Empowering Kinship to Counter Control on Family Discourse in Indonesia

Ivanovich Agusta, Bogor Agricultural University

Abstract: *Indonesian government constructs a discourse on family during modernizing Indonesia. A conceptual "father" used to legitimate control of the regime, as well as "state ibuism" ("state mothering") to control especially women. A controlled family discourse is used around political sphere on national election, public administration, family planning, school, etc. State bureaucrats placed at national, provincial, regency, and village levels to control a nuclear family (Westernized type of family pushed for local people). Countering the dominant discourse, local family still integrates kinship based on women power. The actual and discourse of local kinship used for constructing local economy and local politics.*

1.0.   Introduction

Concepts around *family* and *village* in ex-colonies (former Western colonial countries) must be deconstructed. Critiques should be focused on conventional perspectives based on evolutionism –particularly developmentalism. Besides, deconstruction must be directed through critical comparison periods between colonialism and the former period.

Based on evolutionism, social theories always locate the *village* as simpler community rather than modern society –especially urban society. The proposition, however, is too weak to be laid in Indonesian history. A 15th century Majapahit Kingdom, for example, was so differentiated on marketing, harbors activities and other economical actions (Hefner, 2000). The kingdom (that used to be viewed as traditional community) actually had more complicated social structure to support the activities, rather than European kingdoms at the same period.

Deconstruction of *family* concept in Eastern society also has similar surprising implication. Western theory on family evolution since 1940th decade has been consisting of

teleological nuclear family around domestic activities. Later at the last step, from 1960th decade feminist movement moves women out of domestic activities. The family evolution perspective, again, does not fit in Javanese family of Indonesia –particularly before Western colonization era. In the period, public economical and political activities (out of domestic activities) have been common for parents, sons and daughter, as well as for men and women.

Colonial discourse –or now is better understood as economical imperialism (Petras and Veltmeyer, 2001)—on family and village-community consists of material consequences. Moving wet land economical activities from women to men during village modernization in 1970th decade is parallel with discriminations of agricultural credit program for men (Sajogyo, 2006). After that, recruitments on women as garment industry labor since 1970th decade have been implicating on lower salary, because women have been represented as second wage earner rather than men. Community domination (after managed by almost men) to family (then as area for women or matrifocality) is powered by family development and family planning from the state. At this point, the state power to the village-community also.

At this point, critical awareness on discourses of village-community and family must create space for emancipation of the lowest social position (people in village-community and family members). Before creating the space, we should research formation, institutionalization, and materialization of discourses on relationship between village-community and family for a long history, until now that constructs such a domination one.

This article aims to understand discourses on emancipation formation and mechanism of family and community. The article will also research discourse formations for newly respective and emancipation relationship on each of them, especially to emancipate the lowest family.

The perspective of globalization-from-below will be implemented through postcolonial theory. I will propose location of community and family at the theory. Particularly it needs a new conceptual arrangement to open discussions on family and postcolonial theory. The discussion below focuses on Javanese family and village-community. A

problem occurs to identify Javanese ethnic. Within postcolonial theory, an ethnic is always on the move, on *being* condition (namely polyglot), competing and compounding many discourses (namely hybridity). In this article, Javanese includes people who speak on Javanese language and emotionally tied with the language. Almost of them stays in Central and East Java Provinces, Indonesia, but they may also live around the nation (through migration) and maintaining imaginary solidity through speaking Javanese language each other.

2. State of the Art: Postcolonial Theory, Community, Family

2.1 Postcolonial Theory

Postcolonial theory has been developed from postmodern theories. The postmodern theories themselves emerged from 1968th riots in French (MacDonnell, 2005). Critiques from postmodern theories focus not only to structuralism and functionalism perspectives, but also to Marxism. In other world, deconstruction (one of methods of postmodern theories to destruct a concept then to construct a new one) is directed towards modernity concept, especially logocentrism (Al-Fayyadl, 2005). A new concept wil be arranged by textual analyzes, discourse formation, and deconstruction of writing (Arivia, 2005).

