

# PROCEEDING

The 1<sup>st</sup> International Conference of Arts  
and Arts Education in Indonesia (ICAAE) 2014  
March 5-6, 2014

## RETHINKING THE HUMAN DIGNITY AND NATION IDENTITY: A REVIEW PERSPECTIVE OF ARTS AND ARTS EDUCATION

xvi + 940 hlm; 21 x 29,7 cm

ISBN 978-602-7981-26-3

I. Artikel

II. Judul

III. Dr. Kasiyan, M.Hum., dkk

Hak Cipta Dilindungi Undang-Undang  
Memfoto copy atau memperbanyak dengan cara apapun,  
Sebagian atau seluruh isi buku ini tanpa seizin penerbit  
Adalah tindakan tidak bermoral dan melawan hukum

**Judul Buku :**  
**RETHINKING THE HUMAN DIGNITY AND NATION IDENTITY:  
A REVIEW PERSPECTIVE OF ARTS AND ARTS EDUCATION**

### Penyunting :

Dr. Kasiyan, M.Hum.  
Dr. Widyastuti Purbani, M.A.  
Ayu Niza Machfauzia, M.Pd.  
Siti Sudartini, M.A.

### Desain Sampul:

Ika Dyah Afriani

### Tata Letak :

Pudji Triwibowo

### Penerbit:

**UNY Press**

Kompleks Fak. Teknik UNY, Kampus Karangmalang  
Yogyakarta 55281 Phone : (0274) 589346  
E-mail : [unypress.yogyakarta@gmail.com](mailto:unypress.yogyakarta@gmail.com)



## SPACE FOR CULTURAL ARTICULATION: VOISING THE LOCAL IN COMMODITY TRANSFORMATION

Hery Prasetyo  
Dien Vidia Rosa

University of Jember  
[heryprasetyo83@gmail.com](mailto:heryprasetyo83@gmail.com)  
[dien\\_ros@yahoo.com](mailto:dien_ros@yahoo.com)

### Abstract

*I*ssue about culture articulation as if fuse with urgency to built character which oriented nationalistically to integrated locality through subject democratization. In this context the consequence will be on how local culture with its specific historicity is pulled toward national spirit. This understanding certainly placed locality formation into inferiority space and its presence to legitimate national power. At the same time local movement as though work with its whole dynamic energy in subject culture self-consciousness that rooted to local spirit as the origin of tradition is appearing drag one's feet to present its contemporary. Particularly, when mainstream power eroded space of culture presence. And precisely it is trapped to build articulation lane by placing it into global capitalism networking. Especially, through the making of mass culture consciousness that oriented to plurality standardize. The presence of culture articulation as differ from the mass now is framed into authentic representation spirit with local root that at the same time is meant as spectacle of postcolonial entity. This issue will be the main focus from this essay with build analysis about contemporary Using youth ethnic in placing themselves into local culture articulation. At this point, researcher concerns the existence of youth spirit to present in articulation culture movement which is appeared in spectacle space and at the same time in space of cultural commodity contestation. Meanwhile, youth subject is placed as oriented to technological and contemporary. This is intentionally spaced because of culture politic in Banyuwangi by directing local culture as local commodity which can be contested globally. This issue discursively will bring the local culture articulation problem as rituality of local commodity spectacle for the sake of the local return presence with political economy transformation.

**Keywords:** culture articulation, postcolonial, using youth ethnic.



## Introduction

Why does articulation become urgent to discuss? Is this urgently only exist in contemporary situation or is there a problem that can be referred from its own articulation history? Who has right and quite likely appear in articulation space? Is there any special criteria in articulation perform by subjects? Those questions become starting point in investigating subject's presence and their cultural articulation.

To present articulation by appearing its contemporary from cultural space is a situation how subject exist him/herself with the whole complexity of fight and bet which have consequences consider nonexistent. Nonexistent in this context refer to the stifling of subject voice by making the same it through mass presence. So, when the mass replace subject authenticity condition, who is represent it?

Subjects not represent what concretely exists into empirical reality. Through subject and in their everyday life, history is formed with its mode of production space. Subjects refer to whom which different in and is performed unilateral by elite knowledge. Without give space for the return of subjects, the elite continues to form subjects as a mass crowd and are positioned passively into a crowd that watch power presence in elite rituality and in cultural rituality for power legitimating.

The mass is not more than a creative effort of elite to unite mass power as theirs and operate for them. In another side, elite forms particular boundary for the mass to be recognized as the mass. That is a boundary which is able to be a preference for subjects and unite their self to the mass. Through social formation and knowledge and is followed by power operation, subjects attached themselves to the mass. The mass is a representation from subjects which are different and unlimited.

