

Power Relations In Changing the Culture of The Community

Nawari Ismail

*Master of Islamic Studies Program, Universitas Mubammadiyah Yogyakarta,
Indonesia
nurismaiel@yahoo.com*

Abstract

This study focuses on the workings of power between actors of unequal political and religious. The study used a qualitative approach with an ethnographic design. The study was conducted in a local religious community in the province of Central Java. The results are as follows: In the structure and relationships of unequal political and religious, power is practiced in a variety of social scopes through the fabric of social relations. Inside it, the actors/agents use strategy and capital, giving rise to a dominance dynamic, or intersection, and the dialectical relationship between the actor/agent and structure. Power also has resulted in new knowledge for each actor.

Keywords: *power relations; capital; intersection; dynamic dominance; and agency*

Permalink/DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18326/infl3.v17i2.281-304>

Introduction

Attempt Attempt builds a new Indonesia oriented towards the principles of civil society requires cross-cultural (religious and tribal) human beings, away from excessive religious and tribal sentiments. As an ideology, multiculturalism is a view that recognizes and glorifies differences in equality both individually and culturally (Watson, 2000). As a policy of multiculturalism is a policy that recognizes and protects cultural diversity and equalizes different degrees of culture, the hope is that each group will not be trapped in primordialism and narrow exclusivism (Shahab, 2004). In accordance with Shahab (2004), in the policy of multiculturalism, there is a provision of freedom for each group to maintain and develop its culture or cultural identity. The cultural identity that is the source of the individual or group's differentiation can come from political, religious, and tribal differences. In the case of this study, for example, there are three groups that represent political and religious differences, namely local government officials, Muslims, and Wong Sikep as adherents of the Adam religion.

In this research area located in a rural environment, in addition to the spirit of pluralism, although there has not been an atmosphere of multiculturalism, there is also growing competition between religious groups and government officials. They play their own powers, whether to win the competition or simply to maintain their culture. Interplay occurred between Wong Sikep on the one hand and government officials and Muslims on the other. Wong Sikep is an adherent of Adam's religion, a local religion. They refer to themselves as Wong Sikep or Sedulur Sikep, while orang outside, they commonly refer to them as Samin people. The mention of Samin is because it is associated with its founder, Samin Surontiko (1859-1914), who, around 1890, began to spread his teachings in the forest village of the Randublatung Blera area. This movement then quickly spread to various other regions such as Pati, Kudus, Rembang, Jiwana Madiun, Grobogan, and Bojonegoro. The Islamic Muslim groups at this study site include the Rifaiyah group, the Islamic Employees Foundation (Yakari), neutral Islam, Nahdlatul Ulama' (NU), and Muhammadiyah (MD).

The power relationship between Wong Sikep and groups outside of himself is a consequence of the policies carried out by the state on a national scale. The country's various policies are aimed at changing its

culture, and their implementation is not only carried out by government officials at the local level but also involves local Muslims. Perpetrators from government officials played their power through 'coaching' or constructing Wong Sikep's group to change their culture and convert to an official religion. For example, by listing a certain global religion on the Identity Card (KTP) of adherents of the local religion. Wong Sikep allowed (did not accept) the inclusion of an official religion on his KTP so that his interests were accepted by government officials.

This study looks at power relations from the perspective of actors' actions in the social terrain of changing Wong Sikep's culture as an implementation of state regulation. The power approach from the perspective of the perpetrator's actions is important today. This is at least because of two things, first, in line with global issues that prioritize the importance of individuals or groups as actors and agents in their relationships with other parties. Issues relating to protests and demands for the fulfillment of socio-economic-political justice, human rights, and the struggle for denials of discrimination by minorities demonstrate that. Second, the issues that accompany the process of globalization that gives birth to the sovereignty of actors, individuals, or groups presuppose the running of constructivism in people's lives. The cultural landscape of the contemporary world is changing, and hence the understanding of society as a stable entity is beginning to be questioned. It is characterized by protests and minority demands for social justice and human rights. Thus, the development of globalization not only has an impact on socio-political changes but also changes the scientific paradigm. In the context of anthropology, the symptom requires explanations or new research paradigms and methodologies (Abdullah, 2006) in order for the theories of the social sciences-humanities to be able to understand the development of conditions or social realities of contemporary society.

Wong Sikep's cultural change in this discussion is conceptualized as a social terrain because, in it, the actors act on each other through social relations between them. In it, there are tips or strategies of actors in carrying out and or experiencing power so as to affect their respective positions. Within the terrain, there are relations and rivalries between local communities and local government officials, and Muslims. Each side is trying to strengthen and maintain its position.

Study Focus

This study focuses on the process of working in unequal inter-governmental power or in politically and religiously unequal structures in the field of changing Wong Sikep's culture. More specifically aimed at understanding: (1) the forms of actions of the perpetrator when dealing with other actors in the field of changing the culture of Wong Sikep. In this case, it is related to the issue of strategy and capital used, the dominance and position of the perpetrator's agency in relation to the structure. (2) relationships between positions so as to produce knowledge

Contribution

Theoretically, this study is part of an effort to enrich the study of religious groups in relation to contemporary issues and part of the study of subjects with a micro-analysis unit (through the case of Wong Sikep), but it represents a worldwide issue. Thus, the novelty of this research lies in the explanation of Wong Sikep as a local religious group that is not just an object but a subject that has agency when it comes to actors outside of himself.

