THE POLITICS OF BELONGING:
PLUNDERING THE LOCAL, CLAIMING THE GLOBAL

Agus Indiyanto*

ABSTRAK

Global dan lokal seringkali ditempatkan dalam posisi yang saling berseberangan dan saling menghapuskan. Ketika globalisasi semakin intensif, orang membayangkan adanya proses kepunahan segala sesuatu yang bersifat lokal. Proses migrasi yang semakin intensif ke kota-kota besar dan pada saat bersamaan internalisasi nilai-nilai baru ke dalam tatanan masyarakat lokal melalui perangkat telekomunikasi dibayangkan akan menyebabkan hilangnya lokalitas. Pada intinya, globalisasi menyebabkan alienasi masyarakat lokal pada sistem nilai dan kulturnya sendiri. Namun beberapa ahli dalam studi globalisasi juga memperlihatkan tumbuhnya genre-genre baru kebudayaan global yang jelas-jelas memperlihatkan akar lokalnya. Migrasi ke kota tidaklah serta merta menyebabkan orang kehilangan kontak dengan desa asalnya. Secara berkala orang kota tersebut terlibat aktif mensponsori ritual-ritual komunitas di daerah asalnya untuk memperjuangkan status-status sosial baru. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa proses global dan lokal bukanlah hal yang selalu beroposisi, melainkan bersifat komplementer. Inilah yang menyebabkan lokalitas tidak akan pernah terhapuskan, bahkan proses globalisasi dalam beberapa hal justru merevitalisasi lokalitas meskipun tidak dalam bentuk dan nilai awalnya.

Kata Kunci*: globalisasi, ritual, belonging, lokalitas, status*

ABSTRACT

The 'global' and 'local' are often conceptually perceived as an opposite and obliterate. Due to the intensive process of globalization, many people imagined about the vanishing process of locality. The intensive migration towards cities and the internalization of new values into the local community through the telecommunication infrastructures would directly affect the existence of localities. All of this process leads to the alienation of local community to their values and cultures. Some scholars demonstrate that the globalization also initiate the new globalized cultures which clearly shows their local roots. Migration to the cities, however, did not simultanously push people away from their connections with the vilage of origin. Some studies showed that in many societies there were growing tendencies of migrants involved actively sponsor the local rituals at their home village to regain new status. This phenomenons indicate that the 'global' and the 'local' are not always in an opposite position, rather than complementary. Accordingly, the intensive globalization did not eradicate localities, but in many cases revitalize it although in different forms and values.

Keywords: globalization, ritual, belonging, locality, status

---

*   Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada

INTRODUCTION

This article aims at contributing at the discussion on globalization, locality and belonging, which has created extensive debates since decades prior to the end of the 20ᵗʰ century. Let me start with the question: 'why do people need to belong to a certain locality?' If this question had been asked in the 1960s or 1970s, scholars on migration studies might have easily answered that belonging served functionally as part of survival strategies among migrants. Joining a group means gaining access to opportunities, jobs, and securities (see, for example, Persoon 1983). But today is the 21ˢᵗ century. The advancement of information technology provides great chances for individuals to seek jobs and opportunities and at the same time lessen the dependency on locality-based networks. Everything is available in the global networks. The increasing dependency on globalities is believed to deteriorate the localities.

Many scholars showed that locality is still an important thing for migrants and people in the modern cities (Govers 2006; Hiller and Franz 2004; Jong 2008; Laoire 2007; Lemelle and Kelley 1994; Leung 2003; Pieterse 2004). People often spend a large amount of money to contribute to their community. There is also a tendency of growing groups on the internet which are built upon locality (for example in the facebook). Within these groups they are actively involved in virtual discussions and debates about their home villages on the internet. If this phenomenon is understood as an evidence of the practice of identity politics, of course then there is a very fundamental question to be raised: 'Why do people choose a locality far away while in the context of global society people have a freedom to select one from various symbols to represent the community?'

In order to answer this, we need first to understand what is meant by context. In explaining the term 'context', I follow Bourdieu's assumption that an 'actor does not act in a vacuum, rather in concrete social situation governed by a set of objective social relations'

(Johnson, 1993:6). Bourdieu (1983) calls this a 'field'. The word 'field' is not new in anthropology. It is often used to refer to a specific place where we do interviews and observations or living there to get insight to the subject of our study. Within a field, there is a space, and there are also actors, interactions, interests, negotiations, and strategies. There are also various values and meanings. Considering its complexities, I prefer use field as a social space: it is a space and also a set of relations, where actors (including the observer) interact with one another.