## Articulation and Mass Representation: A Methodology Consequence

By building methodological framework and to operate theoretical imagination which shaped reality formation with subject's character, the writers started theoretical reading through cultural turn concept that is referred to Gramsci's idea. In introducing concept about men as a concrete and thinking through knowledge framework and placed themselves into space and social position. *All men are intellectuals, one could therefore say : but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals* (Gramsci, 1992:9).

Gramsci will placed men position as exist in social situation and historicity by affirming Marx's conception: *"Man make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past"* (Marx, 1972:10). Concept of man is important in understanding how his presence is always being formed in concrete social relation



and historic. Mode of production which is oriented to transform material and present it become a shape of commodity which moved dialectically is part of man existent. While, his existent directly faced through mode of production by presenting the social as regulate and order on how individuality is moved through introduce values which embedded into commodity and on how values become a mean to converse transformation result that later is shaped in money.

The reading of Marx's dialectical frame that is appeared as politic, especially in Lenin's work, is intended political strategy to reach revolution. That is a strategy which is started by achievement of the mass and creates revolutionary blocs by joining radical bourgeois (Lenin, 1974; Lenin, 1977; Hill, 2009). The problem arises from this context, particularly in the condition of state that is still governed by feudal regime that center on land ruling and direct ruling peasant subject and labor peasant. In another side, ruling mode which exist on crisis situation, particularly in force sustainability in the middle of political constellation increase and emerge revolutionary progressive force for the mass, need strategic steps and tactic to represent the mass. For Lenin, direct ruling certainly will be faced with rebellion and the limitation of revolution means, therefore built revolution bloc with bourgeois radical can accelerate the reach of feudal forces overthrow. By the end of feudal regime power, it is needed ruling model through proletariat dictator which is translated as a phase to escort communist revolution with a way of parliament revolution that rooted to mass labor force with their revolutionary consciousness.

The strategy that is developed by Lenin become part of capitalism reproduction reading which he mentioned as Imperialism through networks monopolistic enterprises and circulation monetary system in banking. Through political-economy model which oriented imperialistically, capitalist state will always develop it's mode of production to others state by shaping monopoly and capital ownership oligarchy networks. In another conception, Lenin Imperialism model called as inequality and reproduction that is combined in Trotsky's language (Trotsky, 2009; Bottemore, 2001). Those ideas of Lenin and Trotsky are used to reach Bolshevik revolution in Rusia.

In another side, arise debate between Lenin's doctrine of mass formation, especially on reductionist that assumed class polarization and revolution that happened from itself. This idea is developed by Eduard Bernstein (Bottemore, 2001). It is become intricate to imagine how mass concept which is arranged materially and dialectically operates reductively. The weakness of reductionism conception opposed firmly by Rosa Luxemburg by carrying authentic mass consciousness concept which then is arranged through dialectic frame on materiality and social space that place the mass (Scott, 2008; Bottemore, 2001). Therefore, the mass has self consciousness about when and how revolution has to



be done. The formation of mass attack spontaneity happened when there is empirical condition that is realized massively.

At this point, Lenin and Trotsky deliver a strategy in creating mass consciousness by making class or technically translated as revolutionary party which able to push the mass for having consciousness. Meanwhile, the with Rosa's mass conception that is formed oriented to leded mass revolution. It is different where the mass is individual networking in work space and has self consciousness to create spontaneity revolutionary action.

The mass debate had formed Gramsci's point of view, especially concern on how party leadership which is weaken by Stalin who only oriented to build Socialist State without care for mass development and networking internationally. Gramsci's critic located to what had been considered by Marx, that is, reproduction of relation of production that not only oriented to pacify the course of modal accumulation but create imbalance unequally. But this condition later did not make the mass takes side on social revolution but precisely takes side to pacify it social position. Gramsci's experiences on party leadership formation and active mass movement and is arranged not only based on production which is imagined mechanistically but to create cultural formation that enable materiality to be moved socially.

The problem then is placed on the framework of how the actively mass exist in relation of mode production but in another side the mass is shaped through leadership. This problem was introduced by Marx dan Engels in *The German Ideology* (Marx and Engels, 1976). For Gramsci, the problem no longer is placed on how ideology is created and is operated but on the creation of character and ideological leadership which able to make the mass obeys behavior order in the world.

Leadership no longer becomes Weberian charismatic character that able to move the mass mythological and relation which have the quality of non-rational (Kurzman and Owens, 2002). But in cultural leadership, it appears consciousness movement way that material and can give fulfillment of material needs. This understanding bring to how leadership able to give space on practical and be oriented to cultural where this leadership model may become justification in theoretical frame of hegemony practice.