In line with the theme of this study, to discuss matters related to the actions of the perpetrator when dealing with other actors in the field of changing the culture of Wong Sikep, I moved on and was inspired by Bourdieu's thoughts. As for discussing the workings of power as a process of knowledge formation, I was inspired by the thought of Michel Foucault. However, I do not close myself off from the mutual allusions of the two thinkers, including other thinkers, on an issue or focus that is being studied. This serves as a comparison as well as to understand the position of the research findings in relation to the thoughts of these experts.

In seeing power as an action inseparable from its theory of '*practice*' (Bourdieu, 1977; Harker et al., 2016). In explaining the social practice, he gave the formula: *habitus x capital + terrain = practice*. Praktik is 'the dialectic of the internalization of *externality and the externalization of the internality*' ('dialectics of internalization of externalities and externalizations of internalities'). The formulation supposes that in social practice, there is a dialectic between structure and agent. Internalization of externalities occurs when the offender receives the influence of the structure. On the contrary, internal externalization occurs when the

structure receives the influence of the offender. This practice is the result of a process of interaction between the perpetrator (agent) and the structure.

In this context (Bourdieu, 1977) proposed a new concept of 'habitus,' which serves as a mediator between the objective structure and the actions of the perpetrator (agent). Bourdieu interprets habitus as a long-lasting and heritable scheme of cognition that serves as the cornerstone of a unified and structured praxis. Habitus is a process of reflective and reproductive activity and is a subjective structure consisting of interpretive or cognitive schemes and is based on the experience of the agent with the other party in a network of objective structures in the social terrain. The *field* is interpreted as an arena of various forces *that* are dynamic. For this reason, Bourdieu describes the terrain as a structured and dynamic condition of society. Each actor struggles with the other and fights to excel and be able to survive. The process of struggling to excel or simply survive is largely determined by the capital owned and utilized by individuals or groups. In addition, in each terrain, there are its own rules, and therefore the perpetrator must master them in order to excel or survive.

The process of working power implies the presence of an attraction between the agent and the structure. In this connection, Bourdieu (Miller & Branson, 1987) sees the human individual as a creative figure, and in his social relations, the individual can influence and, at the same time, be influenced by existing structures. In this context, Aheam (2001), when looking at the relation of Bourdieu's habitus to the agency, concludes that Bourdieu's frame of mind, in addition to allowing social transformations derived from actions born of habitus, also provides the possibility of resistance.

This question needs to be raised because the relationship between actors, at least in perspective (Bourdieu, 1977; Harker et al., 2016) and Foucault (Patton, 1987) (Tobroni, 2016), have always been unequal or inequality in power relations. In such unequal power relations, it is possible to dominate. Bourdieu sees the structure of domination as based on the practical logic of social actors in an unequal sphere, and the social sphere is plural, not singular as in Marx's concept(is), therefore inequality because domination is not only seen from economic factors, but also in

cultural, political, gender, artistic, and other aspects such as religion. It assumes that in all societies in every terrain, there is a controlled and mastered, dominated and dominated. In this connection dominance depends largely on the situation, resources and strategies carried out by the actors. This leads to the occurrence of various possibilities and the insignificance of dominance.

In power relations, the dominant group (*a domination enterprise*) has the ability to impose, influence, and restrict the level of thought and behavior of other people or groups and the dominant. It is only important to note that such domination exists because of the legitimacy of the dominating, which is the basis of authority or legality for the dominating. The process of domination is also carried out gracefully rather than by crude violence. In Bourdieu's language (Haryatmoko, 2003), domination is not only seen as an external result but is also seen as a result of habitus by the perpetrator (individual or group).

Each party involved in power relations seeks to maintain and improve its position, differentiate itself, and acquire a new position. (Pierre Bourdieu, 1977; Harker et al., 2016; Haryatmoko, 2003) The competitive strategy carried out by actors depends on the size of capital ownership and capital structure in their position in the social sphere. Those who are in a dominant position tend to choose a strategy of maintaining, for example, through the various rules of the game that exist. While the dominant use strategies aimed at undermining the dominance of the dominant party, for example, through actions to change certain rules or policies that, in essence, seek to improve the position or obtain a new position.

Another strategy used by the perpetrator is to discredit the type of capital that is the strength of the other party, including domination through discourse. The dominance of discourse, which is a form of symbolic violence, is decisive in the defining and organizing of groups, including the definition and determination of legitimate or illegitimate cultures (Haryatmoko, 2003), and usually, the other party will carry out a reversal of the discourse.

Pierre Bourdieu (1977) and Jenkins & Bourdieu (1992) also looked at the relations of *domination* in a social terrain of ownership of access to capital. The dominating party, in producing and enhancing its symbolic

value, uses a *strategy of distinction*, which is to try to 'stand out' from the party below. The greater the accumulation of capital carried out by the dominant group, the greater the symbolic value it has (Harker et al., 2016) so as to maintain its dominance. For Bourdieu, the capital structure determines the position of the actors in a certain terrain. In other words, *capital is the basis of domination* even though it may not be realized or deliberately hidden by the perpetrators. In this case (Pierre Bourdieu, 1977, 1979; Harker et al., 2016; Haryatmoko, 2003) posits symbolic, cultural, social, and economic capital. For Bourdieu (Harker et al., 2016; Jenkins & Bourdieu, 1992), people who have the same capital and habitus as others are better able to make structural changes or survive than those who have no or little capital. In addition, economic capital, in addition to symbolic, social, and cultural capital, is still considered the most important driver of class differences in social relations.