As a discourse theory –especially developed by postmodern theorists—postcolonial theorists understand that reality is constructed by the people discursively, so that the reality becomes imaginary (Foucault, 2002; Said, 2001; Venn, 2006). Although some theorists conclude that the reality emerges only as a discourse or fictitious (Hindess, 1978; MacDonnell, 2005), this article moves on a perspective on existing relationship between discursive practices, material and institution as well. Nevertheless, the material things cannot be viewed within naive-realism perspective as well as critical-realism, but better understood as a

consequence of discursive imaginary by people altogether. The discourse has not been such a logic or logical rhetoric, but developed as a systematized knowledge through self consciousness, everyday social interaction, until institutionalization, organizing, even material building.

For me, conceptual relationship will be arranged especially between culture, power and locality aspects. The knowledge above has inherently power or a primary power matter for people to control all of matters of the discourses. Western enlightenment on 18th century only promoted one aspect (*logos* or logical side) to reach systematized knowledge (Al-Fayyadl, 2005; Derrida, 2005; Venn, 2006). A man with the knowledge is considered a humanist (to be a human), so that he has an ability to get power and has a legitimation to emancipate others (who are less-developed). Based on evolutionism perspective, the action of emancipating may make others mature (towards humanism).

All of the discussion, unfortunately, denies dialectics of enlightenment, when power is used to dominate to other people. Knowledge is developed to systematize Other, or to discipline the less developed people (Said, 2001; Venn, 2006). The discourse has been institutionalized within Western colonization and imperialism, especially from 19th century. Texts about Other (the colonies's people) is actually an important knowledge as well as power to arrange an identity of less-developed people in colonies (or now developing and less developed countries). The imaginary identity is empowered through colonial government, and supported by economical and military entities of the colonialists. The systematization of representation remains on ex-Westerns colonization nations-state, even after the nations-state now are formally independent.

It operationalized, for example, through international donore and Western states to *develop* Eastern states. After their independent, The West (Europe and USA) changed the colonial structure into international imperialism, especially through aids, economic relationship, and globalization. Beside multinational agreements that reflect neo-liberal economy, the ex-colony nations-states are still influenced by Western nations through development projects that funded by Western states and donors (that actually promotes knowledge, technology and experts from donor side).

On the context of imperialism, postcolonial theory aims to deconstruct Western discourse that remains on texts and perspectives on Eastern people (Said, 2001). Construction about the East is deconstructed by critical and contrary study on Eastern concepts themselves. At the first phase of postcolonial theory development, the deconstruction is conducted by detecting the concepts' history on Western history context itself (namely genealogy) (Foucault, 2002). Destruction may also be conducted through critiques on writing text of Western categories and diagrams (deconstruction) (Al-Fayyadl, 2005).

At the second phase, postcolonial theory is also developed through genealogy and deconstruction of Eastern texts themselves. More than that, a space for subaltern (the lower position of people) voices is created, so that they may be exist and express their own opinion (Venn, 2006).

Social relationship works in certain discourse. Using the perspective, the community and the family cannot be a reality, but can be understood as imaginary construction of the members. The postcolonial theory on imaginary community has published extensively, from national levels until at regional spaces. A concept of imaginary village-community in this article may borrow the concept above, as well as adapting the concept for local Javanese culture.

Nevertheless, discussion on family is still rare in postcolonial theory, particularly compared to feminism. The article will propose a new "face" of family within postcolonial theory. More than that, I will propose dynamic relationship between village-community and family

2.2 Locating Community in Postcolonial Theory

Logocentrism by Descartes ("Cogito ergo sum") implicates on causality analysis. Compounding with teleological perspective, the causality analysis has been constructed step by step into bigger systematized knowledge, towards human maturity (humanism) and social maturity (history) (Al-Fayyadl, 2005; Venn, 2006).