I will start the discussion with ideas of globalization and its impacts on localities. The changing context triggered by the advancement of transportation and information technologies apparently changes the nature of human interactions. Later, this phenomenon affects the ideas of locality. In the second part, I willl discuss the concept of belonging and its theoretical implications. In the last part I will show that as a concept, belonging can be used by people to reclaim their social status. In this sense, locality is not the opposite of globalization, but rather part of it.

GLOBALIZATION: THE FADING PROCESS OF LOCALITIES?

The term 'globalization' has become an important concept in social sciences since the three last decades of the 20ᵗʰ century. This term has been increasingly popular since many scholars use it to describe phenomena which take place as direct consequences of enhancement in information technology and transformation. One of the important markers of globalization is 'ethnoscapes', i.e. the quick, intensive, and extensive human mobility supported by the sophistication of transportation technology (Appadurai, 1995). People can now easily move from a country or continent to another within hours. This situation has then led to a new community of the multinational professionals, business people, politicians, academicians, and others, that control their business from abroad, beyond geographical boundaries.

Advancement of transportation and telecommunication infrastructures has had extensive and fundamental impacts on social and cultural life of the local community. People can easily access and mobilize resources from distant areas. People are getting less dependent upon local agricultural jobs as industries nearby provide opportunities to earn instant income and less dependent on seasons. There are flows of people from remote agricultural areas to industrial towns. As modes of production change, modes of consumption also shift toward an urban-modern consumption style introduced by media advertisements. People are getting more outward-oriented since the local resources to support the new necessities were getting scarcer or limited. Rural and remote villages increasingly become part of national and transnational networks (Govers, 2006:13).

Locality integration into national and global orders has a fundamental impact to the local community. The neighborhood and community ties dwindle as density and intensity of interaction between members decrease. The extension of scope and intensity of interaction allows people to freely obtain and choose values from various sources (Abdullah 1999). At the same time, the local values are increasingly contested, for instance about the meaning of personal presence and participation. Information technology advancement is 'connecting people[1]' 'presenting' or 'connecting' people digitally from abroad. The sophisticated 3G (or 3,5G) communication technology provides services for talking, seeing, and sending greetings between people across the world in real time[2].

Face-to-face relationship, which is formerly perceived as one of the characteristic of communalities, is now much more formalized and simplified. In many cases, visitation between neighbors only occurred in specific and formal events, for instance in life cycle rituals. Other than these events, the meaning of presence can be represented by technology. I prefer to call this new nature as digitalized presence. As noted by Giddens (1991), technology does have capability and role in bridging 'the intersection of presence and absence, the interlacing of social events and social relations 'at a distance' with local contextualities' (Giddens, 1991:21).

Thus, distance, space, time, and contextuality become less meaningful in such a community-based network. This leads to fundamental problems in anthropology. Community and culture, which in anthropology are believed to be bounded entities consisting of groups of people, shared meaning, and fixed territory (Clifford 1988), are suddenly requestioned. The assumption of isomorphism of space, place and culture creates several fundamental problems in community. Gupta and Ferguson (1992) mention at least four fundamental problems in relation to the place/space in anthropology. First, the question of identity, especially for those who live in-between borders, cross-boundaries migrants, and who are more or less permanently living in new habitats, such as refugees. Often they bring along their 'original' culture to the new place, such as the Sikh, the Khmer, the Tamil, and refugees from Middle East countries. Secondly is the issue of cultural differentiation and plurality within the framework of national culture. The term 'sub-culture' is widely used to explain this differentiation, but it brings along the sense of domination. This concept however cannot explain the fundamental cultural differences of people from different regions coexisting in one space (place). Third is the question about cultural hybridity caused by colonialism. In postcolonial studies, fundamental questions about the connection between culture and place are often examined. Fourth, the question of social change and cultural trans-formation occurring within the context of societies that are already connected in the web of inter-connection (Gupta and Ferguson, 1992:7-8).