The process of power working is more circular, like a circle. This study presupposes that the field of life, especially in changing the culture of Wong Sikep, involves many interests of actors or is closely related to *power relations*. As inspired by can be possessed, given, or transferred, but is an effect of a particular social relation whose exercise exists only in action, power *isn't a thing that is either held by or belongs to anybody*. For (Foucault, 1980), power is a game or strategy in which there is a struggle, a relentless battle to change, defend, and strengthen positions.

Power operates productively and positively, and it is not always repressive and negative. Instead, it produces something and allows everything to be done (Bertens, 2002). In it is characterized by the construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of knowledge continuously and expressed through the actions of the performers. Power produces forms of pleasure, systems of knowledge, goods, and discourses (Abu-Lughod, 1993; Michel Foucault, 1980). Power and knowledge are inseparable. Truth/knowledge and ideology/power are closely related because truth/knowledge is not outside but inside ideology/power. The continuous exercise of power creates knowledge. On the contrary, continuous knowledge gives birth to the effect of the power of Truth/knowledge is nothing but the relation of power itself.

Methods

The Methods section is usually the second-longest section in the Ab-

stract. It should contain enough information to enable the reader to understand what was done and important questions to which the Methods section should provide brief answers. This research uses a qualitative approach with an ethnographic design. It is located in Baturejo Village and in the surrounding villages, namely Wotan and Sukolilo. Initial information was obtained from the base informants and then developed into key informants, both among Wong Sikep, government officials, and Muslims. The determination of informants used purposive techniques or criterion-based selection. The determination of informants has then used snowball techniques.

Overall, this research was conducted in several stages, namely: (1) Review of the literature. (2) Work on gatekeepers. (3) Data tracing according to the focus. Data collection was carried out with in-depth interviews, observations by participants, documentaries, and conversations (daily course method). Meanwhile, to obtain information of historical value, life history interviews are used. The data collection technique is supported by supporting instruments such as voice recorders, cameras, pocket notes, and field notes (field notes). (4) Data analysis is carried out, as stated by Bogdan and Biklen (1982), in two stages, namely analysis when in the field and post-field. Analysis when in the field is carried out inductively. The post-field analysis is carried out through a process of categorization and finding local concepts or cultures related to the research objectives, then connecting between concepts so that characteristic related to the research theme as a whole (holistic) is found. (5) re-checking the information and data presented to the informant.

Result and Discussion

Power Relations

Unequal relations involve the interests of the performers and show a game in which there is a relentless struggle to change, acquire new positions, improve, and strengthen positions. Power is practiced in a plural social sphere, not only in the political and economic spheres but also in other fields such as population, education, and religion. It operates through the interweaving of complex relationships or actions between positions that are dynamic and productive.

In language (Michel Foucault, 1980, 2002), power is not essentially the preservation and reproduction of economic relations but a

relationship of power. Thus power is not possessed but is practiced in a social sphere in which there are many positions that are strategically interrelated and constantly undergo shifts and changes (dynamic). Power is productive because, through its implementation, the perpetrators acquire new knowledge and understanding that is useful to them, thus allowing the construction and reconstruction of knowledge and actions of the perpetrator. This is actually not only found in the power relations between the state and Muslims with Wong Sikep but also in the relations within Wong Sikep himself.

Those in a dominant position tend to choose a strategy of maintaining, for example, through various existing rules of the game or regulations, both in the form of policies and interpretations as carried out by government officials and Muslims. This indicates that the work of power is not through repression and oppression but it works through regulation and normalization. Regulation means creating rules of the game, policies, discourses, mechanisms, procedures, ordinances, and others, not through direct control that is physical or repressive. Normalization means the adjustment of actions to the norms that one party believes to be correct.

Both regulation and normalization play more of a controlling role and a filter as well as a disciplinary planter. Regulatory technology produces obedient figures that can be used, changed, repaired, and even subjected. In language (M Foucault & Sheridan, 1979), regulatory technology works to create discipline and therefore supposes the existence of a control system that is hierarchical in nature that is positioned above and below.

Foucault's view is seen on the ground because the state at the central level exercises power by seeking to control the lives of local religious groups or indigenous communities through various regulatory systems, both in the form of rules and policies and interpretations related to religious life and indigenous communities. For this, the power exercised by the state is related to the perpetrator or other parties, so it becomes a constellation of powers. The constellation of power is formed when the process of power between the parties takes place. The power process carried out by the state is characterized by the legitimacy of the state as a form of power consisting of various political apparatuses, and others continue to try to maintain the order of power through a number

of policies and rules, both written and unwritten.

Various rules and policies are an embodiment of the work of regulatory technology in the relations of state power with local religious groups. This is stated in the statutory system, starting from MPR provisions, laws, government regulations, ministerial circulars, and others related to the arrangement of religious life and indigenous community programs. All of them became a kind of controlling, supervising, and directing tool by the state on the life of local religious groups.