Hegemony enables a leadership that can create consciousness in the meaning of social group unity and justify mass practice on individuality. Through hegemonic leadership character, individuality diversity is appeared embed to a whole action of the leader in making mass subjective to be his owns. In this context, mass problem and mass movement will be carrying to somewhere become important to be realized, especially on how this leadership is able to



create think order on practice and movement of ruler domination upon the mass until on how the model and strategy to against it.

Gramsci's *Cultural Turn* placed the mass framework in various cultural space, social practice, relation of production and consumption, and form also its various determinant. The concept of "order" and "mode" become specific in the using of hegemony concept where "order" refer to intellectuality dialectical knowledge unity. While "mode" refer to how the movement of means of production emerge and is operated to transform social relation.

Gramsci developed *Praxis Philosophy* conception which methodologically able to be applied in Sociology dimension (Gramsci, 1992; Jubas, 2010). It particularly placed man as a part of hegemony practice completely presence and is formed with praxis through knowledge in social context where praxis is done. Hegemony practice completely presence signed the existence of social spaces that are shaped specifically through various determination.

The concept then is arranged structurally by Althusser as Marxism Structuralist frame model. This framework adopted social space completely presence determinably culminate to its various or later called over determinant and finally return to economic as the basis of relation of production (Althusser, 2007; Callinicos, 1976). This affirmation from Althusser is meant to anticipate various social structure and social space context that is supposed to be separated and can operate by itself without mode of production which is formed and related in capitalism system. In this Althusserian conception, society is arranged through ideological structure that able to create unconsciousness. And this structure also able to interpolates or summon subject presence. The conception later, that is arranged ideological and repressive.

The work of repressive in presenting the subject with its order structurally able to position subject as only a part that his presence is formed ideological repressively. And subject is forced to face various social structure content that its wholeness is connected become ideological system. This ideological accumulatively arrange whole variety become total unity by shaping internal contradiction or contradiction in structure order content. While subject is exist through internal contradiction that interpolates him.

The Althusserian way of thinking creates methodological frames multiplicity. First, the placing of mass as an internal contradiction group and subject become only as a part that had been interpolated. Meanwhile, the repressive that later is appeared as an interpolation by subject, it is what orally and textually represent way of ideology presence itself. The completely presence of hegemony in social structure order that is language in oral and textual turn to formation system which enable its presence become exist or is vanished.



Later, subject presents vertically dominative in social-architectural space. In the presence, subject is shaped by ideological formation that appear as repressive and hegemonic force regime with the creation various social space and various subjectivity that is formed as mutually surveillance to form disciplinary and docility in dispositive (Foucault, 1980; Foucault, 2003). This becomes Foucault's way to develop archeology of knowledge conception and the presence of subject.

Subject in theoretical discourse structure will appear universally and empirical contextuality dimension only become a differ. These emerge from how the mass is projected into disciplinary and competition area for leadership presence that hegemonic. This conception appears to have its discontinuity particularly on crack of how to represent social space which specifically different with had happened in Europe.

Cultural space simultaneity which embeds with colonial presence is a part which is talked so much by Marx, Lenin ataupun Trotsky. Therefore, creation of mass which universally able to unify in Anti Capitalism-Colonialism and Imperialism ideological movement become zest from mass which is vanished by mode of production where the existence only positioned as labor that passively will operate through culture formation which is center in Europe. Non-European mass that culturally has different character with the European discursively is formed in European culture structural formation. And what is objectified as outside Europe arbitrary is arranged appropriate with European self-interest.

India as a little part of cultural space which is formed by Europe-centrist zest become interesting, to see the appearing of colonial subject in elite and mass contestation. Ranajit Guha represented India's mass as is formed in domination without hegemonic formation (Guha, 2000). This conception started from formation of the mass which is arranged structurally and referred to mass differentiation which consequence to elite formation. Elite refer to Europe subjectivity formation that is represented through administrative colonial leadership character, that was character which represented the whole region and colonial cultural entity that then is conceptualized as National elite which represented regional and cultural locality (Spivak, 1995). The existence of elite which contested his domination in compete for the mass, it formed mass in its crack into how the cultural is sustained and how the cultural is operated as a part of daily life complexity.

Mass in colonial space become mass which flow in elite power space, especially on how the mass is voiced and objectified through elite's voice and attitude. Meanwhile, in another side, historicity and colonial character only exists through elite. The problem arise when colonial elite faced with European, what kind of strategic and tactic that will be used by colonial elite to move the mass? And how is about the mass subjectivity inside?



