

Conference Paper

Kauman and Laweyan Batik Etiquette of 1950-1970 Period in the Perspective of Genetic Structuralism

Pranti Sayekti, Dharsono, Guntur, and Ahmad Adib

Student of ISI Surakarta Graduate School

Abstract

The view of genetic structuralism from Pierre Bourdieu emphasizes the importance of the origin of mental structures in individuals in addressing a social order. The mental structure of the agents is determined by the existing social structure and analysis of the origin of the structure itself. This view can be used to see the emergence of batik etiquette in Kauman and Laweyan villages Surakarta in the period 1950 - 1970s. The birth of batik etiquette is not merely a representation of products, but it is also related to the shifting of batik producers' habitus and changes in the orientation of national development politics. Habitus shift of batik producers brings the consequences of changing the attitude of batik producers in seeing the social order that is happening. Laweyan batik etiquette is more varied which is likely to be driven by the attitude of batik producers in seeing their position amid batik products from Kauman. Laweyan batik producers place themselves differently from the Kauman village batik products. This condition gave birth to the attitude of producing more etiquette than the Kauman batik etiquette.

Corresponding Author:

Pranti Sayekti
pranti_sayekti@yahoo.com

Received: 23 January 2019

Accepted: 26 February 2019

Published: 17 March 2019

Publishing services provided by
Knowledge E**Keywords:** etiquette, genetic structuralism, batik

© Pranti Sayekti et al. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the International Seminar on Language, Education, and Culture Conference Committee.

1. Introduction

Pierre Bourdieu sees a society as a system that tends to be objective. The social systems that make up objective social structures are caused by a process of social construction that is always continuously occurring. This dialectic process is an objectification stage of the structure that will be formed. Society has subjective patterns in shaping social construction, which in turn becomes patterns of standard structure. Bourdieu emphasizes the dialectical relationship between objective structures and subjective phenomena. Dialectics for Bourdieu is the main stage that can drive social construction.

Community activities, including the process of art, are a dialogical process in forming a social construction. The process of art was initially a stage of reproducing structures

OPEN ACCESS

that had been arranged in the previous phase, but also became a catalyst for producing new structures. In the case of this artistic process, the Surakarta batik product was a representation of the implementation of obedience to the teachings of the ancestors. Batik teaching is seen as a process that must be carried out because people see batik as an expression of rituality. Batik as a rituality expression is an object-oriented structure that was formed long before the batik producers were born.

The teaching of batik has been organized and has social legitimacy. These conditions form obedient patterns that tend to be dogmatic. Dogmas in the batik process are channeled through teachings in a formal or informal context. This procession can be found in several books that place batik as a symbol of social status. The placement of batik as a social status symbol strengthens batik and attributes within it in a sturdy structure. The books that place batik in a sacred and social framework can be understood as a process of reproducing cultural divisions. The developing dogma places certain batik motifs only to be used and reproduced by certain parties. This phenomenon in the view of Bourdieu's sociology is a phase that must be passed by agents in forming a structure.

An understanding of the process and product of art in relation to the role of the art actor in forming structures in the community cannot be separated from the origin of the mental structure of the agents and the origin of the social structure itself. This process is known as genetic structuralism analysis. Bourdieu's view places genetic origins as the initial phase for seeing more complex structures. Products or individual roles in reproducing art are influenced by two main conditions. First the role of the mental structure of the art agents to reproduce art objects and the second need to be studied further the origin of the social structure as a party that encourages or inhibits the art process.

In this context, art objects are not present suddenly, but are dialogical products between agents and structures. Artists have social spaces or even groups that control them, which in turn can shape products and attitudes in art. Artists as agents play a role in their respective positions so that social construction is born of a dialogical process between art in various positions and structures.

Forms of structure and social structure origins become the second factor that forms the mental structure of the art agents. Art products cannot be present without the encouragement of these external factors. Mental artists have a bond to structures that they might not want. In this context the agents have no power to reject the conditions that are happening. In the case of batik, one particular motif can only be used for one particular purpose. Artists have the opportunity not to always approve of these concepts, but adherence to structures that appear on the surface. The batik producers are likely to disagree if one particular motive is only intended on one agenda, but the position

of the batik producer is not in the space to refuse or approve these standards. In this position, art performers are in a structure that has been constructed previously.

Bourdieu sees the position and attitude of the agents as expressions of the inter-faith organization and field. (Harker, Richard. (2005). *Habitus X Modal + ranah= Praktik Pengantar Paling Komprehensif kepada Pemikiran Pierre Bourdieu*. Yogyakarta: Jala Sutra.) Habitus in this context is the attitude and knowledge of art agents as capital to understand and relate to the social world. Habitus is a controlled and controllable attitude. Habitus is in individuals. Fields are spaces that are outside of individuals. Field is a space that can construct thoughts. Habitus can be seen as an internalization stage of the structure. This structure internalization is used by individuals to perceive the surrounding environment. In principle, habitus is a product of structure internalization.

Artists' habitus is their attitude and character in producing or reproducing art. In the case of batik and batik accompaniment products, the attitude of batik producers is a reflection of their understanding of structure. The presence of batik etiquette as an attractive product in the process of marketing batik can be seen as a dialogical effort between batik producers and the surrounding structures.