At the local level, the country's regulatory techniques also worked when government officials from the district to the village level implemented Wong Sikep's culture change policy. At the district and sub-district levels, arrangements are made through the preparation of proposals that seek to change the culture of Wong Sikep. On the other hand, the village head provides support through Wong Sikep's population data and carries out policies that are often unwritten but decisive. The role of the village head is often carried out through collaboration with local Muslim parties. Thus at the local level, the actors involved in changing the culture of Wong Sikep are increasingly scattered.

Muslims in many domains are actually 'partners' of government officials in exercising their power. Regulatory techniques in the form of normalization are carried out by Muslims through social mechanisms constructed by them and, in essence, to control and maintain the position or status quo. In that way, the power tends to make judgments on the other party (wrong-true, good-bad, normal-abnormal), and in the end, there is an attempt to control or subdue the other party's behavior through rules. The normalizing power exercised by Muslims is seen through the spread of discourse that Wong Sikep's corpse care procedures are not correct and therefore need to be 'straightened out.' As long as Wong Sikep has not or has not acted in accordance with ideological (Muslim cultural) interests in the care of the corpse, then Wong Sikep's body should not be buried in the village cemetery.

While the dominant use strategies aimed at breaking down the dominance of the dominant party or resistance, for example, through actions to change certain rules or policies that, in essence, seek to improve the position or acquire a new position. For example, Wong Sikep tried to get the state to change its policy on religion through efforts to get the

local religion (Adam) recognized and included in the KTP.

Another strategy used by perpetrators is to discredit or transform the type of capital that becomes the strength of the other party, including domination through discourse. Because the dominance of discourse, which is a form of symbolic violence, determines the definition of groups and the determination of legitimate or illegitimate cultures (Haryatmoko, 2003), and usually, the other party will carry out a reversal of discourse. For example, in the context of this study, negotiation strategies are used by the parties to dominate stereotypical discourse while there is a reversal of stereotypes.

There is so much evidence to support Wong Sikep's strategy in dealing with state-run power and Muslims. The evidence is scattered in various domains, for example, in education, agriculture, and the option of choosing religion and marriage, as well as in oral religious missiology and the care of the dead. This also shows that although Wong Sikep waited more for the power of government officials and Muslims, and the latter two groups 'attacked' more, Wong Sikep did not automatically accept, obey, and be affected. Instead, they struggle, dodge, and negotiate through various tips. Although, for example, Wong Sikep often acts 'silent,' according to their habitus or character of resistance inherited from previous generations, silence actually contains the meaning of resistance, so it can be called resistance-tacit, and this is often expressed through kiroto-boso (a special language that Wong Sikep only understands internally, and can serve as a symbol of resistance) and the revitalization of the values of Sikepism.

Dynamic intersection and Domination Relations

Wong Sikep is often perceived as an easily altered and influenced group due to its naivety and silent nature. This perception can be seen from the statement of government officials who assert that Wong Sikep is only a small group that is exaggerated even though they have converted to Islam, except for a handful of the older generation. This statement gives the impression that Wong Sikep is an impressionable and masterful figure. This paves the way for us to ask further, if so, whether it is true that Wong Sikep has been permanently or even hyped. A group that is conquered helplessly when it relates to and struggles with government officials and Muslims due to the exercise of power by the state and

Muslims.

The answer to this question certainly needs to open a discussion between significant theory and field evidence related to the issue of dominance. As an opening, theoretically, the study of domination is related to the concept of hegemony because, in it, there is a dominant and subordinated or conquered party. (Gramsci, 1995) and also Joseph V. Femia, in Gramsci's Political Thought (1981), states that hegemony occurs when coercive instruments and ideological instruments are already held by the ruler. One of the cores of Gramsci's thought is that moral, intellectual, and affective observance is influenced by the forces of economic and political structures. The context of the relationship between Wong Sikep and the government officials presupposes that the strength of the country's economic and political structure will further marginalize the values and traditions of the local religious group.

From a hegemonic perspective, the global culture represented by the state apparatus will be singular because of the monolithic disposition of capitalism. All cultural expressions, including their symbolic expressions, will refer to the dominant expression in the market name. This also presupposes that local (religious) groups have no more freedom space because they simply accept and agree on moral, cognition-affection, and even psychomotor, which are continuously persuaded by the state elite. Local culture will naturally be slowly marginalized. For Gramsci, the ruler was presupposed to be a giant genius and, with his 'intelligence,' was able to spy the consciousness of people's resistance.

Thus in the state of hegemony, one has no optimistic attitude in fighting it and, at the same time, is not critical in dealing with it. A group becomes powerless and resigns itself totally in the face of the strength of another group with all the capital it has. In the context of the relationship between government officials and Muslims with local religions at the site of this study, it does not actually show such hegemonic power relations characteristics. Instead, what happens is more appropriate as an intersection relation. That is, there is mutual disrespect, negotiating through various tips such as throwing out stereotypes, resistance, and even accommodating existing groups, thus giving birth to cultural mixing, especially among Wong Sikep. It is true that government officials, including Muslims, appear to be more 'aggressive' in carrying

out their power relations with Wong Sikep, while Wong Sikep waits for more, but that does not mean that Wong Sikep automatically accepts and is affected. In many domains, government officials and Muslims do not fully control and influence Wong Sikep according to his agenda. For example, in agriculture, although Wong Sikep seems to accept agricultural technology, in the planting system, they still maintain their own traditions, likewise in other domains, such as education, the option of choosing a religion, and mass marriage. This also occurs in the relationship between local religious groups and local Muslims, as in the case of the use of more in the treatment of may it.