The systematized perspective above (logosentrism and teleology) implicates on locating community as part of an evolution stage into society. Community concept is parallel

with *gemeinschaft* (by Tönnies, 1955) or mechanical solidarity (by Durkheim, 1933). Community consists of simple social structure, simple social differentiation, and simple division of labor. The representation is considered fits in village-community. Moreover, vilage-community is always dependent from urban society (explained as rural-urban continuum theory by Redfield, 1985). This linearity mechanism becomes a matter to be deconstructed by postcolonial theory. In rural-urban continuum, position of urban area is higher than rural area, because cosmopolitanism is considered to be developed there, particularly by accepting experts, capitalists institutions, and military apparatus (Derrida, 2005). On the contrary, village-community is positioned as subaltern, where is lower than urban area, and can not be existed by itself, so that its voice should be presented by urban society.

Besides, community has romantical perseption that social relation is harmonious. Even within Marxism –and of course other perspectives above—the first step of social evolution, primitive community (e.g. primitive communism), has not any social contradiction, because there is not social stratification. Communist society at the last step of the evolution also becomes romantically utopian of harmonious classless society (Marx and Engels, 1960).

We have see above that evolutionism context on community is not valid anymore, because some communities (some *societies* may be better) in Indonesia (for example Majapahit Kingdom) are used to be more developed ones rather than societies in Europe at the same period. Besides, discourse on community since colonial era has been consisting Western *logocentrism.*

Community evolution perspective consequently locating village-community at lower point and being dominated by colonists of Western society. A good documentation on exploitation toward Indonesian villagers was novel entitled *Max Havelaar* by Multatuli, published at the end of 20th century.

Today donors and Western states locate village-community within economical rationalism perspective, for example as part of social capital (Coleman, 1994). Embeddedness of social and cultural structure in economical actions (for example through community

network) is understood as mechanism to accumulate social capital. The social capital may decrease economical transaction cost, so that third world development works and becomes more efficient.

Unfortunately, instrumentalizing community network denies people's capacity for self reflection, more than just acting based on economical rationality or socially transaction cost. For example, some villagers still resist from state domination as well as Western imperialism (International Forum on Globalization, 2003).

Postcolonial theory, on the contrary, analyzes space for self reflection by the people. Tie –as well as boundary—of community is considered as a result of people consciousness as exemplified in everyday social relation, as well as material produced by them. Relationship with others out of the community usually managed as hybridity forms, for example understanding –better understood as self reflecting on—new forms and new mechanisms of discourses related to people's self consciousness or to their own language (Anderson, 2002; Venn, 2006). Their consciousness is considered as a judgment of the truth and the discourse there.

2.3 Locating Family in Postcolonial Theory

Postcolonial theory lays on conflict perspective in theories of sociology of family. I found it blurry to locate postcolonial theory into the conflict perspective. The category is too wide, including all of critical angle towards family – better to identify the category as critical perspective. Range of the category begins from structural conflict theory, micro and macro resources conflict (including feminism), to dialectical deconstructionism of postmodern theory (Klein and White, 1996). We can see that Marxist theories stays in the same category with postmodern theories, although the Marxist theories are always denied by postmodern ones. Unfortunately, within the wide category even the postcolonial theory has not been included. We may imagine that the postcolonial theory may be derivated from *dialectical*

deconstructionism (I think the phrase in the book is still wrong).

By locating postcolonial theory into the critical perspective, theoretical roots can be found in Said's critique on orientalism, Bhaba's hybridity concept, and Spivak's study on subaltern (Venn, 2006). It is assumed that the West (Europe and USA) constructs family discourse in parallel with Western industrialism as well as colonists' interest. According to the Western discourse on family, many types of families and kinship in (ex-)colonized communities are denied and are moved to be the Others. They exist only through Western language and Western knowledge. Moreover, the *Other Family* must orient themselves to the Western concepts of family (Occidentalism), so that they are located as subalterns.

In postcolonial theory, family is better considered as a discourse. Marriage, for example, is viewed as mechanism to fulfil sexual desire. The need has emerged before some rules of marriage and family development were constructed (Heryanto, 2000). Then the rules are materialized through praxis of family members. The praxis is typical in discourse of family, for example acting a solidarity among family members.