In this case, connectivity is the keyword. In situations where the 'culture' is separated from the 'space/place', connectivity enables people to maintain and keep their ties with their 'traditional' social networks or far away home-villages. But, of course, a new nature, form and meaning of social relationship or a new community are not the same as in the place of origin. All of this development, then, leads to a reduction and

simplification processes of the meaning of appearance/presence and emotional aspects of social ties. Interpersonal relationships have a new different dimension, highlighting digitalized image as the most important aspect rather than 'physical' aspects. We can call this new nature of relationships as 'digitalized social relation'. Presence, empathy, emotion, relationship, affection, can be represented with digital electronic data containing emotional messages (emoticons). A wife may be enraged when her husband fails to remember their wedding anniversary, but it can be tolerated if he sends an anniversary message or gave a call. In a different story, people would be very glad when receiving a short birthday message even though it is sent automatically by the machines (people do not necessarily remember birthdays since technology provides tools which can be set to 'remember' important moments and it will automatically send greetings).

The more personalized telecommunication devices enable people to get involved in a web of communication network. The only reason for being absent from this network are technical reasons: 'the device is off; the battery is being recharged' or 'out of service area'. Outside these reasons are unadmitted and meaningless. It is clear that technology facilitate the formation of new patterns and community structures, which are now built upon new logics, ideas, values and norms formed by technology.

In this context, territorial reference becomes less important. The flow of cultural objects and meanings, which were previously available only in a locality, have now spread so widely and rapidly across national boundaries. Thus, everyone can participate, experience the same sensation, and share meaning with others in other places. People do not need to be in the same place to share feelings. For example, people anywhere shared the same feeling of sadness when their national football team was eliminated during the final round of the FIFA 2010 world cup without having to go to South Africa. People can also easily find Peking duck (Chinese cuisine) in Amsterdam, or Italian Pizza in Bali. This is possible because worldwide social relations have intensively been connecting various localities so that 'what happens at the local level may be formed or influenced by events occurring elsewhere and vice versa' (Giddens, 1991:18). Then it raises a question about 'authenticity' which is directly associated with 'locality'. Another problem is 'whether there is locality? Is it still relevant in this 21st century talk about an area of origin?' (Clifford, 1988:275).

If it is all about webs of interaction, community can be defined as a network, containing a series of social relationships within (Hannerz, 1996). Accordingly culture 'is not necessarily tied to a particular place, but rather created at the interstices between people in their interaction' (Olwig and Hastrup, 1997)). It is now more complicated to connect between place and culture because of the spreading ideas of culture through mass media. Tomlinson calls this process deterritorialisation of culture[3] (Tomlinson, 1999: 29).

In the absence of territorial referent, then, culture can only be identified from the social network shaped by the ideas of community or memories of collective identity based on locality (Lovell 1998): 4). Thus, locality does not necessarily root in 'real' space or specific physical territory, but it can be ideas or remembered places (Gupta and Ferguson, 1997:34-35). As noticed by Cohen (1999) the substantial basis of this kind of community 'should be the awareness about boundaries, where awareness-group differentiates itself with others, and symbolic construction, a construction of symbolic map and ideology as social orientation for its individual members'. In this sense, community exists more as symbolic order rather than empirical realities (Cohen 1999). Moreover, 'community is not a rigid and static entity but rather fluid and in constant motion' (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002:3). People can freely associate or interpret their association to certain communities. Besides, people may have different reasoning while participating in certain community matters. Within a network and symbolic based community, longing and belonging are important aspects of cultural identification.

CONCEPT OF BELONGING

An irony accompanying the fading process of locality is the idea of culturally and ethnically separate places is perhaps even more salient now (Ferguson and Gupta, 1997:69). A number of studies on the diaspora, exiles, refugees, stateless people show how ideas about remembered places play an important role as a symbolic anchor for the community of migrants. For the immigrants, memory of place, ideas of 'homeland' is often perceived as one unifying symbol for dispersed community (Gupta and Ferguson, 1997:69). In this context, people just need to imagine themselves coming from the same place far away to unite or to belong to a certain group. So in this case there is a paradox, on the one side 'the place' is discarded; elsewhere 'the place' is socially constructed (Rodman, 2003).

At this context, authenticity is not important. The questions such as "Who are you? Where are you from? What is your ethnicity?" are not relevant. People just need a same sentiment of 'belong to a community', because of the similarity of imagination about the place of origin (Anderson, 1983). It is an adequate reason to share the meaning and communality with others who share the same imagination, although they have never been or originated from a same place.

