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Abstract

This paper aims to compare two animated series and critically look at the story elements which represent the plurality of the society. Recent studies commonly pointed out that Upin-Ipin (UI) and Adit-Sopo-Jarwo (ASJ) describe the genuine culture of the Malay-Indonesian archipelago, which is multiculturalism. Most scholars see cultural diversity in these animations as a fact. However, the study on reading a plurality of cultures as a value rather than a fact is rarely conducted. This study aims to analyze the works of two countries, Malaysia’s Les’ Copaque and Indonesia’s MD Animation, to demonstrate the inadequate category of cultural diversity as a ‘fact.’ Parekh’s theory of multiculturalism makes way to map and understand the plurality of society the series represent. At the same time, the cultural diversity presented in the series must be understood as a postcolonial pluralism landscape. By understanding the multicultural situation as postcolonial pluralism, this study concluded that first, multiculturalism in UI and ASJ performs cultural traces that derive from the country’s history, including colonialism. Second, multiculturalism in UI and ASJ is thick with ethnoreligious pluralism problem as a form of cultural penetration by European colonial, which is still apparent.
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INTRODUCTION

Since the discovery of the Asia-Europe maritime trade route (the silk road), the role of the Malay-Indonesian archipelago has become vital (Damuri et al., 2014; Lombard, 2005; Muis et al., 2012). With its vast trade in spices, the most important commodity, the archipelago had long been one of the world’s great maritime empires (Lombard, 2005). It is not exaggerating if Lombard (2005) metaphorically called the Malay-Indonesian archipelago a “crossroads of civilizations,” a meeting-point that was originally based on an economic motive but then expanded on cultural, religious, political reasons, etc. (Furnivall, 2010; Hefner, 2017).

As a cross in international route, with the great entrepot of Malacca, “the Venice of Asia,” the archipelago’s coordinate is not meant to be a temporal transit locus. The adventurous nations then saw the Tanah di Bawah Angin (the lands below the winds) (Reid, 2011b) as “The Promising Land.” The Malay-Indonesian archipelago became a magnet for merchants, travelers, clergy, and even orientalists to come before finally settling in the areas of the former Majapahit empire (Dalimunthe, 2016; Yahya, 2019).

When European galleons first sailed into the archipelago in the early sixteenth century, European found a world comprised not of stagnant societies lost in traditional slumber but a bustling region well into its second millennium of state rule and commercial dynamism (Hefner, 2017). When European domination was reaching its peak in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the European colonial government applied a racial policy that changed the existing cultural plurality order. However, the long history of multiculturalism rooted in Malay-Indonesian regions does not necessarily guarantee that the society is far from the pitfall of diversity. Moreover, social segregation keeps haunting multicultural postcolonialism as the latent inheritance of colonialism (Furnivall, 2010; Hefner, 2017).

The fact that the Malay-Indonesian archipelago is frail somehow becomes the impetus for Upin dan Ipin (UI) (Les’ Copaque, Malaysia, 2007) and Adit dan Sopo Jarwo (ASJ) (MD Animation, Indonesia, 2014) creation. Besides being educative and rooted in indigenous culture, (Djumala, 2018; Febriyanti, 2018), local identity politics (Ghani, 2015; Jiman, 2011; Yusof & Aripin, 2018), animation market (Mahdi et al., 2019; Saputro, 2011), and cultural complexity are obviously affecting the narration of the series. In addition to presenting innocent and ideal children’s world, the uniqueness of UI and ASJ is apparent from the exploration of the plural landscape depicted by the characters, background, and narration. In addition to serving their purpose in entertainment, these series segmented for children show peculiarities of the cultural locus in each geographical area thick with cultural diversity.
UI and ASJ are catalysts for children’s programs relevant to the actual social life of Malay and Indonesian multicultural children. To understand plural societies in the Malay-Indonesian context, this paper looks at cultural diversity as a fact and value. The value of a magnificent culture will be better understood and explained if the historical facts that become the community’s blueprint are presented as the subject.