Discussion on family here is conducted to deconstruct Western discourse, that locating Eastern families as Others and positioned them at lower status on the context of linearity of modernity evolution or development. We also deconstruct perspective in which Western scientists is considered more competent on (so that it is valid for them to power to) development programs or family development program in ex-colonies (a tutelage concept). Actually a concept of nuclear family, for example, has been Western arrangement since industrial revolution at 18th-19th centuries. Up to 20th century, the nuclear family had pejorative meaning, which is considered as an unintended impact of industrial revolution. The revolution has broken wider kinship relationship into smaller ties of nuclear family members (Scott and Tilly, 1975; Zinn, 2000). Before entering development era since World War II, however, the perception of the nuclear family has switched into positive meaning. The nuclear family now is considered as one of important supports for economic development (Parsons, 1955;

Zimmerman, 1947).

Social dynamics within family are not only influenced from outside, but also emerges as consequences of everyday family members' actions. Through the actions the members actually reproducing newer meaning on every source of changes. A hybridity process works when the family members bring older perspectives out of the family (a diasporas process), then construct newer discourse and praxis to response any social changes. The new ones may consist of older perspectives inside and outside of the family, or constructing a real new perspective out of the formers. Moreover, self awareness that emerges in the family members becomes an important "capital" to emancipate themselves, or for helping Othered families.

A relationship between family and community may also be considered as other hybridity process. Self identity constructed in family's members may be different from community's representation. To avoid community's colonization to the family, a deconstruction need to be focused on subalternizing mechanism from community to the family.

3. Javanese Family and Community

3.1 Subalternizing Village and Family

At least since Mataram Kingdom (about 16th century) –at the time before facing Dutch colonization—villages development reflected village leader's capacity on managing villagers (Onghokham, 1986; Soemardjan, 1991). The king gives territorial authority for the leader, but without any supporting financial and material resources. The leader must manage villagers to produce any things and services by and for themselves. Relationship between the villager-community and the king is reflected by *upeti* (financial or anything contribution) from the village leader to the king once a year. Besides, during a war the village leader has been supporting the king by mobilizing the villagers as kingdom's armies. Nevertheless, the village leader may move

his/her obedient to other kingdom, if the former king were forget the village. In other worlds, emerging village always reflects self-governing autonomously, and capacity of village leader to lead villagers.

On the contrary, some villages became dependent and locating at the lowest bureaucratical structure when they are united. It has been happened during the beginning of 20th century (Sajogyo, 2006), paralled with reorganization of Dutch colonization. The idea of uniting some villages becomes control mechanism. Beside materially –for example wider territory of uniting some villages—the new united village also emerges on managerial discourse. In the discourse, uniting some villages must decrease statistics (better understood as sensus) of villages. This mechanism makes management and control to the villages working easier than before (Boyne, 2006; Venn, 2006). The controller is bureaucratical levels above the villages, for example sub district and district governments (especially during local autonomous era since 2000).

Control to villages categorization –especially during Soeharto regime at decades of 1970-1990—is materialized or powered by selecting and delivering development resources from national level to provincial, district, sub district, and end at village level (Nordholt, 1987). Materialization of the distribution also strongs village boundary, because the resources are distributed within formally village boundary.

Categorization as well as control and subalternization mechanisms to villages has been materialized particularly on development of typical formal village leader or *kepala desa* (chosen by upper government level). Their main task is distributing the development resources. Here the controllers are embodied within village or district leaders. Formal leader became stronger rather than informal leader in the same village (Nordholt, 1987). During the social change process, since 1980th decade villages financial has been more dependent to district and national governments –and on the contrary their autonomus on financial management has decreased (Booth, 1989). Surely the discourse on the hierarchycal control to villages will end to control to families.

Out of the hierarchical control mechanism, national and district governments actually control families within villages directly. The control works through actions of

development caders (Sajogyo, 2006), for example caders of family planning, infrastructure development, group financing. At this point, formal village leaders control the territory, and development caders control development sectors programs (sectors mean programs of departments or governments specifically).