Cultural articulation which is formed through elite spatiality is the beginning point of methodological framework searching. Subject whose presence melt in mass presence is appeared become homogeneous and without authentic historicity. Mass is formed in the will and elite power formation which will push it into a world with elite cultural formation. This has consequence to elite and mass relation model that created homogeneity which formed friction inside, struggle and crack in mass subjectivity. This placed on how elite created separated poles and pull the mass into rotation of pole's fight. The appearance of dominant elite supposed of the seized mass and formed mass to take sides to aim which is offered, continue to the mass which is imagined become force that could be called its presence when elite wish for it (Anderson, 1991). The conception is imagined formed the difference between exist, that will be existed and the maker of existence. Meanwhile, exist in this understanding is placed in region which continually appropriate changing with the change of social relation.

Changing context and imagination of direction and formation are articulated continuously by elite and mass. Elite appeared as unify in daily and political direction is formed for the mass. While, cultural space presence of mass is compressed and changing presence that is existed by its material condition. In this context is the presence of another world shadow in different elite. It means that to unite the mass with world shadow and strategy of world achievement will be different when it placed into mass everyday life with subject's complexity and subjectivity. At the same time, this end up with the failure of elite to formed direction which can be articulated totally for the mass.

Cultural articulation for subject embedded as private and public. In this meaning, mass formed itself as had relation dialectically to materiality and subject historicity that then are appeared through the social until it formed consciousness and unconsciousness space for subject. This understanding delivers on how cultural articulation is a part of subjectivity presence in placing subject as the mass. Subject who is imagined will direct to elitist poles that only follow elite then is appeared as a subject who has formation into the shaping of active and subjective cultural articulation.

### **Subalternity: About Mass Subjectivity and Individuation Consciousness Intensification**

Contemporary is historicity presence space which articulately able to appear in front of subject. At the same time, the presence history which vanish others shouted to become the dominant in contemporary. Meanwhile, others are silent, unvoiced, and did not have a chance to presence. Their presences only absorbed and melt that they cannot be recognized as exist and present in contemporary history.



Subaltern subject as is appeared in history only placed as socially has position. Self-subject that exists in a shape of relation of production moves social formation and intensively is represented by elite. Subaltern subject is positioned in non-exist identity (Spivak, 2004) a conceptualization which is complicated to be imagined to operate. Precisely in this point, it enables to start by referring to subject, particularly on how subject placed and talked about the self. Subject as non-elite placed the self as a part of that is arranged and neatly look also closed when it represented. When subject said about what and who is the self, preference that is used will always lead to outside the self.

Non elite is embedded into the mass, meanwhile the mass is built upon social subject positions heterogeneity. Youth are placed as exist in mass and specifically, youth in this article is meant to discuss cultural articulation which is presented by educated youth, those who socially and structurally able to take education. Education is seen as a part of how ideology massively is incepted to form mass docility in elite social formation. Subject exist and being existent through ideology which transform the self as utility object.

In transformative movement, subject exist in non-exist past time situation which are authentic and empiric also exist in the future that utopia imaginative that happened precisely through thinking process. Through creation framework model which is arranged by elite and empower discipline of body and knowledge to walk on projected street, that precisely make subject has distance of himself and his origin and become docile subject. The docility is appeared on how subject present in social spaces and voice his position with change and by changing his identity.

From words which voicing about origin, as: *"I am a Javanese live in Banyuwangi"*, *"I am a Javanese who have to learn Using culture"*, *"I am an Using-Javanese because my mom is an Using and my father is a Javanese"*, *"I am rural Using"* are concepts which discursively placed subject into nothingness that able to determine what is and where will social position subject go. Through the resistance, affirmation, comparative and spatiality, mass subjectivity performs contradictory presence formation. By celebrating subalternity which has locality powered, subject will melt himself among the mass by playing into difference of others.

The celebration of local in this context formed what is conceptualized as individuation consciousness intensification<sup>18</sup> or to present the changing of social

<sup>18</sup> This concept is explained novelistically by Natsuo Kirino, in chapter 6, Fermentation and Decaying concept. One of the character in the novel, Professor Kijima described about historicity which able to form contemporary as part of individual survival with Individuation Consciousness Intensification that refer to physiology. This concept sees individual mutation in adaptation practice and position in system, structure or order. Further reading is Kirino, Natsuo, 2010. *Grotesque*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama. In this writing, concept of individuation



structural society as cultural evolution in subject space. When subject is arranged through subalternity, evolutive reference which placed self-subject and cultural root is not only happened outside subject. Genetically, subjectivity problem touch on how is culture becomes a part that inherited and intensively creates individuation space.