There have been many studies on the animated series UI and ASJ, discussing multiculturalism explicitly and implicitly. However, those existing researches have not answered the problem formulated in this paper. Surprisingly, those studies consider the cultural diversity in UI and ASJ as a fact of the society they represent, the people of Malaysia and Indonesia. Most studies investigated the aspects of education and learning (see. Lestari, 2018; Yusof & Aripin, 2018), character (see. Putri et al., 2021; Sutiyani et al., 2021), value, and morals (see. Jiman, 2011; Masriani et al., 2021; Risdiany & Lestari, 2021), and others (see. Hidayat & Wasana, 2019; Yulianto, 2018). All discussion rests on the multicultural representation carried by the animated series, hoping that they can provide positive education for children in each country. Meanwhile, the condition of Malay-Indonesian plural society is understood a priori and without considering the influence of colonialism that has shaped the multicultural face of Malaysia and Indonesia today.

On the other hand, articles discussing multicultural issues in animation have not reached the level expected by this paper. The studies place an animated series that takes locality as the background as a cultural politic of the country they represent. Mahdi et al. (2019), for example, saw that UI has a role in shaping the identity of Malay, especially for kids. Cultural elements in animation are very obvious in the setting, language, and daily activities of each character. The digital context that meets global demands, as shown in Ghani’s research (2015), is considered appropriate to promote Malay’s cultural values. UI series can be viewed as a means to introduce a Malay locality to Malaysian people and viewers from abroad.

Meanwhile, Saputro (2011) saw that the creation of UI is inspired by (1) the response to the failure of Malaysian animation, which previously failed to produce high-quality productions, and (2) the promising global animation market. By placing an animated narration from a local context, this animation is nothing but the result of the decommodification of new media. As a political culture, the animation produced by Les’ Copaque can be considered a propaganda medium for Malaysia, which call itself “Truly Asia.”

Several scholars described multiculturalism more explicitly by placing UI and ASJ as the ideal face of Malay-Indonesian plurality. Ihwanah (2018) calls UI an animated series that has been successfully portraying religious tolerance. Cahyono and Susanti (2019), on the other
side, consider UI as the actual portrayal of Malaysian social diversity. It can be seen in the special episodes of religious holidays, which are Islamic (as in *Esok Hari Raya* or *Eid Al Fitr*), Confucianism (*Gong Xi Fat Cai* or Chinese New Year), and Sikh (*Deepavali*). Both Ihwanah (2018) and Cahyono-Susanti (2019) agree that UI provides multicultural education, especially for children. Fe briyanti (2018), not much different from the earlier researchers, also found an ideal picture of multiculturalism in the ASJ series laid upon its setting, language, and narration.

At first, Muhdaliha and Arlena (2017) seemed to break away from the previous trend by offering a new approach to seeing multiculturalism in children’s animated shows. Utilizing the matrix system, a method adapted from Tsukamoto on the manga matrix, the two researchers were trapped in a monotonous and uniformed descriptive discussion. It is similar to other studies which describe intrinsic elements of animation. The description of the characters is presented in different words, but the result is not so much different from the conventional method usually performed to analyze fiction. The stagnation is most likely because scholars understand multiculturalism simply as a fact and not as a value. Thus, the plurality displayed by UI and ASJ is taken for granted. In short, studies that see multiculturalism as a fact will find it difficult to see a loophole in critically looking at the representation of multiculturalism in the animated series. Therefore, this paper sees cultural diversity as a dynamic plural society situation (a value) and not as a static phenomenon (a fact). This paper will thus look at the condition of the archipelago’s culture in the historical struggle which forms plurality in Malay-Indonesian society today.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

