

utapas already applied.
Bank of China - East Asia

MODEL J.

ARNDT

17 9 JULI 1947
15 JAN 1948

462

OT VESTIGING.

Bestuit van den Resident van Timor en
Onderhoorigheden
van 25 November 1937 No. 326.-

FX HARSONO

verleent aan THIO KAM SUTAR KAM SUTAR
van het Koninklijk Besluit van 15 October 1915 No. 32
Indië te vestigen.

**GAZING
ON**

IDENTITY

Menerawang Identitas

Gegeven te **K O E P A N G**

den 25sten NOVEMBER 1937

10/28 - 11/20, 2016

Resident van Timor en Onderhoorigheden.
Namens dezen:
De Gewestelijk Secretaris,
afwezen: De Hoofdcornities

ARNDT Fine Art Pte Ltd

Gillman Barracks, 47 Malan Road #01-25
Singapore 109444

Man as an individual has the freedom to decide their own will' is a meaningless quote. When one is declared to be valid as a citizen the freedom changed.

For the Chinese, although they were born in Indonesia, they are still considered as migrant. Apart from Indonesian Citizenship certificate, they must also have other documents, where this regulation is not applied to 'real' Indonesians.

The dichotomy of real-migrant, free-bonded, is presented in this work. The facial expressions, poses, interaction in the family that seems to be free and happy on one side; and on the other side facing legal-formal issues that specifically only applies on them. The point is, the law becomes discriminative if it applies only to suppress a community group.

FX HARSONO

**GAZING
ON
IDENTITY**

Menerawang Identitas

Colophon

GAZING ON IDENTITY

Menerawang Identitas

Solo Exhibition of FX Harsono

ARNDT Fine Art
Gillman Barracks
Singapore

20 October – 20 November 2016

Exhibition Curator

Lisa Polten

Writer

Didi Kwartanada

Text Translator

Elly Kent

Photo

FX Harsono

Design for Catalogue

Sari Handayani

Printed in Yogyakarta, Indonesia
in an edition of 500

©2016, FX. Harsono and the author

ARNDT

Didi Kwartanada

THE PAPERS THAT SURVEILLED

Identity Cards and Suspicion of the Chinese

From time to time, the slip of paper featuring passport photos and personal details, which we usually call an “identity card” (Ind: *kartu identitas*), becomes the subject on national debate. During the New Order (1966-1998), citizenship cards (known as the “Kartu Tanda Penduduk”/KTP in Indonesia) belonging to former political prisoners (Ind: *tahanan politik* or simply “tapol”) were stamped with a special code, as were those belonging to ethnic Chinese. Government officials could immediately ascertain the identity of former political prisoners or those of Chinese descent by looking at the “KTP” number. As the regime changed and we entered the 21st century, special codes were abandoned, and a new era began: the e-KTP or electronic KTP – made from plastic rather than paper – was programmed by the Department of Internal Affairs at the beginning of the 2010s. This medium attracted no less controversy, beginning with the prohibition of photocopying the cards, the erasure of the religion column, claims of interference from foreign intelligence agencies, a lack of transparency in the tender process; controversy continues even today.

Blitar-born artist FX Harsono has not been left behind in these controversies over the Indonesian identity card, although on a more specific level, namely in relation to Chinese identity. This brief essay will attempt to provide some historical background to the relationship between this minority group and the identity cards, especially during the Dutch colonial era.¹

¹ For further discussion of the Chinese identity card during the Japanese occupation, please see Kwartanada (2013).

The construction of the Chinese as “the Problem”

Alongside efforts to control the Indies at the end of the 19th century, the Dutch government began to pay more serious attention to any elements that might pose a threat to their legitimacy. One real threat was what they referred to as “Foreign Oriental” groups: Chinese, Japanese and Muslim “foreigners” (especially Arabs and Turks).²

The authorities in Batavia and The Hague were continuously worried and suspicious that the Asians were drug smugglers, money forgers and were bringing in large quantities of illegal arms across the border. The Dutch were very conscious that they were in the minority compared to the numbers of these ethnic groups, especially outside of Java (Tagliacozzo 2007: 128).