Batik, which initially functioned as a part of one's social status, experienced a shift in function. Batik is a commodity that requires a new marketing system. Batik as a structure has a standard or pattern that has implications for the work process, usage up to the standard aspects of distribution. Changes in the position of batik can be interpreted as a change in structure that is beyond the power of the art actor. Etiquette becomes part of the structure, after going through the stages of internalization in the agents.

Understanding of batik etiquette as part of the process and attitudes of individual perpetrators of batik can be analyzed based on Pierre Bourdieu's concept of genetic structuralism. The analysis of genetic structuralism allows a thorough understanding of the mental attitudes of individuals performing arts in relation to the reproduction process of batik structures.

2. Discussion

2.1. Symbol reproduction

Pierre Bourdieu sees the process of reproducing cultural symbols carried out at various levels. This process in Pierre Bourdieu's view is seen as a form of symbolic violence

to legitimize the prevailing social order. A society has a tendency to create social construction at various levels which in turn produces new structural spaces. Educational institutions play a role in reproducing symbolic violence in these structures.

The legitimacy of the social order can be seen in the case of art products. *Pakem* (rule) is one of the symbolic expressions that gain cultural legitimacy. Artists place the theme as a reference in expression. The strength of the standard as a social structure can be traced from the teachings on the standard in the books found in the Islamic Mataram era. The attitude of the community in accepting standards is a form of obedience to the existing order.

The principle of obedience to the standard has been taught since individuals in the early age community. This educational process in the eyes of Bourdieu is a phase of legitimacy of symbolic violence. Educational institutions in sharing their forms are seen as institutions responsible for symbolic violence in society. Individuals are obliged to obey a social order which they do not necessarily have to accept the order.

Reproduction of art symbols can be done as long as they do not deviate from the mutually agreed structure. Social action in addressing social structures can be understood as a form of the structure of action itself. Social actions and structures of social action are interchangeable fields of activity

The labeling process in the form of giving etiquette to batik products is not merely a manifestation of the art actors' expedition, but also means an attempt to deny the established symbolic structure. Labeling in the form of batik etiquette is done by batik producers, not merely as a form of compromise on the role of batik that has changed, but also as a vehicle in creating new structures. These structures in turn become activities of reproducing new symbols. Batik is labeled to be something that is then considered commonplace. Labeling on batik is a real proof of the cultural negotiation process in the structure.

The process of negotiation in culture within the self can occur when new awareness is present in the individual. At that level habitus is a relatively permanent system of behavior and disposition that can move from one object to another. The transfer process is an integration of previous experiences.

Displacement is a product of a dialogical process to form social construction. At the individual level dialogic space results in cultural negotiations. Perception, interpretation in individual or society takes a dominant role in shaping the social construction. Cultural negotiation in Bourdieu's view is able to form new structures.

In the case of batik in Surakarta, the existence of batik etiquette is an accompanying element of batik products. The existence of batik etiquette was something new in the

1950s. Batik etiquette is produced as a form of marker of similar products that previously appeared without any sign. In the previous period, batik products were produced in the context of cultural preservation, so that they did not require economic-oriented visual markers.

The presence of etiquette on batik is an advanced stage of the cultural negotiation process in batik producers. Batik, which in the previous period was seen as part of social activity and ritual shifted into part of economic activity. When etiquette is born there has been a shift in the function of batik. Batik is a commodity product, so the presence of etiquette is a sign of the shift in the function and role of batik in society.

2.2. Habitus of Batik producers

Pierre Bourdieu sees society as a figure who always changes. Bourdieu's principle of structure emphasizes dynamics and dialectics as drivers of social construction. In the case of batik in the Kauman and Laweyan regions, batik producers are habitus whose existence renewed and influenced the structure of the surrounding community. Social construction is an important factor that forms a structure.

Change in one society is not solely determined by external consequences, but also determined by internal effects that are internal habitus. The dialectic, as a press point for Bourdieu's view, is the interaction between the agent and the field. Uniformity of habitus will in turn give birth to a lifestyle. Lifestyle is an expression that is driven by an individual's understanding of something.

Habitus in Bourdieu's view can last long even though it is not permanent. Changes are possible if there is interference in the field and capital around individuals. This condition is caused by habitus is a phase of internalization of external structures, which are outside the individual. Understanding of the external structure will be restructured by individuals.

Bourdieu sees that there is a correlation between the field and ability of one's capital to change habitus. Capital is capital that allows individuals to get opportunities in life. There are many types of capital, such as intellectual capital (education), economic capital (money), and cultural capital (background and network). Capital can be obtained, if the individual has the right habitus in his life.

Social capital, cultural, symbolic cannot be reduced in economic capital alone, because each form has its own specifications. But ultimately economic capital is at the root of all. In other words, every capital will undergo transformation or conversion from one form to another. (Ritzer dan Goodman. (2012). *Teori Sosiologi Klasik – Post Modern Edisi Terbaru*. Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana.)