Out of material control, subalternization of families also emerges in family discourse (Shiraishi, 2001; Mulder 2001a, 2001b). A discourse of *Father* is reconstructed. The father is reconsidered as leader that knows a lot –even all of—knowledge. The father, then, has a legitimation to govern other family members, even he may govern by out of social norms. Here *Father* is not only part of family members, but also reflected a discourse of absolut leader.

At the same time, *Mother* (*Ibu*) is reconstructed by the state as follower and servant of *Father*. The discourse of *state-ibuism* located Mother below Father. Control is materialized by disciplining *Dharma Wanita* organization (which may be translated as *mother serving father*), and PKK/*Pendidikan Kesejahteraan Keluarga* (translated as *mother serving all of family members*) (Sajogyo, 2006). At this point, we see that the scoupe of discourse of family is different from feminist movement (for example dichotomy of men and women).

Other discourse focuses on children. A linearity perspective bases the discourse that children is part of childish family member (Mulder, 2001a, 2001b). In *childish discourse*, children may play all of the days. Result of the children are toys, or toy's matter. Consequently, their result cannot produce intensive and deep meaning of life. Moreover children is reconsidered as people that have not become Javanese people yet, or have not become a fully human being yet. Within this point of view, the children cannot exist by themselves, but their existence must be declared by Father or Mother.

Discourses of Father the Leader, Mother the Servant, and Children the Player works during community's colonization to family. Community dynamics need serious suggestions and action—considered as area for maturely (wo)men—that is not able to be entered and developed by children. If the children represented their family in village-community meetings –because his/her Father cannot come

to the meetings—legitimation of his/her family were decreasing compared to other families that represented by Fathers directly. Village-community dynamics, then, are better understood as dynamics around family leaders. Through the selection (of entering meeting, for example) for family leaders only, the state may controls dynamics of villages as well as dynamics of families.

3.2 Family Emancipation

Historically, Javanese family is relatively aoutonomous when facing village-community (Hefner, 2005; Onghokham, 1986; Soemardjan, 1991). If the village leader were denying any welfare of families-members, then the families may move their obedient to other village leader. They may migrate to other village where the leader were accepting them. Territorial tie is not never tightly for Javanese family. Separation of the family from the village-community even may be a new step for emerging new village-community, based on solidarity of Othered families.

Community tie is more tightly through blood, ethnical or religious relationship (Hefner, 2005). If there were people in conflict, they may be separated by blood relationship. It shows that kinship relationship is more tightly than territorial relationship. Ethnical conflict during *Reformation* era is surely based on different ethnical ties. Peasant movements since colonization era are managed by religious leader–who can mobilize people based on religious tie. Besides, any conflict where families involve within are influenced by the leaders performance on managing or denying the families-members—they have been emerging since Mataram Kingdom era. In other words, imaginary community that consisted of families is constructed by ties of blood, ethnics, religion, or autoritative leader.

Facing many types of communities, family members also have their own autonomy. This perspective is different from other argument focuses on hierarchy within families (Mulder, 1984). Social interaction within Javanese family now has actually been changed towards equality. In this new context, the discourse of Father the Leader could soon be broken if the Father were violating the rule and public

manner. Father has power, but also is fallen into the discourse trap. Interestingly, social movements and revolutions in Indonesia unconsciously are denial actions of *Children* against *Father* (Shiraishi, 2001).

Another important matter to deny against any rule is having an experience on same social position. The experienced (wo)man is considered to be able to control a local history and having a lot of knowledge, so that (s)he has legitimation to stand up at the same level with the higher position. In this context, experience becomes a matter of *tutelage* (as an expert matter) to power to other discourses. In another side, experience is a mechanism that may be gathered by lower position. The mechanism also works within a family, in which marriage could be an experience for everybody. An experienced wife (a widow) has equal position –at least equally—with her husband.