The process of intersection is possible because: First, state-run power receives backlash in the form of resistance from local religious groups, such as strengthening local culture, both in the form of reaffirmation of physical culture (clothing) and internalization of values to citizens. This is in accordance with Foucault's view that when the perpetrator exercises power, it is possible to cause resistance from other perpetrators. In the process occurs, intercultural mutual seduction in the form of mutual giving and receiving. In the process of intersection, it is possible that there is a group culture that influences more than others, but that does not mean that the group culture that is more controlling or influencing is fully reproduced by the other group. In the process of intersection, one party does not use violence but, as stated (Bourdieu, 1979), uses symbolic violence. The other party is trying to survive or cultivate creatively and even innovatively so that a blended culture occurs.

Second, such views are in line with perspectives that view individuals/groups as active, creative, and even manipulative subjects, including views (Bourdieu, 1977) and (Michel Foucault, 1980). By basing oneself on that perspective, every interindividual/group relationship will have a more dominant party, but the dominant party (which is temporary in nature) cannot be interpreted as tacitly passive and resigned. On the contrary, there is a process of interpretation and a process of selection-creation-innovation according to the interests of the actors that eventually gives birth to a culture of alloys.

Third, this concept of intersection corresponds also to the view that power is to spread or exist in all relationships and social fields (social

sphere/field (Foucault, 1980; Tobroni, 2016). Power is not just played by certain individuals and groups. Power is always in a state of life, 'in play.' Therefore it can also be said that power is exercised by all perpetrators, in the sense that individuals or groups are always in a position to exercise and experience power simultaneously (Cheater, 1999; Michel Foucault, 1980) and spread throughout the field. In the context of this study, power is exercised not only by Muslims and government officials but also by Wong Sikep, who operates in various social domains. Each of the actors involved in power relations may be opposed and supportive, thus causing a change or continuation of Wong Sikep's cultural identity as well as changes in the actions of state officials or Muslims. The nature of relations between actors, both individuals and groups, takes place dynamically and complexly, this is in accordance with the interests of each perpetrator, both in the form of struggle, struggle and competition.

Bourdieu (1998), Cabin & DORTIER (2008), and Haryatmoko (2003) see dominance in the sphere of unequal and numerous relationships, not singular as in Marx's concept (is), so that inequality due to dominance is not only seen from economic factors but also in aspects of culture, politics, gender, religion, art, and others. It assumes that in all (developments) societies, there are dominated and dominating. This leads to the occurrence of various possibilities and the insignificance of dominance because one or group that is dominant in a certain environment or institution but in another environment or institution can be dominant.

The dominant group (a domination enterprise) has the ability to impose, influence, and restrict the level of thought and behavior of other people or groups so that the dominated submit, in the sense of following the culture of the dominant party. However, it should be noted that the existence of such a dominating party is due to the legitimacy of the dominated, and the process of domination is carried out gracefully, not by violent violence. Thus, for Bourdieu mechanism of domination is not only seen as an external result but is also seen as a result of the habitus. This view presupposes that domination is not only due to the ability of the other party (structure) to coerce and influence but also because of 'consent' and acceptance from the perpetrator (agent), so there remains a process of selection from the agent. This is consistent with Bourdieu's central view of the existence of a dialectical relationship

between structure and agent in his attempt to address the bipolar issue between the two elements.

In Wong Sikep's culturally changing terrain, the mechanism of domination, in Bourdieu's view, runs on the field. For example, although one of the parties, especially Wong Sikep, is influenced by government officials in agriculture, it is based on conscious consent according to their interests. In addition, Wong Sikep still sorts out which ones are acceptable and which ones should be rejected because they are considered incompatible with his life values, such as farming techniques. The language often used by Wong Sikep when receiving power that causes them to 'take' other cultures, namely 'melu/niru sing slick,' 'following or slicing the deeds or traditions of others whom he considers good.' The 'good' standard here means according to the culture or tradition-religion they have. On the other hand, they will also refuse the actions of the other party that are considered unkind.

More than that, it seems that it needs to be elaborated further on the dominance itself. For Foucault, for example, domination is considered the essence of power. This is because, in Foucault's perspective Patton (1987) and Tobroni (2016), power always takes place in inequality, so it is possible to dominate. The question is what kind of dominance of power is in Foucault's perspective. The answer to this question must be attributed to Foucault's view of the dispersed and capricious character of power in the sense that it is carried out and experienced by all actors and is present in various aspects, and is dynamic. This means that at a certain time, in a certain aspect, it may be one party that affects the other party, but at the time and or in the other aspect, it is more influenced by the other party.

The dynamic and scattered character of power certainly affects the nature of domination, meaning that domination is also dynamic, capricious, and not constant, which tends to be hyphenic, as in Gramsci's perspective. If this is the case, then that dominance does exist in the terrain of Wong Sikep's cultural change as a result of the state's regulative actions. Because in this study, it was proven that there are no perpetrators or groups who simply conquer without a relationship.