As an ideology, multiculturalism is an understanding of diversity that is motivated by social conditions (Nasikun, 2007), politics (Azra, 2007), economics (Furnivall, 2010), and culture (Parekh, 2002). In terms of cultural diversity, plurality is considered capable of accommodating the basic interest of every member of the society that multiculturalism is referred to as cultural basis (Azra, 2005). Of all the theorists, Bhikhu Parekh is one of the experts in studying plural society. His book, *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*, is considered one of the essential references in the contemporary cultural diversity discourse (Hadyanto, 2011). Besides being critical of the concept of liberal multiculturalism, Parekh’s model emphasizes more on cultural conditions (Bauböck, 2001; Hefner, 2017; Kukathas, 2019). As a third-world person, his concept of plural society will be more relevant to diversity in Third World countries based on their historical facts.
Most liberal theories see cultural diversity as a fact rather than a value (Bauböck, 2001). However, Parekh (2002) considers a multicultural society, which includes several cultural communities with an overlapping but nonetheless distinct conception of the world, systems of meaning, values, forms of social organizations, history, and customs and practices. For Parekh (2002), multiculturalism does not depart from differences at the individual level. On the contrary, diversity is obtained culturally and forms a benchmark that becomes the authority given a form and structure then embedded in a historically inherited system (Hadyanto, 2011; Syamsiyah, 2018).

Today, cultural diversity is inseparable from the concept of the nation-state. A key premise of the nation-state was that democracy is impossible without modernization, and modernization requires the homogenization of political culture (Hefner, 2017). Parekh (2008) refuses a tendency for Western liberal theorists. He mentioned three models of the state’s multicultural policy in dealing with the modern plurality style, namely (1) nationality; (2) ethnic-nationality; and (3) ethnic-multicultural (Irhandayaningstih, 2012). In modern society, Parekh (2008) maps cultural diversity into (1) subcultural, (2) perspective, and (3) communal (Hadyanto, 2011; Syamsiyah, 2018). Consequently, each form can be responded to by (a) monoculturalism or the fusion of all cultures, and (b) multiculturalism or accommodating of every culture.

This paper sees cultural diversity as a value rather than a fact. As a value, plural society will be better explained if historical facts around cultural diversity in the society are presented as a grand discussion. It is helpful to remember that non-Western cultures have their history of pluralist challenges and their own need to devise meaningful formulas for its resolution (Hefner, 2017). In addition, the face of the plural society in UI and ASJ is also understood as the representation of postcolonial pluralism. This paper will follow the depiction presented by Hefner (2017) related to multiculturalism in Malaysia as a continuation of British imperialism and Indonesia as a former colony of the Dutch East Indies.

**DISCUSSIONS OF MAIN THEMES**

**Outlook for Multicultural Animating**

At least to some degree, most modern states today are culturally diverse. Many societies are multicultural because they are open to a diversity of people who come and go and, sometimes, stay (Kukathas, 2019). Multiculturalism here is understood as a socio-cultural condition in which the composition of the community consists of at least two ethnicities and religions, but they live side by side in harmony (Hefner, 2017; Parekh, 2002).
Southeast Asia is a dynamic, pluralistic meeting point, considering cultural diversity formed by the maritime world trade network (Reid, 2011a). With the great entrepot of Malacca, “the Venice of Asia” (as early European visitors called it) on the southwestern edge of the Malay peninsula, Southeast Asia (sea) is the primary trade route linked to Muslim principalities in the east of the archipelago. In this area, religion is an integral part of the ethnic groups that inhabit the archipelago. Although most of the trading ports in the region were under the rule of Muslim empires, the archipelago was conducive to interethnnic collaboration and cultural exchange (Hefner, 2017). Anthony Reid (2011b) also states that the maritime world in Southeast Asia is in better condition than the Mediterranean, the Levant, and North Africa because it is significantly integrated into the South China Sea. However, before going too far into discussing the interior of a multicultural archipelago, this paper needs to look at the depiction of plurality presented in the two animated series, as mentioned earlier. In this section, the early discussion dwells on the intrinsic description of animation. Scientific work is commonly done in literary studies by imitating Stanton (1965).