Preference and articulation space have position and structure that faced each others in cultural orbit which is formed through elitism orientation that is performed as separate from subject. In another side, this elitist space will perform it force as operate to form mode of production and cultural articulation space. Each elites and force era strive for appearing as a determinant by modification new cultural pattern. Cultural mingled is not understood purely as something unites substantially because the idea of values strengthens which is materialized in competition amongst cultures. Individuation consciousness intensification which is articulated by subject is present as cultural exponential, a kind of culture ruling and descendant in certain level. Nevertheless, in another side, it faced with adaptation as sustainable adjustment of others culture and new mutation. And cultural subject practice mutates and transmits to form new practices which more openness to contestation and modification.

Problem of strengthen and sustainable culture cannot detach from individuation consciousness intensification that genetically orientation, that the cultural always embed into generation identity of hereditary line which is affirmed in subject blood<sup>19</sup>. For instance, in one of cultural development formation that worked through tradition for generations which is closed disposition by mean only descendant or pure bloods that can execute and sustain it. Therefore, it needs subject's existential consciousness in cultural practice to inherit the importance of perpetuate his own culture which furthermore build pride and self-esteem assumptions individually and socially as a way of life. These mean, cultural practices always refer to subject ability to sustain culture.

---

consciousness intensification is used to understand subject consciousness for recognizing and forming cultural preference to compete and practice his/her articulation space.

<sup>19</sup> The writers tried to expand B. F. Skinner's idea on evolution of culture. The idea of cultural heir genetically is used by Skinner in explaining a cultural sustainability through individual practices who inherit characteristics and qualities from ancestors. The idea is developed from J. B. de Lamarck who built argumentation about *Acquired Characteristic*. In this context, the heir of cultural characteristics is understood as embedded with *bloodlines* which socially are knots where descendents, especially ritual culture, must have trace and genetic records that appropriate to sustain the tradition. Furthermore this argument can be followed through Skinner, B. F. 1971. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*. New York: Penguin Books; Skinner, B. F. 1953. *Science and Human Behavior*. New York: The Free Press. And compare with Rosa, Dien Vidia. 2011. *Genetic, Identity And The Future of Urban Culture*. Proceeding The 3<sup>rd</sup> International Graduate Students Conference On Indonesia "Indonesian Urban Culture and Societies". Yogyakarta: The Graduate School UGM.



In this context, there arise subject articulation problem related to individuation consciousness intensification when face with the pure bloods and mingled bloods which root to formation of practical mass as cultural agents and spectator mass in complex cultural space. Pure blood subjects genetically face their subjectivity with others pure bloods who responsible for cultural heritage that is similar or different. Nevertheless, there are potencies and wider space to face mingled blood subjects who enter the system that later able to adapt and even transform values of old culture. Therefore, cultural practice of mingled blood subjects emerge new values that may different from the origin culture and establish new design culture.

The process mobilizes whole ability pure blooded subjects and mingled blood subjects in forming cultural identity for the battle and competition or cultural modification in a system. Therefore, the origin of pure culture and how it is modified or transformed present adaptive practice where genetic basis become important (King, 1981). Young generation as cultural heir generation and its articulation begin dialectic set from genetic existence that formed cultural preference. Through those youth zest, mass position, elite, and cultural is determined. For instance, several Banyuwangi's young informants were telling their cultural preference basically were passed by referring origin, heredity as identification process which then emerged as a long path cultural practices. Complexity arises not only from mingled blood generations but also from pure blood generations that faced cultural determination which is different in the different environment.

*Ya waktu pertama aneh soalnya kan cenderung kalau yang dari Jawa ke Using itu yang Jawa itu biasa ndak begitu agak kasar tapi kalau yang agak ke Usingnya itu agak kasar dikit jadi agak shock. Kulturalnya itu agak kasar. Pertama itu penyesuaiannya itu ndak langsung ngerti bahasanya. Ada beberapa bahasa Banyuwangi itu yang kadang ngerti kadang nggak, ya salah tafsir juga pernah. Abis itu bahasanya dicampur buk, Jawa tapi logatnya pake Using (Deky).*

(Well, for the first time it was weird because there was tendency if from Java to Using that Java usually did not too rude but if rather to Using a little bit more rudeness so it was somewhat shocking. The culture is rather rude. First for the adaptation, did not understand the language. There were several Banyuwangi's languages that seldom understand or did not understand, yes, ever misinterpretation. After that, the language was mixed, Mam, Java but the dialect used Using) (Deky)

*Kalau saya Using logatnya Jawa. Eh, nggak ding tapi (Uci).*  
(I am Using with Java dialect. Eh, but it is not really (Uci).