Of all the groups of “Foreign Orientals” the Chinese attracted the most suspicion from the Dutch, because in terms of sheer numbers, they were the largest. The end of the 19th century was marked with a rise in *singkeh* (new migrants from China). Although they seemed very different to the locally born Chinese descendants (known as *peranakan*), the Dutch indiscriminately put them under the “*Chinezen*” category in the census. Table 1 shows the rapid development of the Chinese community at the end of the 19th century, especially due to an increase in female immigrants.

Alongside increased concern and suspicion, the image of the “evil” Chinese in the Dutch East Indies proliferated in the 19th century. During the campaign

Table 1.

The Rise of the Chinese Population in the Dutch East Indies 1860-1900

Year	Chinese Population		
	Male	Female	Total
1860	88.250	52.033	221.438
1880	212.213	131.580	343.793
1885	241.742	140.010	381.752
1890	308.693	152.396	461.089
1895	309.859	159.665	469.524
1900	347.004	190.312	537.316

Source: Departement van Economische Zaken (ed.), *Volkstelling 1930 Deel VII*. Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1935, p. 48.

2. The term “Foreign Oriental” used by the Dutch seems absurd, even to the Dutch themselves. Firstly, long before the Dutch knew there was an island called Java, many Chinese and Arab people were living there. Secondly, it was no problem for the newly arrived Chinese or Arabs to be called “Foreign Orientals”. However this phrase was not at all appropriate for those of Chinese or Arab descent who had lived in the Indies for hundreds of years. Imagine if the Jewish in the Netherlands were also classed as “Foreign Orientals”? Finally, it should have been the Dutch who were referred to as “Foreign Occidentals” (*Vreemde Westelingen*), on this land of the native born Javanese. (Kwartanada 2011: 43).

for the pacification of West Borneo, the Dutch military commander called the Chinese "the most immoral of all immoral nations" who would "only listen to force" to mend their ways (Moor 1989: 59). Another officer acknowledged the importance of the Chinese, but at the same time derided them: "If it weren't for the Chinese, we would have missed out on a lot of things, but still we despised those dog-eaters" (Dharmowijono 2001: 226). Dutch writers further entrenched this negative image in their fictional stories of life in the Dutch East Indies. "Villainous" (Dutch: *aterling*) and "sly" (*sluw*) were two of the stereotypes generally applied to ethnic Chinese in the novels of the Dutch East Indies at the end of the colonial period (Dharmowijono 2004: 161-173).

Thus it is not surprising that supporters of Ethical Policy deliberately painted a "negative picture of the involvement of the Chinese in a wide range of economic fields" (Dharmowijono 2004: 171). This was related to their role as middlemen in economic life: active in trade, loan financing, opium and tax farming, as well as other "pariah" activities that were seen as "dirty work" by the Javanese and the Europeans (see Carey 2015). The flood of Chinese immigrants caused the Dutch to join in the outcry against the *het Gele Gevaar* or the "yellow peril" as it had come to be known in English. Even worse, in 1891 J.J.M de Groot, the great Leiden sinologist lamented that "their train of thought, internal lives, their religion, morals, and customs, the ancestral practices which are the chief driving force of all they do-- all of this is still a closed book to us" (Tagliacozzo 2007: 131). In short, all of this ignorance led to the construction of the Chinese as "*the problem*" in all this chaos. However, according to research from Cornell University historian Eric Tagliacozzo (2007: 132) this Dutch phobia was most excessive. He writes "The Chinese in all of these context were clearly not a threat to the development of colonial states". In fact they were far too busy with rivalry and competition amongst themselves, Tagliacozzo says.