_Ui_ animated series is generally a story of orphaned twin boys’ daily lives, Upin and Ipin. The setting of the story is in Malaysia, a shady and far from pollution village called _Kampung Durian Runtuh_. Semiotically, the naming of _Kampung Durian Runtuh_ by Saputro (2011) represents a wait for sustenance. The animation illustrates a plural society, shown by the characters: Upin and Ipin, as protagonists, and _Opa_ (the grandmother) with _Kak Ros_ (the older sister); _Atuk Dalang_, Ehsan’s family, _Mail’s_ family, _Cik Gu_ (the teachers whose names are _Cik Gu Jasmin, Cik Gu Melati, Cik Gu Besar_), _Fizi, Dzul, Ijat_, and _Abang Shaleh_ and others. The characters mentioned are from the same ethnic groups, the Malays. Besides the Malays (Malayan-Mongoloid), are also present non-Malay characters such as Mei Mei and Uncle Ah Tong, who are Asiatic Mongoloid (Chinese), Jarjit Singh, Devi, Rajoo, and the father, Uncle Muthu, who are from Caucasoid (Indian).

Racial diversity in Malaysia is shown by the presence of more than one character representing one race. It is a form of ethnic representation in the story under the big theme of diversity. The first racial representation is seen in the character Mei Mei and uncle Ah Tong. With narrower eyes than other characters, Mei Mei’s physical appearance is a particular oriental feature. Visually, Mei Mei’s oriental facial characteristics represent children of Chinese ethnic groups. Her character is also described as careful, thorough, and persistent. In an episode especially made for the Chinese New Year celebration entitled _Gong Xi Fa Cai_, Mei Mei is pictured wearing Chinese traditional clothes _cheongsam_ (see. Cahyono & Susanti, 2019; Muhdaliha & Arlena, 2017).
Meanwhile, Uncle Ah Tong is described as an old Chinese man who often wears red suits. The suit consists of a button-up Chinese man’s clothes (Koko shirt), a T-shirt, and pants. The choice of color (red) is a semiotic visual of a traditional Chinese costume (cheongsam), which is always worn during the celebration of Chinese New Year. Another depiction of Chinese identity is shown by Uncle Ah Tong’s character as a trader and a wholesaler of secondhand goods. In another episode about Chinese New Year, Uncle Ah Tong shows his skill in writing Chinese calligraphy.

Uncle Muthu and Devi become the representatives of Indians (Caucasoid) in Malay. The assertion that they are Indian is taken from an episode where Uncle Muthu celebrated Diwali during the Feast of Light. Uncle Muthu is a good food stall owner who has good singing skills and loves to dance. At the same time, Devi’s figure is pictured in dark skin, and she wears Bindi in the middle of her forehead. Devi’s way of dressing also depicts her original ethnicity, Indian traditional clothes, long pants, and a long blouse.

Parekh (2002) divided multiculturalism into isolationist, accommodative, autonomic, interactive, and cosmopolitan. In a social context, “autonomous” multiculturalism is the model adopted by the neighboring country by referring to the fact that citizenship status in Malaysia is not based on universal individual rights but on what political theorists call “differentiated citizenship” (Hefner, 2017; Parekh, 2002). Autonomous multiculturalism is a plural condition where the subordinate cultural groups seek to achieve equality in the dominant culture. In the political context, the subordinate cultural groups want a collective autonomous life. The main concern of this culture lies in maintaining the same life and rights as the dominant group. The subordinate group challenges the dominant to create equality (Irhandayaningsih, 2012).

Citizenship status in the country, known as the “Land of Indigenous Malay,” is classified based on ethnicity. Malay is the dominant ethnicity, and Indian and Chinese are the subordinate ethnic groups. The racial dispute still happened in Malaysia even after the country’s independence in 1957, one of which was between Malay and Chinese people in 1960. The conflict led to resistance by the Chinese ethnics until a declaration of a new country, Singapore (Hefner, 2017). Based on the description, Malaysian plurality can be categorized as a third type, autonomous multiculturalism.