Author's field data tendencies relating to this dominance are also a correction to Eric Grillo's views. There are at least three views (Grillo,

2005) regarding this dominance. *First*, he viewed domination not as the essence of power, and this view of his is a critique of Foucault's view, which stated otherwise. He viewed Foucault's 'model of agnostic power as reductive because it only saw power as 'the imposition of influence over the thoughts and behavior of others and mixed up power and domination. *Second*, for Grillo, domination is not the essence of power. Power relations only become synonymous with domination if in the context of conflict, not if in a cooperative situation. *Third*, for this reason, he proposed the concept of a 'participative model of power' based on Hannah Arendt's theory of action which defines power as the ability of humans to act and plan together' (man's ability to act and to carry out conferences plans). This model identifies power with empowerment, in contrast to the agnostic model, which identifies power with dominance. This model is considered appropriate when describing relationships in cooperative situations, and in this situation, power is not the driving factor of the agent, but the power of the determining factor is the result of the collaboration of the performers.

In terms of the meaning of domination itself, (Grillo, 2005) limits it to two aspects of whether a group dominates or is dominated: A group is able to influence and control another group, meaning that a group has the capacity to impose and determine another group, and a group that is 'dominated' becomes 'subdued' (resigned, obedient, and affected) in such a way. If this is the limit of domination, then in the case of Wong Sikep's relationship with government officials and Muslims, there is no dominance. Because although government officials, and Muslims, take the initiative to exercise power first, Wong Sikep waits for more and sees the pattern of power exercised by outsiders, but Wong Sikep does not always obey or be conquered. It is true that Wong Sikep was often silent and even carried out certain actions according to the agenda of government officials, such as receiving teaching and learning facilities, but never sent his children to school, they were also 'forced' to choose religion and marriage procedures according to the official religion, but they then fought back by returning to the original religion with various arguments and using *kirotoboso*, even later strengthened the internalization of Adam's religious values. Even in the realm of agriculture, which is heavily influenced by technology from government officials, Wong Sikep is still able to resist in terms of a farming system that

is different from that socialized by the relevant officials. They also adhere to the mayit care procedure using wrapping cloth, but they have their own arguments (tafsir) against the wrapper (mori), which is different from the interpretation of the local Muslims. The evidence once again suggests that there is no dominance as intended by Grillo in the terrain of Wong Sikep's cultural conversion, meaning that no group dominates and is permanently dominated.

Structure and Agency Positions

The discussion of the dialectical relations of agents and structures in the question of domination leads us to further examine the position of structures and agents in power relations in the field of cultural change Wong Sikep due to the existence of state regulatory techniques. Bourdieu (Miller & Branson, 1987) sees that the individual is actually active. Therefore he can not only be influenced by the structures that exist in his environment, but he also actively influences existing structures or at least performs actions that are considered unusual in his cultural environment and actions that are tailored to his interests. In other words, (the factors of an important individual in its relation to the structure (objective), the subjective structure of the individual (agent) with the objective structure of interrelated and dependent. Action as a social practice is a reflective and reproductive activity between ideas (cultural or subjective interpretations) and social reality (structural or objective symptoms).

This research in the field of cultural change of Wong Sikep supports Bourdieu's thesis. Government officials tasked with changing Wong Sikep's culture with specific targets and times in accordance with the rules (such as the Remote Indigenous Communities Program = PKAT) did not execute it as planned. This is because it is tailored to their interests, for example, so as not to lose the 'project land' of economic value. On the other hand, the individual apparatus is not completely free because he also continues to pay attention and carry out the task of implementing state policies so as not to appear completely failed. They continued to channel support (aid funds from the government) -- although some Wong Sikep feared irregularities -- but also did not fully carry out optimal 'coaching' or empowerment.

Although the existing rules are the same, individual officials such

as the sub-district head and some local village officials conducted various power relations in the face of Wong Sikep. Some act quite 'hard,' especially when implementing state policies, but some are also cautious. In Javanese, the officer often performs 'iyak-iyuk,' getting around the policy of making it a way but without neglecting his own interests. On the other hand, the perpetrator among Wong Sikep, when related to other actors, is inseparable from the intervention of his personal interests. The socio-political network he built with outsiders in the name of Wong Sikep is used as his personal capital when related to Wong Sikep's internal environment.

This dialectic of the relationship between agency and structure can also be found in the power relations run by the individuals of the Sikep citizens in the face of the strength of the structure (tradition-religious and tetenger elder). This can be seen in the case of the village head election. Some perpetrators from among Wong Sikep did not follow the 'tetenger' or orders of the elder, but in arguing, they still leaned on the views of the elders. Likewise, in the field of the economy (livelihood), although some Sikep residents no longer work as farmers (a job that Wong Sikep must do), they still say they are farmers, while the jobs they are engaged in are considered part-time.

Their actions demonstrate free choice, both in their political and economic behavior. It's just that even though they have the freedom to make their choice of action, they still base their actions on the elders or the traditions-religions they adhere to. Such a view is different from one that sees agent action as having nothing to do with structure, as in the theory of 'agency as a synonym for free will.' For this 'theory of action, as reported by Ahearn (2001), the agency requires prerequisites of mental states in the individual, for example, the intention of self-awareness, a rational point of view, and the control of intentions. Hence this theory of agency denies the socio-cultural elements that surround human action. This is, of course, also different from the view Giddens (Ahearn, 2001) which connects agency with structure. An agency can be considered as the ability of a socio-culturally mediated individual to perform actions or praxis because (the practices of the perpetrator are 'formed' (something that limits or facilitates) by the structure, and his actions play a role in strengthening and reconfiguring the structure, but the social structure itself is the result (outcome) and at the same time the means (medium)

of social practice/action of the perpetrator.