Paper: An Effective Medium for Surveillance

How to supervise all of these people that the colonial government saw as unmanageable? In his masterpiece on smuggling on the border with Straits Settlements during the colonial era, Tagliacozzo (2007: 129-130) says there were three methods of control.

Firstly: through the regulation of residential zones and the implementation of travel permits between areas (*passenstelsel* and *wijkenstelsel*), which limited the flexibility of movement and mobility among Chinese traders. **Secondly,** they forced Chinese business people to keep books in a language that the government could understand (including Malay in Romanised script), alongside their original records. Finally, they were given complex legal statuses. On the one hand the Chinese, as “Foreign Orientals”, were legally equivalent to the native population. However in court and in matters of trade, they were equivalent to Europeans. Although the authorities claimed that all these steps were taken to protect local residents, the real reason was the Dutch fear of ethnic Chinese, and all this at the same time as they were solidifying their power in the Indies (Tagliacozzo 2007: 129). Here please permit me to add a fourth aspect: surveillance through identity cards.

One source says that as early as 25 July 1740 the VOC (Dutch East Indies Company) authorities had determined that all Chinese were obliged to carry a residency permits (*permissie-briefjes*). Within three days, Chinese who wanted to stay in Java or outside of Java had to obtain permission from authorities (Sugiasuti 2003: 270). The VOC's bankruptcy in due to corruption 1798 was followed by the birth of the Dutch East Indies – with the interruption of English government from 1811-1816 – which increasingly tightened colonial control over residency permits by introducing the statute book/ Staatsblad. (Stb.) 1863 no. 83; Stb. 1872 no. 40 and Stb. 1875 no. 103 (Sugiasuti 2003: 270). It seems that the administration of these residency permits was quite long and complicated:

Letters requesting residency permits had to be submitted to the Dutch East Indies through the Resident. The time between the submission of a request and the release of notice of decision was quite long, approximately 40 to 50 days. This was not only due to the process itself – it took three or four detailed inspections before the application could be submitted to the post office – but also because hundreds of residency permit applications were received every month (Sugiasuti 2003: 272).

On the matter of the artefacts then, when did the “modern” identity card – with the invention photography and fingerprint technology – come into use?

Adam McKeown, a professor in global history from the University of Columbia presented an interesting study of what he called the “globalisation of borders” in his book *Melancholy Order* (2008). He argued that the use of passports, photographs and fingerprints to document (read: monitor!) migrants occurred through a process from the 1880s to the 1920s, when white colonisers wanted to regulate Asian migration. The regulation of borders created a situation “in which migration regulation is directed at the individual migrant, nation-states became the authority of border control, and everyone in the world accepts the right and legitimacy of each nation-state to restrict who may enter its borders or not” (Kwee 2011: 174).

According to McKeown’s explanation, in general during the heyday of Dutch colonial government, there were three kinds of “modern” identity card for the Chinese, which existed from the end of the 19th century through to the transfer of sovereignty in 1949 (Soentjaja, 1954: 46):

- (1) the entry permit (Dutch: *toelatingskaart*);
- (2) residency permit (*vergunning tot vestiging*, known by the Chinese as “ongji”³); and
- (3) notice of residency (*verklaring van ingezetenschap*). This document came in two forms, one for those born in the East Indies and one for those born elsewhere.

3. The term “ongji” originates from Hokkien dialect, which means “the king’s paper”. Why was it called this? Because at the top of the letter, there was a picture of the Dutch crown. This permit cost F. 150, (guilders) for a male immigrant, and F. 50, - for female immigrants (Setiono, 2008: 41 note 48).



image 1

Let us consider these one by one. Image 1 is a *toelatingskaart* belonging to a four year old girl – “*de Chineesche vr/vrouw*”/ Chinese female – named Oeij Be, born in Tjiang Tjioe (currently: Zhangzhou) in southern Fujian, China. This card was issued in Cirebon (West Java) in February 1905 with the certification of the assistant resident. This entry permit notes that previously Oeij Be had lived in Singapore and that, in January of the same year,

she had landed in Cirebon on the boat Poh Ien. Her arrival was facilitated by a certain Oei Keng, whose familial relationship to Oeij Be is unknown. The child appears in a photo on the lap of a young woman wearing classic Chinese clothing and accessories (perhaps she is her mother). Interestingly, the documents from the colonial period at the beginning of the 20th century were still valid sixty years later, in a different regime. It is noted on this document – by Cirebon Immigration Office of the Republic of Indonesia – that Oeij Be died in 1961.

