan/kebatinan, but even so in the categorization of “beliefs” or kepercayaan/kebatinan made by the government, all animist teachings, including **Arat Sabulungan** in Mentawai Islands, are forced into the categorization.

The abolition of **Arat Sabulungan**’s belief is not related to government policy to the elimination of belief stream, which are considered to be troubling religious life, community, and nation. This movement began during the Soekarno administration (1945-1966), through Decree No.167/PROMOSI/1954. Based on this decision, the government of the Republic of Indonesia, through the Attorney General’s Office, conducted surveillance, investigation, and even prohibition on all forms of beliefs that existed and developed in the community, which were deemed inappropriate or contrary to the provisions of the government at that time, which only recognized several religions.

Improving government policy, in 2017, has made this tradition breathe a sigh of relief, because the form of public belief in Indonesia has been recognized since 2006. However, based on Decree No.23 of 2006, Article 61, paragraph (2) and Article 64, paragraph (5) of Law Number 23 Year 2006, concerning on Population Administration, and it was later amended by Law Number 24 of 2013, this was justified by the Constitutional Court’s announcement on Tuesday, November 7, 2017.²
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