Capital

Every perpetrator, individual, or group seeks each other and uses the capital he has so that the knowledge and actions of others change or are able to maintain their own culture. According to (Bourdieu, 1977; Harker et al., 2016; Haryatmoko, 2003), they use different types of capital, namely: cultural, social, economic, and symbolic. In her relationship with parties outside her group, Wong Sikep uses cultural, economic, social, and symbolic capital. Adherents of the Adam religion use cultural capital in the form of local wisdom (harmony and harmony) and apply it consistently. This is especially meaningful in the midst of a frequent process of conflict among Islamist groups themselves. The consistency between the teachings and the application of harmony has neutralized or at least become a counterweight to the perception of non-Wong Sikep. Almost all Islamic groups and government officials have a positive perception of Wong Sikep's views and behaviors that deserve to be imitated by Muslims. Adherents of the Adam religion, with their 'local wisdom,' have become a mirror for the Islamist group. Included in the category of local wisdom that is the cultural capital of Wong Sikep is the shoplifting and charisma of the elders. Within certain limits, the charismatic value of elders has an impact on the birth of solidity and solidarity among group members. This is very meaningful, especially when they are dealing with government officials; this capital is used to fight silence and carry out 'retaliation' through the election of higher-ups so as to change the local political scheme.

Wong Sikep also uses social capital in the form of political networks with political elites at the national level and relationships with nongovernmental organizations. Social capital in the form of Wong Sikep's political network was utilized at a later time and was not optimal. This is because of the strong influence of social capital (political networks) that were used by government officials and Muslims in previous times. However, Wong Sikep's use of social capital (networks with political elites and nongovernmental organizations) has dampened religious conversion by the government and Muslims, prevented rapid cultural change in many aspects in the interests of government officials and Muslims, and spawned careful actions from others.

Although Wong Sikep is economically included as a poor group, it does not mean that they do not utilize economic capital. The method he used was to transform the economic capital of the government apparatus aimed at him into economic capital when it came to Muslims. This is in the form of providing access to irrigation facilities and facilities -- received from government officials -- to Muslim farmers, thus raising their positive image.

Meanwhile, Muslims also use various capitals when relating to Wong Sikep. They use cultural capital in the form of religious ceremonies such as in the month of shawl, circumcision, and the use of mori for the dead. These ceremonies have given birth to cultural reproduction or cultural borrowing from the Wong Sikep community. The reproduction of the culture later became an integral part of the Wong Sikep culture. This reproduction seems to have been the character of adam's religion from the beginning. This can be seen from several other aspects, such as the taking of the concept of divinity (similar to the manunggaling kawula gusthi), clothing, and the concept of incarnation.

Some of the Muslim rituals of the month of Shawal -- such as silaturrahim (visits to each house), delivering food, and Bodo kupat -- taken by Wong Sikep have made the relationship between them relatively fluid. This also shows that Muslims are taking advantage of their cultural capital, thus 'stealing the heart' of Wong Sikep. Islamic groups also use cultural capital in the spirit of missiological doctrine. This is based on the understanding that performing religious missions to others is an obligation, both to people who have not embraced Islam (proselytizing people) or Muslims themselves (ijabah people). They do it in a variety of ways, both verbally and in deeds. Muslims also use social capital in the form of political networks with government officials from the village to sub-district levels. This, among other things, made Wong Sikep accommodate the segregation of their funerals with Islamic groups.

On the other hand, government officials use social capital in the form of collaboration with Muslims and political networks or bureaucracies of state officials. This led to a quasi-religious conversion among Wong Sikep. That is a unilateral claim from government officials who confirmed that there had been a religious conversion among Wong

Sikep, namely from Adam's religion to Buddhism and also to Islam, but in fact, it did not happen in reality. In addition, government officials use cultural capital in the form of a system of laws and regulations, science and technology (for example, agricultural technology), schools, and education. Moreover, government officials also transformed Wong Sikep's special language as a capital and tool to facilitate the process of 'culturalization' of these remote indigenous communities.

Government officials also use symbolic capital, which is a symbolic attribute in the form of authority in carrying out or implementing the rules of the game related to local religious life and indigenous communities. More than that, they have economic capital. The different types of support (grants) in various fields (agricultural irrigation, agricultural technology, school education, and social) given to Wong Sikep clearly demonstrate that.

Power and Knowledge

Even though Wong Sikep is more waiting in relation to government officials and Muslims, it does not mean that they do not exercise power. The perpetrators in all three groups both exercise and experience power at once. For Foucault, the power that each actor runs is productive and positive. Power produces forms of pleasure, systems of knowledge, goods, and discourses. (Abu-Lughod, 1993; Bertens, 2002). In it is characterized by the construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of knowledge continuously and expressed through the actions of the performers. Thus the process of working power gives birth to endless change.