Images 2a and 2b show *vergunning tot vestiging* or *ongji* from Kupang (West Timor), in the name of Thio Kam Soei, dated November 1937, signed by the Resident Secretary of Timor and surrounds. It mentions that the holder of the card is a “*Chinees Hokkian*” (Hokkien Chinese) aged 22 years, 1.68m tall, born to Thio Ho and Tan Kak in Tjoan Tjioe (in China), and working in a cafe in Waingapu (Sumba). Thio has no “distinguishing marks” (Dutch: *keentekenen*) on his body. It also mentions that he travelled to Hongkong on ship Tjitjalengka in 1940. All of the Thio’s identifying features are listed on this cloth card. His most recent photo from 1956 is attached, with additional information regarding this. Finally, an immigration official has noted that Thio died in 1966, and his death certificate is also attached.



image 2a and 2b

Verklaring van ingezetenschap issued to those born outside of the Dutch East Indies can be seen in image 3a and 3b. Appearing on this one is Go Ka Leng, a six year old “*Chinees*” child who lived in Surabaya with his parents (his place of birth is not listed, but it is certainly overseas). This document is dated May

1941 and was released by the Assistant Resident of Surabaya. The information contained on it is almost the same as that found on *ongji*. However this one is more technologically sophisticated, because it features three fingerprints from the card-holder and since he is a minor, also from his father. As in the documents discussed earlier, Go's identity card was still valid as an official document – and as an instrument of control – during the subsequent regime. Added to this one is that in 1958 Go married his partner. Further, three years later, it is also noted that Go was given an S.K.K.A (Ind: *Surat Keterangan Kependudukan Asing/Foreign Resident Notice*), which indicates he was a foreign citizen.



(image 3a and 3b)

From the three examples given above, these colonial documents fulfilled their surveillance well. The same effective system continued to be implemented during subsequent eras by the government of the Republic of Indonesia.

Having sufficient employment was one of the main requirements for consideration in the issuing of residency permits. Those who could not fulfil this requirement were rejected and deported to their home towns in China. Natasya Sugiastuti's dissertation (2003: 270-278) provides rich historical data from old newspapers on cases related to residency permits (*ongji*). In 1897 it was reported that "A Chinese person Ho Thong Kwa was ordered to immediately leave the Dutch East Indies because he had no residency permit". It appears that security agencies had conducted a raid, targeting Chinese immigrants not holding *ongji*. These repressive agency actions sometimes resulted in unfortunate decisions and tragic short-cuts. Tan Teng Kok, who had lived in his area for 18 years without an *ongji*, hanged himself because he could no longer tolerate police harassment.

In 1932, there were still reports that "on the rearmost Chinese ship departing yesterday 21 *singkeh* Chinese were expelled from Indonesia because they did not have *ongji* and did not have sufficient means to support themselves". The year before "from Tanjung Priok a 376 Chinese from Java, South Sumatra and Borneo were sent on a Chinese ship for not possessing *ongji*" (Sugiastuti 2003: 277-278).

The "king's paper" eventually became an effective instrument of surveillance, and on the other hand was also a signifier of the destiny and future of Chinese immigrants...