As a concept, 'belonging' is actually problematic: it is not a value-free concept, since it contains positive feelings of connection (Govers, 2006: 8). Belonging actually covers three things: attraction, identification and cohesion (Marshall, 2002:360). There is a certain charm that makes people feel and own, and eventually formed solidarity of togetherness, feelings, imagination, and meaning. So in this case there is a series of personal judgment, chance and choices, sentiments, images, so that someone with a positive assessment of the voluntary group are couraged to be involved in the group.

Yet as shown by Govers (2006), 'belonging to a community' is not always containing positive and supportive values. It can also be limiting and destructive not only for those who are outside but also those who are inside the community

(p. 8). Apart from its voluntary nature, an involvement in a group (belonging) in it self creates new boundaries and consequences. By joining the group, one will be pulled back into the patterns, rules, interactions, meanings, values and even the new binding structures, whether it is based on the old structure/culture or the newly - built structure.

Terminologically, belonging is very closely related to the locality, it is a marker of identity. Belonging, which was originally an individual's decision process, in reality often go beyond boundaries of individual experiences and exist in the communal level (Lovell, 2002:1). It is emerged as a nostalgic longing about the place, so belonging is basically tied people in a particular place and social relations. Lovell (2002:4) concluded that belonging is 'a way of remembering and of constructing collective memories, which are constructed upon a notion of place and position'. Belonging reflect the perceived ideals, emotions, sentiments, and social relationships, about the notion of places. It does not matter whether the place here is a real place (which has a clear geographical reference) or the place that exist only in the imagination of the people.

In the absence of territorial referent, collective memory about the 'place' plays an instrumental role in the formation of collective identity. Shared memories, myths, histories, and other markers of locality become the driving force to live for the displaced community. It is become powerful ties that bind and give a channel for people not only to share common ideas but also in arranging social activities. This can be seen from numerous examples of studies of diasporas, exiles, refugees, displaced and stateless people, where people continue to maintain and preserve the ideas, values, and local cultural practices envisioned as the cultural origin in the context of everyday life. As shown in the movie 'Bended like Beckham', for example, the traditional standards of modesty of women in India are collided with the context of British life. Indian Diasporas cultural practices that appear in Indian films, for example, make the context of locality very blurred; whether it is India

or England. In the study of Diaspora, the boundary between 'here' and 'there', center and periphery, the colony and the metropole (Gupta and Ferguson, 1997:68) is no longer relevant and it can no longer placed in two polar opposites because it can be integrated in one social space.

In this situation, belonging is more optional in nature. Being engaged or disengaged, inclusion-exclusion, integration-separation, with a certain group is a 'strategic' choice (conscious, unconscious) made by the subject to satisfy certain interests. It can be a strategy to fulfill material as well as symbolic needs (Bourdieu, 1977:36). To understand this we need to go further by examining the subjects, who are involved in the practice of belonging, and the possible implications of such practices. From several related studies indicate that 'participants' of the practice of belonging are not ordinary persons, but people with a specific category.

As shown by Ebron, for example, the tourism-based remembered place in Ghana turned out to be a major tourist attraction for the afro-american. The event is more than just a safari but a pilgrimage to reformulate the diasporic identity (Ebron, 1999: 911), which emphasizes the displacement in the era of slavery. This journey is not done by just anyone. As noted by Bruner, participants of this activity are middle and high class African Americans. They come to Afrika (Ghana) in a quest for their roots and experience one of the very sites which were used as staging areas during the slave trade (Bruner, 1996:291). In the case of this tour, participants were forced to rearticulate their identities within particular narratives of family and homeland-narratives that allowed 'the participants to reaffirm their sense of being successful American consumers, but with a culturally privileged difference' (Ebron, 1999:911). Furthermore, this search for roots has a deep meaning, not merely to trace the history of immigration but also of 'the story of a powerful underdog overcoming enormous odds to succeed' (Ebron, 1999:914).