Deky and Yunda were subjects who experienced individual mutation with mingled bloods which symbolized the difference between Java and Using. For Deky, self recognizing to new culture faced into identity formation and cultural attribute which will always appear as the total and singular. Precisely, problem of individuation intensification refer to identity cultural formation by elite. In several things, individuation consciousness intensification placed subject in cultural articulation through mutation of cultural patterns.

Meanwhile, Uci as Using pure blood mutated to Javanese cultural pattern which formed cultural preference doubt in her identity. Using people that confessed to use Java dialect that then negate the Java-ness in her temporally experience. Deky doubt his Using cultural preference which not so long is acknowledged as his cultural identity. And Yunda recognized herself as a rude Using. All of them chose to use Javanese language and Bahasa Indonesia outside Banyuwangi, once and seldom used Using language with friends from Banyuwangi that used Using language in Jember. It is not easy to recognize the struggle of cultural preference in subject articulation because it's dynamic nature which finally form distance in subject consciousness.

Pure and mingled blood young generations arouse those distance in cultural articulation space through self positioning inside the mass which exist in intersection or spectator mass. Particularly in seeing how those positioning were arranged by cultural agents –in this context are artists- and elite. Individuation consciousness intensification is related to subject affirmation and preference about culture. Nevertheless, how did individual consciousness process work in pressures and elite power structural knot? Or how subject able to recognize the root and cultural historicity which are indoctrinated to be accepted as taken for granted from artists and elite? Did artists and elite appear as the same force?

A Banyuwangi youth with Java-Using mingled blood named Yunda, saw those cultural indoctrination symptoms as a way of subject consciousness intensification to return young generation's *sense of belonging* as cultural heir. Their involvement and active participation are demanded to form and turn the cultural track by today's taste. Using Youth struggled on cultural problem which take for granted also the cultural that lose its zest and its historical root. This kind of cultural which is assumed as representative by elite, had been modified by contemporary values which is more interested young generation and interested many people outside Banyuwangi region. This culture, precisely placed the youth into spectator mass position merely because they did not interested on the process and the origin of culture anymore.

*Kalau di daerah saya Buk ya, saya kan tinggal di Banyuwangi kota. Menurut saya tingkat rasa menunjukkan bahwa saya orang suku Using, saya anak Banyuwangi, yang pertama karena dari pariwisata*



Banyuwanginya sendiri itu gencar-gencarnya, Buk. Terus ditunjukkan dengan pertama ya Buk ya, kalau saya lihat dari SMP 1 Banyuwangi kota itu setiap hari Jumat, setiap hari Sabtu kalau ndak hari Jumat itu dia memakai kaos yang tulisannya "I Love Banyuwangi". Jadi semua, baik siswa maupun gurunya itu pake itu Buk. Kalau di SMA 1 Giri, SMA saya itu dia ada seperti acara, disana ada yang namanya pak Suhalik buk, itu seperti peneliti, guru, orang yang me...apa ya...sangat budayawan... ya budayawan sekali tentang Banyuwangi itu. Jadi ngangkat Banyuwanginya itu yo bersamaan dengan siswa-siswanya. Jadi siswanya itu ikut tergerak gitu buk. Terus di kota itu juga..ehh...karena adanya wi-fi, di Banyuwangi itu kan ada program wi-fi id school, itu Buk... Terus kayak anak-anak Banyuwangi yang di kota sering ikut-ikut event yang utamanya mengangkat budaya Banyuwangi kayak BEC juga itu Buk, kan makin banyak anak-anak itu yang ikut. Terus dari Sewu Gandrung. Jadi mungkin dari kemenarikan pengangkatan budaya yang merangkul dari generasi mudanya itu, jadi kepala satu ketemu kepala dua ketemu kepala banyak-banyak, jadinya mereka itu apa ya aktif gitu. Aktif untuk mengangkat budaya Banyuwangi... (Yunda).

(If in my area, Mam, I live in the city in Banyuwangi. In my opinion the level of taste which show that I am an Using ethnic, I am Banyuwangi's youth, first because of Banyuwangi tourism which incessant. Then it showed with, for the first, if I saw from SMP 1 Banyuwangi city, every Friday or Saturday, they wore t-shirt with "I Love Banyuwangi" text. So, all of students and teachers wore it. In SMA 1 Giri, there is Mr. Suhalik, he is like a researcher, teacher, man who....really...cultural...very cultural about Banyuwangi. So, he lifted Banyuwangi with his students. So, the students are also moved. Then I the city also...because there is wi-fi... Later...Banyuwangi's youth often followed events which lifted Banyuwangi culture, for example BEC. Then, Sewu Gandrung. So, possibly from those interesting cultural promotion that embraced young generation, they become, what is... active. Active to promote Banyuwangi's culture... (Yunda).