Conclusion

Jacques Pangemanann – a fictional character created by well known novelist Pramoedya Ananta Toer, a native intellectual who became a colonial official – imagined the Dutch East Indies as a "house of glass" (Ind: *rumah kaca*), like an aquarium where the authority "will be able to see everything". It was people like Pangemanann who "watch every movement that takes place in that house of glass", noting them and reporting them to the colonial government (Toer, 2000: 74). In this context, a piece of paper became an effective tool for the

government to monitor its subjects, those who they could never trust, living inside the "house of glass". .

The colonial government legally categorized many ethnic groups in the Dutch East Indies --based on races and color skin-- as Europeans, Foreign Orientals and Natives. This divide and conquer policy proved effective in preventing the likelihood of unity among those who could potentially endanger the power of the authorities. Thus, the racial segregation of society was strictly enforced. This policy of division also proved effective in distancing different groups from each other. Separation of these groups continues to occur today, and we should remain constantly vigilant against it. One way to do this is to learn from history, including through studying documents like the identity cards that FX Harsono addresses in his work. I hope you enjoy your contemplations. ***

Jakarta, 20 September 2016

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carey, Peter. 2015. *Orang Cina, Bandar Tol, Candu, dan Perang Jawa: Perubahan Persepsi Tentang Cina 1785 – 1825*. Revised Edition. Tr. Wazmi Alhaziri. Depok: Komunitas Bambu.

Departement van Economische Zaken (ed.). 1935. *Volkstelling 1930 Deel VII: Chineez en Andere Vreemde Oosterlingen*. Batavia: Landsdrukkerij.

Dharmowijono, Widjajanti. 2001. "Lim Ho dan Baboe Dalima: Orang Tionghoa dalam Novel Candu Karya M.T.H. Perelaer," in Yati Suhadi, Munif Yusuf, Kees Groeneboer (ed.) *Tiga Puluh Tahun Studi Belanda di Indonesia/Dertig Jaar Studie Nederlands in Indonesië*, Depok: Fakultas Sastra UI, pp. 111-117.

_____. 2004. "Natuurlijk een 'Sluwe Chinees': Chinese Aterlingen in Indische en Peranakan-Romans," in Michiel van Kempen, Piet Verkruijsse and Adrienne Zuiderweg (ed.) *Wandelaar onder de Palmen: Opstellen over Koloniale en Postkoloniale Literatuur*, Leiden: KITLV Press, pp. 161-73.

Kwartanada, Didi. 2011. "Dari 'Timur Asing' ke 'Orang Indonesia': Pemuda Tionghoa dan Arab dalam Pergerakan Nasional (1900-1942)", *Prisma*, volume 30, no 2, pp. 41-54.

_____. 2013. "Segregasi Lewat Bukti Registrasi", *Majalah Historia* (I), 13, pp. 72-75.

Kwee Hui Kian. 2011. Book review: Adam McKeown, *Melancholy Order: Asian Migration and the Globalization of Borders* (2008), *Journal of World History*, Volume 22, Number 1, March, pp. 174-177.

Moor, J. A. de (1989) "Warmakers in the Archipelago: Dutch Expeditions in Nineteenth Century Indonesia," in J. A. de Moor and H. L.Wesseling (ed.) *Imperialism and War: Essays on Colonial Wars in Asia and Africa*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 50-71.

Setiono, Benny. 2008. *Tionghoa dalam Pusaran Politik*. Jakarta: Trans Media.

Soentjaja. 1954. *Kepentingan & Kewajiban Orang Asing di Indonesia*. Malang: Madju.

Sugjastuti, Natasya Yunita. 2003. *Tradisi Hukum Cina: Negara dan Masyarakat: Studi Mengenai Peristiwa-peristiwa Hukum di Pulau Jawa Zaman Kolonial, 1870-1942*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia, Fakultas Hukum, Pascasarjana.

Tagliacozzo, Eric. 2007. *Secret Trades, Porous Borders: Smuggling and States along a Southeast Asian Frontier, 1865-1915*. Singapore: NUS Press.

Toer, Pramoedya Ananta. 2000. *Rumah Kaca*. Jakarta: Hasta Mitra.