As a concept, belonging is in fact highly questionable. David Parkin (in Lovell, 2002: ix), for example, questioned the most important basis

for belonging. Because of the similarity of ideas about the place of origin does not necessarily imply attention, concern, awareness, attitudes, habits, and even about the location of the region itself. Conversely, what about people who share the same identity even though they come from different places? Furthermore, how to explain the multiple belonging, people change and share their loyalty to various groups, since belonging provides a wide space for individual choice. At the same time, conceptually, belonging did not guarantee individual loyalty to one locality (Lovell, 2002:5).

To address these issues, we need a new approach concerning the global and local processes (Appadurai 1995; Gupta and Ferguson 1997; Kearney 1995; Kellner 2002; Lewellen 2002; Savage, Bagnal, and Longhurst 2005). It is not just a way to situate locality in the global discussion but also 'a methodological tool to display the global history of economic and social processes at the heart of local cultural commitments, particularities and claims' (Castells 2000; Ebron 1999). As has been warned, the old definitions of locality which leads to separation and isolation should be reviewed with an emphasis on connectivity, streams, routes, and movement (Clifford 1988; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Fardon 1995).

THE POLITICS OF BELONGING

Belonging is not an abstract or imaginative concept, though it is built on the basis of people's imagination about "place of origin". Therefore, to obtain its actuality, belonging needs and must be rooted in practices (Govers, 2006:12), namely, how people create, maintain, and display a symbol that can unite or distinguish them. This can only be contained in a ritual, a social performance, which is useful for communicating symbols and boundaries.

In the realm of social sciences, term 'ritual' has been regarded as a property of the study of religion (see Leach, 1968). It is perceived as a social performance to express sacred symbols. Turner divided ritual into two major groups, namely religious rituals and secular rituals (Turner, 1995). The first ritual is driven by reason and religious

dogmas in the implementation, while the latter is more akin to a celebration (see Wendy James). Although it included widescale practices (Bell 1992, 1997:94)—from the life cycle rituals to the political rituals—the practices produce two primary outcomes: belief and belonging (Marshall, 2002:360). 'The roles of rituals in the creation of belonging suggested by the fact that social integration and a sense of unity are among the most noted outcomes and functions of ritual' (see Durkheim, 1995). In this sense, ritual is regarded as a symbolic expression of the boundaries of belonging. Through this, social bonds are confirmed, affirmed and reinforced (Cohen, 1985). Therefore, the dynamics of ritual practices are an important marker of belonging.

The dispersed community often practice a local ritual, which is believed as original, brought from and still being carried out by people in the place of origin. But, the ritual practice itself in fact is very different, both in form and meaning, from its original version. Considering culture is a way of life which constructed in a specific socio cultural context and settings, the erosion of natural connection between culture and place create problems on the cultural learning processes and practices. Migrated persons are not only separated from their place origin but also alienated from the essence and meanings of practices, while the infrastructures of cultural learning in the new location are not available. Besides, the sources and nature of learning is very different. They depend on books, internet, and other literal sources to gather information about values, norms, and practices of culture. These kinds of sources tend to be one way, not dialogical, and detach from daily social cultural contextualities. Furthermore, the cultural learning process of becoming then more focused on cognitive aspect, rather than empathetic and experiential. All of these processes, then, lead to extinction of meaning and culture's soul; the community perceives culture as scientific knowledge, laid outside (not part of) their life. So it is reasonable if people are more interested to learn and practice the material aspects and procedures of a ritual, rather than understanding the meaning behind

the practices. For example, in a wedding ceremony, people are more aware and very busy with fulfilling complete peripherals and procedures of ceremony of certain locality they belong to. They prepare a sophisticated 'traditional' ceremony, which is more extensive, glamorous, and astonishing form, but it is not reflecting their understanding about the culture.

However, as shown by Cohen (1985) ritual has never becoming a common property, because in fact it was divided for all participants in different quality. As a symbolic construction, participation in rituals is not a guarantee of similar, shared values. For Cohen, shared practices do not always reflect the shared values; 'commonality of forms but not necessarily meanings" (Cohen, 1985:20).

The symbolic nature of ritual provides opportunities for its participants to take part, or choose to involve in ritual with different meanings. It can be observed from the 'levels bigotry' or ownership of ritual practice. There is a certain group of people who highly motivated and totally enthusiastic in performing rituals. They try to fulfill all requirements and procedures. On the other side, there are also people who just practice a modest ritual. They just follow the basic procedure, disregarding the meaning, reasons, or explanations behind the ritual. Accordingly, the mapping of who are more active and dominating or coloring the rituals of belonging is important to reveal the underlying reasons. However, each member of a community does not have equal access to resources and it formed hierarchical networks and differentiation (Govers, 2006:13), so it is very important to see who possess what, do what, and why do they involved in a ritual, and who are absent in this process.