Mother are also any experienced social position, a matter of knowledge, and a legitimation's matter. As power, *Mother*, then, is also a matter to emancipate other people. A discourse of *Mother* with all of meanings above may work to help other people, as well as to refresh a community at a whole. A social movement namely *Suara Ibu Peduli* (Voice of Caring Mother) –not feminist movement—using experiences of be the *Mother*, an having discursive legitimation to call all of people that influenced by social conflict during *Reformasi* revolt in Indonesia after 1999. The movement also has been helping and caring lost groups during *Reformasi* revolt. *Mother* has *selendang* (long wipe shawl), materialized to *Suara Ibu Peduli*, that give such a warm and pleasant feeling (Mulder, 1984; Shiraishi, 2001) –a condition of refresh that could be enjoyed by people soon after they stay in the *Mother's selendang*. Dialectics between feeling of *warm* and *loose* (out of *selendang*, materialized in financial crises since 1997) makes the concept of *Mother* become a new base on open and arranging family in a new condition.

4 Discussion: Empowering Kinship

Until now, an autonomous village-community is parallel with emerging new village. On the contrary, the

condition of dependency that emerges during uniting several villages also still exist. In other world, Occidentalism (colonialism and imperialism) works through recategorizing and rearranging villages boundaries. The boundaries construction has been followed by managing or governing village-community.

Developmentalism proposes idea of ideal type of family in modern society, in line with increasing family welfare. The idealization materialized as nuclear family (Parsons, 1955; Zimmerman, 1947), a dynamic family consists of only father, mother and children. Actually a statistical myth on welfare is used to propose that the nuclear family (as a little groups with only several members) is efficient and fits in developing local capitalism. Nuclear family become a base to produce anything more easily and is more flexible for local capitalism development. By Family Planning program since 1970th decade, number of children has been limited only for two ones, because children expenses should be decreased to gather welfare family. Still within the discourse, people don't like a family with single child, as the child may be spoiled and tempting his/her parents. On the other side, it has been constructed a discourse of *Eldest Child* (the position that is created after a position of younger brother/sister had been emerged) who will be mature soon through, *firstly*, by loves given by their parents, and *secondly*, by losing the love (Shiraishi, 2001). The *Eldest Child* helps parents (*Father* and *Mother*) and takes a care the younger brother/sister. We must also note that the nuclear family is not parts of polygamy. Disciplining tasks of *Father, Mother, Eldest Child* and younger children open space for the state to control the families.

To reach an ideal type of nuclear family, the state apparatus subalternizes families during national development programs. Such a control to the families also means a control to family members. In other worlds, the control is not only towards women –as argued by feminists— but moreover towards the positions of *Father, Mother*, and *Children.*

Unfortunately, the discourse of politics and development deny other relatives, for example grandfather, grandmother, uncle, aunt, grandchild. All of them have been denied and have not been any space of speaking in the name

of their family, familiarity, or kinship. We must note that the subalternization (and othering relatives of kinship) would be a problem in developmentalism, because –as written above— one of important tie of imaginary community is even kinship relation.

Nevertheless, Javanese family has created any space of autonomy during facing village-community. An exessive point of view on self governing family when facing community –compared to tightened ties between nuclear family and *Guanxi* community in China to manage any corporation—as argued by Hefner (2000) is difficult to be accepted. It had better to propose, that relationship among Javanese families also develops communities. It is not particularly territorial based community like a village, but relationship of kinship (blood relationship), ethnics, religion, and based of an authoritative leader.

This proposition, together with a consciousness on conflict and resistance of Javanese families –that mainly nuclear families—make us difficult to accept a perspective of meaningless family (especially Javanese family as researched above), so that the discourse of family is dominated by Soeharto regime (Shiraishi, 2001). The conflict and resistance by the family above, together with network of Javanese families cooperation, even show such an identity construction by themselves autonomously.