Fields are seen as a network of relations between objective positions. (Ritzer, George dan Goodman, Douglas. (2010). *Teori sosiologi: dari Teori klasik sampai perkembangan Mutakhir Teori Sosial Postmodern*. Yogyakarta: kreasi Wacana) Relations in the field are separated from individual consciousness and will. Field is understood as 1) the field of power in fighting over resources or capital as well as a means to gain access to power, 2) a form of structured relationships that have unwittingly set individual or group positions in the social order.

In the case of batik producers, the use of etiquette is an attempt to structure economic capital. The social and cultural capital that became the power of batik production was transformed into economic capital. This event shows the growing habitus of batik producers. Batik is no longer positioned as part of the cultural structure, but has entered the economic field. Cultural capital and symbols which were originally the main structures of batik art were reduced to being part of mere economic capital. The path of distribution and market control becomes an field contested by batik producers.

Relations between batik producers as agents in fighting over the field to obtain capital access are based on financial motives. This condition has unwittingly changed the habitus of batik producers. Batik etiquette was born as a consequence of the competition system between batik producers. Field is also related to structures that unwittingly regulate the position of individuals. Batik unwittingly gave birth to a dichotomy between batik products produced by Kauman and Laweyan villages. Batik etiquette in Laweyan village has more diversity than the etiquette of Kauman village. This condition is a consequence of competition between the two regions.

Laweyan batik producers have positioned themselves as second-class people, who try to go beyond the quality and quantity of the Kauman village batik. This process is a process that occurs outside the awareness of the batik producers in Laweyan. The actions of the Laweyan batik producers by giving different etiquette for each batik variant that was issued into a marker has marked the process of habitus change of batik producers.

Etiquette is issued as a product of the unconsciousness of the batik agents towards the competition between them. The structure of competition in turn gave birth to a new social order among batik producers.

Based on Bourdieu's point of view there are 3 things that can be used to look at the process matters that occur in the field. The first describes the power of the field (environment) of power (politics). This stage is to see the special link between the environment and the political environment. The second describes the objective structure of the relationship between various positions in a particular domain. The third processes

of analysis is it must be able to determine the characteristics or habits of individuals in occupying certain positions in the field.

The presence of etiquette on batik products in Surakarta in the period 1950-1970 was inseparable from the political situation that was taking place during this period. National economic development policies, which have implications for the export policy of imported products affecting the sustainability of the real sector. The presence and disappearance of Surakarta batik etiquette at that time was influenced by the quantity of textile product imports from Eastern bloc countries. The Pelita (five year program) program that changed the direction of the national economy affected the quantity of imported textile products and in turn killed the batik industry in the early 1970s.

The various batik etiquette of that period reflected the different position of batik producers between Kauman batik products and Laweyan batik. Laweyan's batik producers want to display more aggressive product variations than Kauman products. This aggressiveness is based on the fact that Laweyan's product has not been able to pass Kauman in quantity. Etiquette variant from Laweyan Batik village is each product from the same company will produce different variants of etiquette, indicating Laweyan's position under Kauman.

Kauman Batik etiquette is not as much as Laweyan's etiquette. Kauman has positioned itself as a pioneer and carrier of the character of Surakarta batik. Different habits between Kauman village and Laweyan village indicate different capital weights. Capital in Bourdieu's view consists of four things, namely 1) economic capital which includes the means of production, material and money, 2) cultural capital which includes all intellectual qualifications that can be produced through education; 3) social capital or social networks, and 4) symbolic capital that can take the form of prestige, status, authority that accumulates in certain forms.

Different habitus of batik producers in the Kauman and Laweyan villages is built by different structures. The habitus of the batik producers without realizing it has made a different field between batik Kauman and Laweyan. The behavior of Laweyan's batik producers by making different etiquette for each product made will be seen as a reason. Different conditions were found in Kauman village. Etiquette for Kauman village is seen as a marker of the origin of the product solely. Etiquette for Kauman batik producers is placed as a distinction. Different distinction between Kauman and Laweyan villages encourages different etiquette variations.

3. Conclusion

Etiquette on batik products in Laweyan village and Kauman village is an field that expresses the competition between the two regions. Etiquette is a reflection of the shift in habitus from batik producers. The batik structure that has been running for a long time has changed due to national social and political changes, which have an impact on the changing attitudes of batik producers in showing their existence.

Pierre Bourdieu's genetic structuralism theory can be used as a basis for analyzing changes in attitudes and expressions of etiquette of batik producers in Laweyan and Kauman villages. Genetic structuralism can explain the form of changes that occur and the consequences of these changes.

References

- [1] Harker, Richard. (2005). **Habitus X Modal + ranah= Praktik Pengantar Paling Komprehensif kepada Pemikiran Pierre Bourdieu**. Yogyakarta: Jala Sutra.
- [2] Ritzer dan Goodman. (2012). **Teori Sosiologi Klasik – Post Modern Edisi Terbaru**. Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana.
- [3] Ritzer, George dan goodman, Douglas. (2010). **Teori sosiologi: dari Teori klasik sampai perkembangan Mutakhir Teori Sosial Postmodern**. Yogyakarta: kreasi Wacana.