FREEDOM LIMITED BY IDENTITY

'Humans as individuals have the freedom to determine their own desires:' this is a meaningless narrative when humans are also members of a society in which their existence is only valid if they are in possession of identity documents: documents that no longer only indicate who they are, but also their identity in terms of the social status, political status or citizenship of the identity holder. These status then limits their freedom to conduct their social, religious, educational and political activities.

Identity Documents

For the Chinese in Indonesia, whether they are born in Indonesia or not is no longer important, because they are all regarded as migrants, not locals, not native, and they are forced to hold Indonesian citizenship documents. Chinese, as migrants, require identity documents. These identity documents determine many aspects of their activities in trade and education, their rights and obligations as migrants, their citizenship status and so on.

The ancestors of the Chinese migrated in waves over thousands of years in pursuit of commerce. Records from China <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chinastate> that the ancient kingdoms in the archipelago were closely tied to the dynasties that ruled in China. This history shows that the Chinese have been present in Indonesia for many years, even longer than other Asian or European nations. However the Chinese are still not regarded as Indonesian. This is evidenced in the term "Original and Descendant Indonesian. In terms of formal jurisdiction the Chinese must register themselves as Indonesian citizens through complicated regulations. Hence we might conclude that Chinese descendants receive particular and discriminatory treatment.

Identity is History

Although they may seem to be no more than formal records, in fact identity documents can also show a person's journey: not only in relation to politics and law, but also their personal identity in the historical context the individual exists in, so that in the end all of these identity records can become a reference in the assessment of an individual's cultural journey, because this record shows where they originate from, how long they have lived in one area, what generation they are and so on.

The 'Citizenship Cards' (KTP) belonging to ethnic Chinese that I have collected over the past few years clearly demonstrate this problem. These ID cards were made from 1920 to 1942. Within these cards there are several languages: Dutch, Chinese, Indonesian in the Van Ophuijsen spelling through to Indonesian with the Revised Spelling. So too, the stamp on the cards also showed that these cards had been officially issued by the government where they arrived, be it the Dutch and Indonesian governments.

In Front of the Camera

The dichotomy between the original and the migrant, the free and the bonded, is tangible in the facial expressions and poses; interpersonal relationships between people within the family seem free, light-hearted and happy on the one hand. On the other hand they were faced with formalities, law, legislation and so on, which were reserved especially for those of Chinese descent.

Posing in front of the camera can indicate the position of the subject of the portrait; it can reflect feelings of freedom or pressure. This is caused by a number of factors.

Firstly, people are aware that they are faced with a tool that has the power to record. These kinds of tools and technologies, regarded as modern in societies that were still unfamiliar with modernization, could represent a frightening strangeness. This creates distance between the subject and the tool. The threat becomes more real when it is organized and positioned by a person behind the camera. Photographers are seen to have the power to operate the tool and also to determine the position of the subject of the photograph.

Secondly, the political consciousness of the person being photographed, that they as individuals are no more than political objects whose position in the area is determined by the authorities. There is a sense of pressure due to this consciousness that they are subject to technology and politics. So it is fitting that they are seen as objects in the face of a technology that is foreign to them, and power that determines their social and political status.

However all of this is invalid if a person comes to be photographed voluntarily for a portrait. An awareness of modern culture has minimized this concern about the threat tools that I described above. There is an interesting story, whether it be an anecdote, or a story from the reality of a society not yet familiar with modern culture, 'that a person's age will be slightly reduced every day if their portrait is taken. This is interesting not because of the silly story by modern standards, but also because it shows the alienation of a society that doesn't understand technology, and thus always feels that technology is a threat to their lives.



Undisclosed Identity

2016

Variable dimension

Installation with: 59 light boxes with LED light, digital print on duratrans film, acrylic sheet, LED running text, and 15 stools.