The autonomous space makes the Javanese family easy to take a hybridity process in everyday life, in order to reconstruct newly meaning within and outside of the family. Other hybridity-like experience actually has been emerged in Javanese syncretism activities (Mulder, 2001a, 2001b). The cultural syncretism has been including knowledge aspect as well as everyday praxis. The concept of hybridity of the family open a new space for solidarity across social classes. Emancipatory movement based on experiences of social position within family (for example as *Mother* in *Suara Ibu Peduli*), however, may be incidental. I think the movement focused on spontaneous responses towards suddenly financial crises. If we view the movement as a hybridity process, the discourse needs to be materialized in everyday actions. For me, such a perspective has more opportunity to develop hybridity (and enjoyment of all of the members), rather than a suggestion to organize the movement more

formally (Budianta, 2004). Without hybridity, formalization could become to be a *governmentality* (by Foucault) from elites to control all of members below.

Moreover, it is true that the state subalternizes families (Shiraishi, 2001). At the same time, however, the Javanese family re-manage and re-construct the discourse from the state through actions of hybridity. As the result, the discourse and praxis of Javanese family and kinship members deny the domination and tutelage of the state. The Javanese family still maintains kinship relationship for the sake of a warm and pleasant condition (*selendang* condition). Here we can see that many discourses of family may exist altogether now –although they may not support each other— to construct *co-articulation* of discourses and praxis.

5 Conclusion

Dynamic relationship between Javanese family and village-community may not be declared as a direct relationship. The territorial tie of village-community works only when fits in ties of kinship, ethnics, religions, or authoritative leaders.

It is possible to develop a community, which is based on relationship among families and kinship. Idea or discourse on family may become a foundation to develop people's tie (Shiraishi, 2001). Within the discourse, it could be differentiated closely people (materialized from the discourse of family) from strangers (as Others). A community, then, may be developed through hybridity process of families as members of the community (Anderson, 2002).

Coexistence of state's subalternization towards village-communities and families, and hybridity of Javanese families to response the subalternization, develops co-articulation context between discourse and praxis of village-community and Javanese families. It is rather different from other postcolonial theorists' argument, in which co-articulation tights hybridity within mixed-discourses, I propose that co-articulation closes to *toleration* concept. All of discourses and praxis from all of parties may be in confrontation (even the state may deny villages and families as Others), but all of

them live together in the same space and time.

The co-articulation may be viewed as emerging and developing many paradigms altogether. Social reality as percepted by the people moves among the paradigms, and produces different meaning when entering different paradigm. Surely we still need a deep research on critical point of the meaning movement.

REFERENCES:

Al-Fayyadl, M (2005) *Derrida*. Yogyakarta: LKIS.

Anderson, BR'OG (2002) *Imagined Communities: Komunitas-komunitas Terbayang*. Translated from Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Second Ed. Yogyakarta. Insist.

Arivia, G (2005) *Kata Pengantar*, In: D. Macdonell. Teori-teori Diskursus: Kematian Strukturalisme & Kelahiran Posstrukturalisme dari Althusser hingga Foucault. Translated from Theories of Discourses: An Introduction. Bandung. Teraju.

Booth, A (1989) *Pengeluaran Pembangunan Pemerintah Daerah yang Dibiayai dengan Dana Pemerintah Pusat di Indonesia: Hasil yang Telah Dicapai dan Peluang di Masa Depan*. In: N. Devas, B. Binder, A. Booth, K. Davey, R. Kelly, *eds*. Keuangan Pemerintah Daerah di Indonesia. Translated from Financing Local Government in Indonesia. Jakarta. UI Pr.

Boyne, R (2006) *Classification*. In: Theory, Culture and Society Vol 23 No. 2-3.

Budianta, M (2004) *Tragedi yang Menuai Berkah: Munculnya Aktivisme Perempuan dalam Masa Reformasi*. In: A. Heryanto, SK Mandal, eds. Menggugat Otoriterisme di Asia Tenggara: Perbandingan dan Pertautan antara Indonesia dan Malaysia. Translated from Challenging Authoritarianism in Southeast Asia: Comparing Indonesia and Malaysia. Jakarta. Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.

Coleman, J (1994) *A Rational Choice Perspective on Economic Sociology*. In NJ Smelser, R. Swedberg, eds. The Handbook of Economic Sociology. Princeton. Princeton Univ. Pr.

Derrida, J (2005) *Kosmopolitanisme & Forgiveness*. Translated from Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness. Yogyakarta. Alinea.