The fact of the citizenship status shows that the current multicultural policy in this country is ethnic-nationality. As indigenous citizens, the Malay people are in a superior position while Chinese, Indians, and others become inferior. Related to the animated series, the question is why racial representation in UI is more dominant than in ASJ. It can be the impact of colonialism when the history of racial plurality in Malaysia is considered. As mentioned by
Hefner (2017), the colonial policy applied by the British in Malay related to race (and religion) performs different dynamics from the colonial situation of the Dutch in the neighboring colonized country. As they consolidated their power in the final years of the nineteenth century, the British Malaya accorded Malay rulers prerogatives in Islamic and customary matters. It provided them with the bureaucratic and legal machinery to implement their directives more systematically than ever before in Malay history. The colonial linkage of state and Islam profoundly influence the postcolonial evolution of religious pluralism in Malaya. So if the multicultural condition in UI is observed deeper, the Islamic style is more apparent. It is not only based on the episodes made for the Ramadhan edition (Saputro, 2011), but it is something more latent that its representation is subconsciously attached and eventually appears in the culture. In the other animated series, ASJ, the Islamic style is also striking. It could be prematurely associated with the dominant religion in the two countries, making the phenomenon seem natural.

Unlike the Dutch East Indies, which enforced cultuurstelsel, which the Dutch parliament criticized (Ricklefs, 2011), the British Malay have opted to import hundreds of thousands of Indian and Chinese laborers for the colonial enterprise. The British could have opted to force the Malays, but the political costs of such a strategy would have been high. The less expensive tack on which the British finally settled was to import hundreds of thousands of non-Malays. The result changed the face of peninsular society forever. In short, the multicultural face of Malaysia today cannot be avoided from the influence of colonialism, as is seen in the representation of the animated series that places the racial plurality of Malaysian society as dominant.

The racial issue in Malaysia is indeed subject to change. Since Mahathir Mohamad was elected prime minister in 1981, multiculturalism in Malaysia changed, primarily how they treat the minority. The prime minister, who was not from the Malay aristocracy, changed domestic policy direction. He even talked about the need to build a multiethnic “Malaysian Nation” on some occasions, an idea that implies equality among Malays, Chinese, Indians, and other ethnic groups in Malaysia (Hefner, 2017). When the monetary crisis hit the policies of Asian countries in 1997, Mahatir involved the active participation of Chinese ethnic groups and resulted unexpectedly better than what happened in Indonesia during the Reformation period in 1998. If the racial pattern is presented more dominantly in UI rather than in ASJ, it is a form of embodiment of the nation’s building in the former British colony.

In all these matters, there was a fundamental contrast between Malaysia and Indonesia on the issue of postcolonial pluralism. Indonesia seems to be more accommodating of ethnic
differences fluidly and openly. The idea of differentiating citizenship along ethnic lines, especially related to the indigenous and Chinese, was discussed in the early time of the country’s establishment. But an exuberantly republican ideology and the urgency of anticolonial mobilization have resulted in inclusive and non-discriminatory policies. As long as Chinese Indonesians were willing to renounce their Chinese citizenship, Sukarno declared, they should be welcomed as citizens. However, this historical fact changed with the rise of the New Order when Soeharto implemented discriminatory policies against Chinese descendants (Hefner, 2017). Referring to the early history of the Republic, Azra (2007) stated that Indonesia is often classified as an accommodative and interactive type (Runuwali, 2016). However, cultural groups like Samin and others closer to isolationist multicultural exist.

Accommodative multiculturalism is a plural society with a dominant culture, which makes certain adjustments and accommodations for the cultural needs of the minorities. While interactive multiculturalism is a plural society in which cultural groups are not too concerned about autonomous cultural life. These groups are more demanding to create a collective culture that reflects and emphasizes distinctive perspectives (Runuwali, 2016).

In the ASJ animation, the racial colors are not dominantly presented as it is in UI. This ethnic representation is closely related to the history of colonialism in Indonesia. However, looking at the representation produced by ASJ, it seems that this has something to do with what Hefner (2017) wrote, that the Dutch East Indies took tighter control over ethnicity and religion. On the other hand, the British Malay was more relaxed and still allowed the local elite to have their policy. Since the defeat of the local aristocrats in Java (1825-1839), local elites, especially in Java, have been treated as representatives of the Dutch’s colonial power (Carey, 2008; Ricklefs, 2011). Meanwhile, Islam was always suspected of being an agitator that sparked a rebellion against the colonial government throughout the century (Atikurrahman et al., 2021; Atikurrahman & Ilma, 2021; Sastrowardoyo, 1983). It is not surprising that ethnical color is more dominant in ASJ.