At this point, cultural fate is determined by the winner of the battle in cultural articulation space, the mass, young generation or elite. Who is elite? The cultural heirs who ought to place *high position or prestige* in social system and structure eventually become mass which is positioned as worker that in other word called *the guardian*. Meanwhile, elite which is assumed as cultural supporter take a distance in cultural formation and historicity because they are outside the bloodline or descendent. Therefore, problem emerges which have to be faced when refer to elite position as one who determine and guard the culture. Who is and how elite work in determining the dominant and representative culture as determinant? As beginning position, youth saw from bloodline or descendant to



place elite position as take a distance with culture. The justification is seen from this Banyuwangi youth conversation about local governmental elite and his cultural preference.

*Yunda: "kalau menurutku, sebelum Anas kan Bu Ratna. Bu Ratna basicnya bukan orang Banyuwangi asli. Dia kan Bali. Walaupun dia Bali... dia ndak bisa koq bahasa Using."*

*Hendra: "Pak Anas kan bukan... Pak Anas, kan dari Blok Agung. Blok Agung kan bukan Using."*

*Yunda: "tapi dia..."*

*Hendra: "bisa Using?"*

*Yunda: "bisa walaupun ndak se-medhok atau se-ndeles itu".*

*(Yunda: "in my opinion, before Anas is Ratna. Her basic is not authentic Banyuwangi's people. She is a Balinese. Eventhough she is a Balinese... she cannot speak Using language.")*

*Hendra: "Anas is not... Anas from Blok Agung. Blok Agung is not Using."*

*Yunda: "But he..."*

*Hendra: "can speak Using?"*

*Yunda: "he can, eventhough does not fluent as original Using.")*

In this context, cultural system which is formed by elite keep Banyuwangi youth away from Using cultural root and historicity. In another side, youth articulation space becomes more complicated with the presence of adaptive cultural commodification. The Origin which is arranged through subalternity root and postcolonial networking culminate on how cultural identity concept is formed into mode of production that is lived and on how cultural rituality become part which embedded to subject presence. *Using* discursively refer to how ethnic locality lived in territory which is called Banyuwangi. Using concept with its mode of production which based on the agrarian made it become a region that appeared as compete for and ended into the using which refer into entities categorization which happened traumatically (Margana, 2007; Wessing 1999). In another side, *Using* become part of entities which is developed into culture that is articulated by elite and the mass.

Mass is assigned to cover, document, and interview the cultural agents. And in minutes, cultural artefacts assignment is finished, the depth and how cultural complexity are vanished when it is detached in technological network. The detachment is possible to position cultural articulation into local entity movement to national and global. Cultural articulation celebration which is spaced in technological network also is followed by *Using* cultural spreading and



*Banyuwangian* that create a local identity pride. Nevertheless, it remains question about how elite able to form local pride when mass subjectivity is kept away from stifling? Then, whether this pride becomes part of confirmation of subaltern

### **Epilog: Problematised Locality (Re)Territoriality**

Contemporary which discursively work between original character and mingled, new and authentic become locality problem that particularly is vanished primarily by everyday life which is covered by locality euphoria and is appeared by mass stifling. The presence of mass that is formed by mode of production, especially in the presence and tradition transformation, specifically formed the mass that is only discussed as strengthen cultural authenticity. From the mass, elitist cultural articulation wishes for the mass to be arranged structural-hierarchically, through the original and spiritual strength in locality. Different mass formation and is differed socio-culturally have consequence on how the mass is appeared as something watched, from those the mass enjoyed and also took distance with cultural which is performed by elite.

Mass that stated and voiced itself as lover tradition and Using language in contemporary space is formed passively. Particularly when the mass is faced to culture which is directed become massive and populis. This paradox is shaped when art categorization as rotten to cultural rituality and spirituality, transform by existing the sacred permanent but also present it as massive and integrated to mass that specifically is framed with market force. This is mean to create empower art authenticity without placed it in reproductive network, it only create art as populis and massive which depend on market taste and will keep away the mass from cultural-spiritual rituality that become basis of mode of production.