The people's differences, both in enthusiasm and reference, in attending a ritual raise fundamental questions about the meaning of ritual. The Durkheimian perspective on the functional and philosophical nature of ritual is insufficient to explain the differentiation of meanings that emerged *within* the boundaries of communities. It is also cannot reveal the interests behind the practice of ritual. In this sense, ritual

can be perceived as something meaningful as well as full of interests. Thus, the preservation or the reinvention of ritual also contain multiple interests (see Hobsbawm, 1983), which can only be evaluated further by examining the various parties involved in the ritual.

These interests are even more obvious when the ritual has become more sophisticated, more glamorous and luxurious. This pushes the ritual away from community, since in order to carry out the ritual means more resources to be allocated. In this sense, the ritual is entering a new realm, with control over of economic sources as a keyword. Only the rich city people can carry out the ritual ordinary people could not afford the ritual because the existing resources to be mobilized in the village is inadequate. When the economic resources is becoming increasingly important, the organization of the ritual began to shift, no longer a socially (affirmations of social integration) or cultural (reinventing shared values) meaningful, but more in (re) confirmation of social status. This is the reason why the rituals more open: people may create a complete and glamorous ritual if he has sufficient economic resources. At this level, the ritual of belonging can be perceived not only as a symbolic performance or communication, but also has a highly political contestation. At the same time, the ritual with its new base is creating a new arena for the status competition, because the status has now more open and can be achieved by anyone.

Within the political economic perspective, the ritual can be understood as a tool or a way to achieve and/or maintaining social stratification and status, and also simultaneously reduce the conflicts that arise in the race for status. The people held a ritual to reach and/or to continue occupy elite status. Ritual in this sense is an important basis in constructing, claiming, legitimizing, and stabilizing the social position (status) and authority relationships (Hobsbawm, 1982:9).

When social status is achieved naturally (open the possibility for anyone to get it), ritual is chosen because the embedded symbols of togetherness in ritual can be an effective tool to reduce conflicts arising from disputes and class

status. 'The elites remain as elites without contestations, because the ritual also includes the symbols of social cohesion and harmony' (Hobsbawm, 1982:9). It is more powerful because the ritual is almost always associated with cosmological justification, that people dare not exceed the tolerable 'limit'. Thus, not surprisingly, the main supporters of the 'old but new' ritual of belonging are the elites. Also, no wonder if they are then tried to push the limit to reach the level that makes most people stunned/amazed. From this stand point, the ritual is a commodity to perform the social status of those who practices it. The emphasis on the symbolic or expressive aspects of culture is what distinguishes the practices of ritual of belonging.

At this level also, a ritual of belonging is not necessarily tied to the locality although it presents the ideas of locality. In line with the increasingly sophisticated ritual processions, rituals owners also shifted, no longer the village people (of origin) but the urban middle classes and elites, who gain control over social, economic, and political resources. This process does not necessarily happened at the rural community, but it is now becoming part of urban life. This can be clearly seen on how the concepts of traditional ceremonies which highlight locality and traditionalities now becoming a choice for rich people in big cities. Of course they are able to choose modern or western style, but they also put locality attributes (skirts, procedures, peripherals, etc) altogether.

CONCLUSION

The integration into the global arrangement would have substantial implications for local communities. As the old adage that 'no free lunch', there are always something from the local community which has to be sacrificed when they want to integrate well in the global world. At the most basic level, the enhancement of relationship, which is facilitated by advanced transportation and telecommunication infrastructure, has changed the local living orientation. People become more and more outward oriented and suddenly the local authorities and values are pushed into an inquiry. People are fascinated by

universal global values, and forget that local values are actually more appropriate to local situations.

Inequality of resources and opportunities between regions, between rural and urban areas and between countries, led to more flows of people which now go beyond the state boundaries. The massive movement of people from rural to urban areas, from one country to another, either for economic reasons and education are increasingly becoming a common phenomenon today.