The story of ASJ is centered on three characters, Adit, Sopo, and Jarwo. In the story, Adit is described as a young boy who is resourceful, kind (especially to his sister), helpful (especially to his friends in the neighborhood), and devoted to his parents. Among kids of his age, Adit’s figure stands out. It is not surprising if other kids like Dennis, Mitha, Ucup, Kipli, and Devi see him as an inspiration, especially when it comes to Jarwo and Sopo, who always tease the kids.

Jarwo’s figure in ASJ is a middle-aged man with an average body who doesn’t have any regular job. In one episode, Jarwo works as a porter at Babah Chang’s grocery store, while in
another, he becomes a dishwasher at Kang Ujang’s meatball stall. Occasionally he can be a babysitter, cook, salesman, and so on. Meanwhile, his obsession with money, which he usually gets quickly, often leads him to conflict with Adit and his friends. This man is associated with an old motorbike. His untidy outfit and reckless way of riding a motorbike imply that this figure is a village thug. Sopo is a character who is described as Jarwo’s companion. He is fat, childish, innocent, and thinks very slowly. This jobless man always does what Jarwo says. Because of his innocence, Jarwo often treats him wrong, acting as his boss.

Other characters are Adit’s playmates, such as Dennis, a fat boy who always wears a t-shirt with a Barong Bali image on it and panics when he meets Jarwo; Mita, the tomboy girl; Ucup, who always imitates the speech of the village elders; and Adelya, Adit’s sister who always rides with him in his bicycle. Some adults are also present, like Adit’s parents; Haji Udin, who often settles the fights between the kids; Kang Ujang, the meatball seller; Baba Chang, the grocery store owner in Kampung Karet Berkah. In the representation of racial plurality, ASJ only shows Babah Chang as the representation of the Chinese ethnic Tionghoa (Asiatic-Mongoloid). The other characters are mentioned as Javanese (Sopo dan Jarwo), Sundanese (Kang Ujang), Batak (Pak Anas), and Betawi (Haji Udin), which are ethnic representations.

In the fictional scheme, Indonesian plurality is depicted in ASJ through adult characters like Jarwo, Sopo, Kang Ujang, Haji Udin, and Mr. Anas. Other characters like Adit, father-mother, and Adit’s friends have obscure ethnic identities and tend to be unexplained. The latter is more of the representations of urban society that tend to break and eliminate primordial identities. As the general trend of urban society, ethnic identity is considered a past that should be obscured and even eliminated.

**Historical Background of Multiculturalism in Malaysia and Indonesia**

To present a broad understanding of the various era in Nusantara, this paper needs to step back and reflect on the history of culture (perhaps political and economic altogether). The history of the now known as Malay-Indonesian archipelago cannot be separated from the existence of three great kingdoms that are now part of the territory of Indonesia; Sriwijaya, Singasari, and Majapahit. Apart from coastal cosmopolitanism, the decentralization policy by the most powerful kingdom allowed other small kingdoms to be stable and socio-culturally develop through autonomy, especially in the trading sector (Kartodirjo, 1993; Lombard, 2005; Reid, 2011a). In the mid of the century, when Islam dominated the archipelago, trade throughout the region was not dominated by any single kingdom or principality. Still, it was
based on the networked collaboration of many small states. Here, then, was a pattern of economic “pluricentrism” that, in its cultural diversity and mobility, resembled the booming trade of the eastern Mediterranean in the early modern era (Hefner, 2017).