Market become important dimension when places cultural articulation where its presence move quickly by new and recur attraction. What today accepted by market become different and being created differently for each others. The acceptance no longer related to esthetical but become problem which is rooted in appearance as massively and populis. Local cultural articulation acceleration and spreading no longer trapped by boundary problems which political-economically thresholds the material. The existence of material formation is exploded through digital information exchanges. Youth is formed become documenter who routinely is arranged through curricula and extra-curricular, remains narcissistic will to voice and form artificial world from the material.ch is appearedilannya dibentuk secara masif populis.

The appearance of youth documentation is accompanied by pride formation of their local cultural presence become part of cultural transformation by elite work. Cultural commodification problem become complex when the show is imagined along with the creation of capital structure standardization. Mode of



production capitalization with mass cultural articulation become problem on how the mass is reached becomes part which is represented by elite to strengthen elite position. It means that elite existence remains space for the youth to strengthen themselves through cultural articulation scheme from the elite.

## References

- Althusser, Louis. 2007. *Filsafat sebagai Senjata*. Yogyakarta: Resist Books.
- Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised and extended. ed. London: Verso.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin (Ed). 1995. *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. London, Routledge.
- Bottemore, More (ed). 2001. *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*. Second Edition. Massachusetts, Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Callinicos, Alex. 1976. *Althusser's Marxism*. London, Pluto Press.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 1992. "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for "Indian" Pasts"? *Representations* 37(1):1-26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. "Minority Histories, Subaltern Pasts". *Postcolonial Studies*, Vol 1, No 1, pp 15-29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. *Subaltern Studies and Postcolonial Historiography*. Nepantla: Views from South 1.1. 9-32.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. *The Archeology Of Knowledge*. New York: Routledge Classics.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1992. *Selections From The Prison Notebooks Of Antonio Gramsci*. Edited And Translated By Hoare, Quintin., And, Nowell, Geoffrey, Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Guha, Ranajit. 2000. *On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India.*, in Vinayak Chaturvedi (ed.). *Mapping Subaltern Studies and the Postcolonial*. London: Verso.



- Hill, Christopher. 2009. *Lenin: Teori dan Praktek Revolusioner*. Yogyakarta: Resist Books.
- Jubas, Kaela. 2010. "Reading Antonio Gramsci as a Methodologist". *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 9(2). 224-239.
- King, James. 1981. *The Biology of Race. Revised Edition*. California: University of California Press.
- Kirino, Natsuo. 2010. *Grotesque*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Kurzman, Charles and Owens, Lynn. 2002. "The Sociology Of Intellectuals". *Annu. Rev. Social.* 28:63-90.
- Lenin, I V. 1974. *Collected Works: Volume 25 Juni-September 1917*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. *Imperialism The High Stage of Capitalism: A Populer Outline*. New York: International Publishers.
- Margana, Sri. 2007. *Java's Last Frontier: The Struggle For Hegemony of Blambangan, C.1763-1813*. Universiteit Leiden.
- Marx, Karl. 1972. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Marx, Karl., and Engels, Frederick. 1976. *The German Ideology*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Naour, Paul. 2009. *E. O. Wilson and B. F. Skinner: A Dialogue Between Sociobiology and Radical Behaviorism*. New York: Spinger. Also is explained in Wilson, E. O. 1982. *On Human Nature*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Rosa, Dien Vidia. 2012. "Genetic, Identity And The Future of Urban Culture". *Proceeding The 3<sup>rd</sup> International Graduate Students Conference on Indonesia "Indonesian Urban Culture and Societies"*. Yogyakarta: The Graduate School UGM.
- Scott, Helen (ed). 2008. *Essential Rosa Luxemburg: Reform or Revolution and The Mass Strike*. Chichago: Haymarkets Books.
- Skinner, B. F. 1953. *Science and Human Behavior*. New York: The Free Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*. New York: Penguin Books.



Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1995. "Can the Subaltern Speak?", in Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin (ed), *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2004. "The Subaltern and The Populer: The Trajectory Of The Subaltern In My Work. History of Art and Architecture and Film Studies".  
Downloaded from  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2ZHH4ALRFHw>. At 12 January 2014, 23.00 PM.

Thomas, Peter D. 2013. "Hegemony, Passive Revolution and the Modern Prince". *Thesis Eleven* 117(D)20-39.

Trotsky, Leon. 2009. *Revolusi Permanen*. Yogyakarta: Resist Books.

Vinayak, Chaturvedi. 2000. *Mapping Subaltern Studies and the Postcolonial*. London: Verso.

Wessing, Robert. 1999. "A Dance of Life: The Seblang of Banyuwangi, Indonesia". *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, Vol. 155, No. 4, pp. 644-682.

\*\*\*