Durkheim, E (1933) *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York. Free Press.

Macdonell, D (2005) *Teori-teori Diskursus: Kematian Strukturalisme & Kelahiran Posstrukturalisme dari Althusser hingga Foucault*. Translated from Theories of Discourses: An Introduction. Bandung. Teraju.

Foucault, M (2002) *Mengugat Sejarah Ide*. Translated from The Archaeology of Knowledge. Yogyakarta. Ircisod.

Hefner, RW (2000) *Islam Pasar Keadilan: Artikulasi Lokal, Kapitalisme, Demokrasi*. Yogyakarta. LKIS.

Heryanto, A (2000) *Perlawanan dalam Kepatuhan: Esai-esai Budaya*. Bandung. Mizan.

Hindess, B (1978) *Humanism and Teleology in Sociological Theory*. In: B. Hindess, ed. Sociological Theories of the Economy. London. Macmillan.

International Forum on Globalization (2003) Globalisasi, Kemiskinan & Ketimpangan. Translated from Does Globalization Help the Poor? Yogyakarta. Cindelaras.

Klein, DM, JM White (1996) *Family Theories: An Introduction*. London. Sage.

Marx, K., F. Engels (1960) *Manifes Partai Komunis*. Translated from Communist Manifesto. Jakarta. Jajasan "Pembaruan".

Mulder, N (2001a) *Mistisisme Jawa: Ideologi di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta. LKIS.

Mulder, N (2001b) *Ruang Batin Masyarakat Indonesia*. Yogyakarta. LKIS.

Mulder, N (1984) *Kepribadian Jawa dan Pembangunan Nasional*. Yogyakarta. Gadjah Mada Univ. Pr.

Nordholt, NS (1987) *Ojo Dumeh: Kepemimpinan Lokal dalam Pembangunan*. Jakarta. Sinar Harapan.

Onghokham (1986) *Korupsi dan Pengawasan dalam Perspektif Sejarah*. In: Prisma Vol. 15 No. 3.

Parsons, T (1955) *The Isolated Conjugal Family*. In: M. Anderson. Sociology of the Family, Second Ed. Middlesex, UK. Penguin.

Petras, J., H. Veltmeyer (2000) *Imperialisme Abad 21*. Translated from Globalization Unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st Century. Yogyakarta. Kreasi Wacana.

Redfield, R (1985) Masyarakat Petani dan Kebudayaan. Translated from The Little Community, Peasant Society and Culture. Jakarta. Rajawali.

Said, EW (2001) *Orientalisme*. Translated from Orientalism. Bandung. Pustaka.

Sajogyo (2006) *Ekososiologi: Deideologisasi Teori, Restrukturisasi Aksi (Petani dan Perdesaan sebagai Kasus Uji)*. Yogyakarta. Cindelaras.

Scott, JW, LA Tilly (1975) *Women's Worlk and the Family in Nineteenth-Century*. In: M. Anderson. Sociology of the Family, Second Ed. Middlesex, UK. Penguin.

Shiraishi, SS (2001) *Pahlawan-pahlawan Belia: Keluarga Indonesia dalam Politik*. Translated from Young Heroes: Indonesian Family in Politics. Jakarta. Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.

Soemardjan, S (1991) *Perubahan Sosial di Yogyakarta*. Translated from Social Change in Yogyakarta. Yogyakarta. Gadjah Mada Univ. Pr.

Tönnies, F (1955) *Community and Society*. In: R. Boudon, M. Cherkaoui, eds. Central Currents in Social Theory: The Roots of Sociological Theory 1700-1920, Volume II. London. SAGE.

Venn, C (2006) *The Postcolonial Challenge: Towards Alternative Worlds*. London. Sage.

Zimmerman, CC (1947) *The Atomistic Family*. In: M. Anderson. Sociology of the Family, Second Ed. Middlesex, UK. Penguin.

Zinn, MB (2000) *Feminism and Family Studies for a New Century*. In: ANNALS, AAPSS No. 571.