Archipelago’s geographical isolation is not a barrier to contact each other. The sea is not setting them apart, for they have a paradigm “Sea is not a separator.” On the other hand, the sea is a natural bridge that puts them together. Subsequently, the development of civilization—navigation and cartographic technology, and trading systems—caused the interaction pattern of the people of the archipelago to expand and not limited to the areas inherited from the three kingdoms. In the ancient kingdoms, the Indians and Chinese had often visited the archipelago. Meanwhile, the arrival of Arabians and Europeans in the next era also determines society’s composition in the area (Hefner, 2017; Lombard, 2005).

Now known as Malaysia, the area was part of the archipelago, which later became a British Malay colony. Meanwhile, the former Dutch East Indies colony is now Indonesia. The concept of a national ‘border’ is a political discourse. The inhabitants of Malacca Peninsula and most of the people in Sumatra are Malay ethnic who, in the end, had to recognize different national flags even though they share the same language, tradition, custom, and even religion.

The division of Malay into Malacca Peninsula (Malaysia) and Sumatra (Indonesia) cannot be separated from the history of colonialism in each area. Malay-Malacca on one side and Malay-Sumatra were under British Malay and the Dutch East Indies colonies. The two former colonies then developed into two different nations. Both Malaysia and Indonesia inherited the territories of the former British Malay and the Dutch East Indies colonies. The colonial pattern that British Malaya and the Dutch East Indies applied also determined the development of each country. For example, the presence of people of Indian descendant is quite significant in Malaysia. It cannot be separated from the British Malay colonial policy, which made the Indian population as supporting soldiers in colonial practices in Asia (Kaur, 2013). Meanwhile, the number of Indians is not significant in the Malay peninsula (Hefner, 2017). India was another colony of the British Malay, and even it happened even earlier than Malaysia. It is thus not surprising that Malaysia (as well as Singapore) became a multiracial society, and Indonesia became more multiethnic, though there are also Chinese and Arab descendants as well in the country.

In this case, it should be assumed that the composition between local people and the immigrants from different countries take part in the archipelago as a multicultural society that is multiracial and multiethnic. The composition of Malaysian society, which consists of Malays as the only indigenous population, is supported by the presence of Indian and Chinese people.
Meanwhile, Indonesian society is dominated by some ethnicities, Javanese, Sundanese, Batak, Madurese, Bugis, Dayak, and even Malays as natives. Ethnic groups in Indonesia are naturally tied, meaning they share the same clumps in terms of linguistics, clothing, culinary, etc. On the other hand, people in Malaysia tend to vary in culture (cross-culture society) with minimum similarities.

The type of multicultural societies can be seen in each animated characteristic. UI represents a multiracial society, while ASJ represents a multiethnic society. The conclusion is based on the existence of characters such as Jarjit Singh, Devi, Uncle Muthu, and Rajoo (Caucasoid); Xiao Mei Mei and Ah Tong (Asiatic Mongoloid) in Upin Ipin circle, at home, at school, and in the neighborhood in UI series. While in ASJ, there are characters like Haji Udin (Betawi ethnic), Jarwo and Sopo (Javanese), Kang Ujiang (Sundanese), Pak Anas (Batak), and Baba Chang also Li Mei (Chinese). Their existence confirms the phenomenon of multiculturalism at each cultural locus. In this case, the multicultural pattern in Malaysia is more multiracial, and one in Indonesia is more multiethnic.

When Europeans finally arrived in the archipelago in the early sixteenth century, the trade networks they discovered were not concentrated in one all-powerful kingdom but were dispersed across this island expanse. Although most of the region’s mercantile ports were Muslim principalities, “The Southeast Asian trading city was a pluralistic meeting-point of peoples from all over maritime Asia” (Reid, 2011a). This archipelagic region was conducive to interethnic collaboration and rich cultural exchange. One significant consequence of this fact appears to be that the Malayo-Indonesian peoples involved in the trade developed cultural traditions that showed strong family resemblances across great ethnic and political expanses. Most of the societies in this vast archipelagic region drew on a Malay-Indonesian civilizational reservoir (Hefner, 2017).