The productive and positive character of power runs on the field, not only in relations between groups but also among Wong Sikep himself. Internally, Wong Sikep, each perpetrator knows and understands the character of the other perpetrators better, as well as creating new alliances to restore and strengthen their respective positions. In the relationship between Wong Sikep and government officials, the first party acquires new knowledge expressed through actions, for example, about the importance of agricultural technology (economic field), understanding the significance of coblosan as part of the media to counterattack against government officials (political field), understanding the meaning of support for its interests, as well as new knowledge that the support can

be transformed into the capital to elevate its image when it relates to Muslims. For government officials, power relations with Wong Sikep increasingly understand their character and give birth to more cautious actions when dealing with them, understanding Wong Sikep is not an innocent person who is 'stupid' and is considered not to follow the development of the existing situation.

In relation to Muslims, the power exercised by both parties also gave birth to new knowledge for Wong Sikep, thus giving birth to a mixed culture or some kind of hybrid culture in their culture, such as janazah-tomb care, mori, clothing, circumcision, bodo kupat, even in marriage and religious anutan.

Conclusion

In politically and religiously unequal or unequal structures and relations, power is exercised in a plural social sphere through the interweaving of complex relationships or actions between dynamic and productive positions. In it, the performers use various strategies and capitals so that there is a dynamic dominance or indirection, and at the same time, it shows the dialectical relationship between the agent and the structure.

Strategy is carried out through regulation, stereotypical discourse, resistance, and even accommodation. The negotiation strategy in the operation of power indicates the existence of the agency of the perpetrator or the presence of an active, creative, and manipulative individual. The actors in each group use cultural, symbolic, economic, and social capital in relation to others. Each perpetrator does not have these four capitals when related to others. Each perpetrator is also different in the use of form in each of his capitals. In addition, the amount (amount) of capital owned by the perpetrator may not necessarily affect other actors. It all depends on the ability of the perpetrator to find, utilize, and transform existing capital. It's just that one thing is certain every actor always has a strategy for finding, utilizing, and transforming capital. Capital transformation exists through the use of other parties' capital into one's own capital, both when related to the other party and with third parties.

Operation of power can to generate new knowledge among Wong Sikep. Each perpetrator in their internal circles better understands the character of the other perpetrator and gives birth to a new alliance. In relation to government officials, Wong Sikep gained new knowledge

about the significance of agricultural technology (economics), “coblosan” (election of legislators, presidents, regents, and village heads) as part of the media to counterattack against government officials (political field), the meaning of support for his interests and even new knowledge that the support can be transformed into the capital to elevate his image when related to Muslim. In relation to Muslims, Wong Sikep gained new knowledge that gave birth to *hybrid cultures*, such as in Janazah care and funerals, circumcision, “bodo kupat”, and even marriage.

Bibliography

- Abdullah, T. 2006. Integrasi Nasional, Globalisasi dan Kearifan Lokal. *Antropologi Indonesia*.
- Abu-Lughod, L. 1993. *Writing Women's Worlds*. Berkeley. University of California Press.
- Adams, TM, & Fuller, D. 2006. *The Words Have Changed but the Ideology Remains the Same: Misogynistic Lyrics in Rap Music*. *Journal of Black Studies*, 36(6), 938.
- Ahearn, L. 2001. Language And Agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 109–137.
- Bertens, K. 2002. *Filsafat Barat Kontemporer*. Inggris-Jerman. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Bourdieu, P. 1998. *Practical Reason: On The Theory of Action*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge : Cambridge university press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1979). “Symbolic Power”, cb dalam D. Gleeson. *Identity and Structure: Issues in the Sociology of Education*.
- Cabin, P., & Dortier, J. 2008. La Communication: État Des Savoirs, 3ème éd. *Sciences.*, 107(9), 781–782. <https://doi.org/10.1086/365162>
- Cheater, Angela. 1999. The Anthropology of Power: Empowerment and Disempowerment. *Changing Structures*. London: Routledge-Taylor & Francis Group.
- Foucault, M, & Sheridan, A. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews And Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 2002. *Power/ Knowledge Wacana Kuasa/ Pengetahuan*. Yogyakarta: Bentang Budaya.
- Gramsci, A. 1995. *Further Selections From The Prison Notebooks*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Grillo, Eric. 2005. Two Dogmas of Discourse Analysis. *Power without Domination*, 12, 3–41. Paris: Universite de Paris.
- Harker, R., Mahar, C., & Wilkes, C. 2016. *An Introduction To The Work of Pierre Bourdieu: The Practice Of Theory*. London: Springer.
- Haryatmoko. 2003. Menyingkap Kepalsuan Budaya Penguasa. *Jurnal Basis*, 11(5), 23.
- Jenkins, R. 1992. *Pierre Bourdieu (Key Sociologists)*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Miller, D., & Branson, J. 1987. Pierre Bourdieu: Culture and Praxis. *Creating Culture: Profiles in the Study of Culture*, 210–225.
- Shahab, Y. Z. 2004. *Identitas dan Otoritas: Rekonstruksi Tradisi Betawi*. Jakarta: Laboratorium Antropologi, FISIP UI.
- Tobroni, F. 2016. Mengkritisi HP-3 Perspektif Konstitusi dan Pemberdayaan Rakyat (Kontribusi Teori Sosiologi Membaca Putusan Nomor 3/PUU-VIII/2010). *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 9(2), 381. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk927>
- Watson, C. W. 2000. *Multiculturalism*. England: Open University Press.