Piecing Together Fragments of Migration

2016

Drawing series no 1

Size: 75 X 90 cm



The Record of a Journey

2016

Oil on Canvas

Size: 164 x 123 cm, diptych



De vingerafdruk (afdruk der middelste dr.
kerhand) zal slechts worden gevorderd ind.





Gazing on Collective Memory

2016

Installation with wood, found object book, ceramic bowls, 3D Digital print, frames and photographs and electric candle light.

Size: 80 X 190 X 270 cm



The Families

2016

Pigment base print on photo paper

Size: 20 x 345 cm, (10 panels, each panel 20 x 30 cm)





The ID Card

2016

20 copies of original ID card

Size: 50 x 312 cm



FX HARSONO

Blitar, East Java 1949 Indonesia

Lives and works in Jakarta- ID

fxharsono@gmail.com

www.fxharsono.com

SOLO EXHIBITIONS

- 2016 ***The Chronicles Of Resilience***, Tyler Rollins, New York, USA
Gazing on identity / Menerawang Identitas, ARNDT Fine Art, Gillman Barracks, Singapore
- 2015 ***The Life and The Chaos Object, Images and Words / Kehidupan dan Khaos: Benda, Citra dan Kata-kata***, Erasmus Huis, Jakarta, Indonesia
Beyond Identity, Nexus Arts Gallery, Adelaide, Australia
- 2014 ***Things Happen When We Remember / Kita Ingat Maka Terjadilah***, Selasar Sunaryo Art Space, Bandung, Indonesia
- 2013 ***"what we have here perceived as truth we shall some day encounter as beauty"*** Jogja Nasional Museum, Yogyakarta
- 2012 ***Writing In The Rain***, Tyler Rollins, New York, United State of America
- 2010 ***FX Harsono: Testimonies***, Singapore Art Museum, Singapore
Re:petisi/posisi, Langgeng Art Foundation, Yogyakarta
- 2009 ***The Erased Time***, National Gallery of Indonesia, Jakarta
- 2009 ***Surviving Memories***, Vanessa Art Link, Beijing, China
- 2008 ***Aftertaste***, Koong Gallery, Jakarta
- 2007 ***Titik Nyeri/ Point of Pain***, Langgeng Icon Gallery, Jakarta
- 2004 ***Mediamor(e)phosa***, Puri Galllery, Malang, Indonesia
- 2003 ***Displaced***, National Gallery of Indonesia, Jakarta
Displaced, Cemeti Art House, Jogjakarta
- 1998 ***Victim***, Cemeti Art Gallery, Jogjakarta
- 1996 ***Suara (Voice)***, Cemeti Art Gallery, Jogjakarta
- 1994 ***Suara (Voice)***, National Gallery of Indonesia, Jakarta.

GROUP EXHIBITIONS (SELECTED)

- 2016 ***20th Biennale Of Sydney***, Sydney Australia
BACC International Exhibition: Concept Context Contestation: "art and the collective in Southeast Asia", Cemeti Art House, Jogyakarta
Rethinking Home Group show at New Dakota Art Space, Amsterdam.
- 2015 ***Videos from South-East Asia'*** curated by Iola Lenzi, in the framework of Art Paris Art Fair 2015, Grand Palais and at the Silencio Club, Paris, France
- 2014 ***The Roving Eye, Contemporary Art From Southeast Asia***, Arter Space for Art, Istanbul, Turkey
Past Traditions / New Voices in Asian Art, Hofstra University Museum, New York, United State of America
- 2013 ***Concept Context Contestation, Art and the collective in Southeast Asia***, Bangkok Art And Cultural Center, Bangkok, Thailand.
Jogja Biennale XII, Jogja Nasional Museum, Jogyakarta. Indonesia
Sip! Indonesian Art Today, ARNDT Gallery, Gillman Barracks, Singapore and Berlin. Germany
- Indonesian Painting I***, Group show at Equator Art Project, Singapore
- 2012 ***Beyond Geography*** by South Asian Visual Art Centre (SAVAC) at Art Toronto, Canada
What is it to be Chinese? Group exhibition at Grimmuseum, Berlin, Germany
Encounter, Royal Academy In Asia, group exhibition at Institute Of Contemporary Art, Lasalle, Singapore
Edge of Elsewhere, group exhibition artists from Australia, Asia and the Pacific at 4A, Sydney, Australia
- 2011 ***Edge of Elsewhere***, group exhibition artists from Australia, Asia and the Pacific at 4A, Sydney, Australia
4th Moscow Biennale, Moscow Russian
Beyond The East, Macro, Rome Italy