Religion was an integral part of archipelago ethnicity. From the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, the growth of international commerce moved large numbers of people out of localized societies into a multiethnic macrocosm. Islam became essential to support the macrocosm (Hefner, 2017). The cultural mobility and hybridity seen across this vast island region illustrate that its constituent societies were not changeless, traditional entities hermetically sealed from their neighbors. On the contrary, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when European domination peaked, this stand-apart quality was given even greater cultural leverage with newly ascendant notions of biocultural evolutionism and racial superiority (Gouda, 2008; Stoler, 1989). European colonialism implemented racial policies that changed the previously stable order in a plural society. Social segregation was
deliberately applied as a European policy to maintain their dominance over the colonized regions. The colonial politics somehow changed and shaped the face of multiculturalism in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago today (Hefner, 2017; Setiadi, 2015).

Looking briefly at the historical background, when the British and the Dutch still set their power along the Malay-Indonesian archipelago, many indigenous people saw social segregation as a plague that undermined harmony in Malaysia and Indonesia. They thought social stability could be realized along with the fall of European political power. Malaysia, which achieved its independence in 1957, still faced ethnic violence in the years after World War II and 1969. Not to mention the Malay-Chinese conflict responsible for the beginning of Singapore. Meanwhile, the neighbor country, Indonesia, although not as strict as Malaysia in enforcing citizenship status based on ethnicity, repeatedly enforced to face ethnic anarchy in the late 1950s and 1965, even after being independent since 1945. What is more surprising, from 1996 to 2001, Indonesia was rocked by ethnoreligious conflict (Hefner, 2017). The irony has been foreseen by JS Furnivall, the British administrator, and political writer, in a series of widely read works prepared in the final years of Western colonialism in Southeast Asia, related to the idea of plural societies and the new native leadership, which is incompetent in managing multiculturalism in Malay-Indonesia politically.

European colonial policy was central to the emerging politics and culture of pluralism in the region. The Europeans seized the commanding heights of an already plural civilization, expanding and expropriating its wealth while reorganizing and segregating its constituent Asian communities. They laid down the territorial boundaries within which all national leaders were to operate in the postcolonial era. In Muslim regions, they affected a partial secularization of the political order that differed from the Dutch East Indies to British Malay or in British Malaya itself. Finally, in assigning different ethnic groups to specialized positions in everything, the Europeans crystallized the most essential of supra-ethnic categories: the distinction between indigenous Malayu-Indonesian “children of the soil” (Malay, Bumiputera, Indonesian, pribumi) and “non-indigenous” or immigrant Asians (Indians and, especially, Chinese) (Hefner, 2017).

**CONCLUSION**

The message UI and ASJ try to convey is a plural society. The two animated series seem to want to confirm that the multicultural Malay-Indonesian archipelago is an ideal representation of plural society. Therefore, the main discussion about the two animated series
is cultural diversity, ethnicity, ethnoreligious, multicultural education, character, etc. One that cannot be ignored behind the multicultural face displayed today is that its appearance has received a touch of skillful European colonial hands. People in the archipelago lived in a multicultural society before the arrival of the Europeans. Thus, multiculturalism formed and appears today is the impact of a typical postcolonial situation.

When Malaysia and Indonesia became independent, ethnic conflicts continued to be the people’s concern. As Robert W. Hafner has written, the assimilation of Javanese and Sumatrans to Malay ethnicity indicates that the fluid and permeable pluralism of the early modern archipelago world had not disappeared entirely. With European help, the divide between Malays and non-Malays was taking on the strongly oppositional quality canonized in Furnivall’s “plural society.” The anthropologist Clifford Geertz once remarked that national independence stimulated ethnoreligious sentiments in the new nations because it introduced “a valuable new prize,” namely control of the state. Asian nationalism, as Furnivall (2010) said, offered no solution to the problems of identity and integration in these deeply divided countries. Nationalism would end only by pitting one ethnic community against another, exacerbating rather than ameliorating society’s divisions. Unless some formulas for pluralist federation could be devised, Southeast Asian pluralism seemed doomed to a nightmarish “anarchy.” Are the two series the best way before finding the proper formula for plurality in the archipelago?
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