- 2010 **Contemporaneity/Contemporary Art in Indonesia**, Museum of Contemporary Art, Shanghai
- 2009 **Beyond The Dutch**, Centraal Museum, Utrecht, Nederland.
- 2008 **3rd Nanjing Triennale**, Nanjing, China.
- 2006 **Out Now**, Singapore Art Museum. Singapore
- 2000 **Reformasi Indonesia, Protest in Beeld**, Museum Nusantara, Delft, Netherland.
The Third Kwangju Biennial, Kwangju, Korea.
- 1996 **Tradition/Tension**, Asia Society, New York (continued to Vancouver (Canada), Perth (Australia), Seoul (Korea))
- 1995 **Asian Modernism**, Japan Foundation, Tokyo, Japan
- 1994 **Jakarta Biennial Contemporary Art** Taman Ismail Marzuki (TIM), Jakarta
- 1993 **Asia-Pacific Triennial of Contemporary Art**, Queensland Art Gallery, Brisbane, Australia
- 1992 **Artist Regional Exchange (ARX 3)**, Perth, Australia
Artists Week, Adelaide Festival, Adelaide, Australia
- 1987 **Pasar Raya Dunia Fantasi, Seni Rupa Baru (SRB) Proyek I**, TIM, Jakarta
Environmental art, Parangtritis Beach, Jogjakarta. Indonesia
- 1979 **Gerakan Seni Rupa Baru (New Art Movement III)**, TIM, Jakarta. Indonesia
- 1977 **Gerakan Seni Rupa Baru (New Art Movement II)**, TIM, Jakarta. Indonesia
- 1975 **Established New Art Movement**, TIM, Jakarta. Indonesia

PUBLIC COLLECTION

Fukuoka Asian Art Museum, Japan
 Ullen Foundation Collection
 Singapore Art Museum
 National Gallery of Singapore, Singapore
 Sherman Foundation, Sydney, Australia
 National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia
 National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, Australia
 Gallery of Modern Art, Queensland, Australia
 OHD Museum, Magelang, Indonesia
 Arthub Asia, Far East Far West collection, Shanghai
 The National Gallery of Indonesia

AWARDS

2015 Joseph Balestier Award For the Freedom of Art, from U.S. Embassy Singapore – Art Stage Singapore
2014 Prince Clause Fund Laureate award
2014 Anugrah Adhikarya Rupa 2014 Award, from Minister of Tourism and Creative Economy, Indonesia

Author

Didi KWARTANADA studies the history of the ethnic Chinese in Indonesia, especially Java. His work has been published in English, German, Japanese, Mandarin, Dutch and, of course, Indonesian. He is the Director of the Nation Building Foundation (NABIL) in Jakarta and is preparing a book on the history of Chinese identity cards in Indonesia. His most recent work is *The Chinese in Indonesian-ness: Roles and Contributions in the Development of the Nation* (2016), as managing editor cum contributor.



No. 48/1937.

VERGUNNING

DIT JABUT

Mengan alasan: *Keinginan*

Vide akte Perma No. 5-8

Tanggal: *20*
P.I.

De resident van *Soemba* *rijnders*

leerling warongbe- vergunning om op den voet
diende te Waingapoe (Soemba)

(T. 1916 No. 47) zich in Nederlandsch



K.B.J.
PENATA