Within the process of movement, migrants are not only faced with a situation and a new social network, but also the identity problems. They experience some contestations between the new value at the destination and the old values brought from their homeland. At this level all the migrants had been 'neutralized' both in social status and identity. They have been more or less untied from old social network in the village but at the same time they have not yet affirmed in the new social network. In such a situation, people try to find new sources to establish their status and identity. Some people use the newly acquired resources in the destination as the foundation of social status, such as wealth, position and fame. However, for some people all of these achievements are not enough to satisfy their need for status and identity, because economic and political achievements are not unique.

In this sense, locality has an important value. It provides unique symbols that can be transformed into a constructed base for identity and status. Ritual, in its wider meaning, is the most important source of values which can serve both localities and statuses. Involving in a ritual means claim to member of a locality, but at the same time positions in the ritual denote one's status and prestiges. I called this as ritual of belonging. The combination between the liminal feeling as migrants and status/prestiges offered by localities made this ritual of belonging increasingly important even in the global cities. It is not about contestation or resistance between global and local, rather than simply a way of reclaiming status in the global communities.

[1] A slogan of a handphone brand, suggesting that to be connected, one has to own the product.

[2] An advertisement of a communication provider exagerately illustrates how technology is able to capture emotional moment of a baby birth with a camera-phone. See also an advertisement about Idul Fitri teleconference between a son and his family (who are not home for the holiday) and his parents in the village.

[3] The story of deterritorialized culture, refers to general weakening ties between culture and place, partially describe the whole story of globalization. When a group migrates, settles in a new place, interacts with different groups, there should be changes in their social and cultural life. They cannot employ the entire social cultural practices of the place of origin. While there is a push, centrifugal forces, toward an adaptation with the new niche, there are tendencies to retreat, centripetal forces, to the old tradition of origin. There are always double movements, called by Inda and Rosaldo as de/territorialization (2002); i.e. simultanous processes that transcend territorial boundaries and have territorial significances. By putting 'the slash' between 'de' and 'territorialization, Inda and Rosaldo argued that *'deterritorialization always contain territorialization within itslef…. 'de' may pull culture apart from place, the 'territorialization' is always there to pull it back in one way another'* (2002:12).

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Irwan. 1999. From Bounded System to Borderless Society. *Antropologi Indonesia* XXIII (60):11-18.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1995. The Reproduction of Locality. In *Counterworks: Managing Diversity of Knowledge*, edited by R. Fardon. London: Routledge.

Bell, C. 1992. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*: Oxford University Press, USA.

―――. 1997. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*: Oxford University Press, USA.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Vol. 16: Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, Edward M. 1996. "Tourism in Ghana: The Representation of Slavery and the Return of the Black Diaspora." *American Anthropologist* 98 (2): 290-304.

Castells, M. 2000. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Clifford, J. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, J., and G. E. Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cohen, A. 1999. *Signifying Identities: Anthropological Perspectives on Boundaries and Contested Values*. London: Routledge.

Cohen, A. P. 1985. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Routledge.

Ebron, Paulla. 1999. "Tourists as Pilgrims: Commercial Fashioning of Transatlantic Politics". *American Ethnologist* 26 (4):910-932.

Fardon, R. 1995. *Counterworks: Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Giddens, A. 1991. *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*: Stanford University Press.

Govers, Cora. 2006. *Performing the Community: Representation, Ritual, and Reciprocity in the Totonac Highland of Mexico*. Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson. 1992. "Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politic of Difference". *Cultural Anthropology* 7 (1):6-22.

———. 1997. *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds for a Field Science* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hannerz, Ulf. 1996. *Transnational Connection: Culture, People, Places*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hiller, HH, and TM Franz. 2004. "New Ties, Old Ties and Lost Ties: the Use of the Internet in Diaspora". *New Media & Society* 6 (6):731.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1982. "Introduction: Inventing Tradition". In *The Invention of Tradition*, edited by E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inda, Jonathan Xavier, and Renato Rosaldo, eds. 2002. *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Johnson, Randal, ed. 1993. *Editor's Introduction: Pierre Bourdieu on Art,Literature and Culture, The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature/ Pierre Bourdieu*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jong, Edwin de. 2008. "Living with the Dead: The Economics of Culture in the Torajan Highlands, Indonesia", *Social Sciences*, Radbout University Nijmegen, Nijmegen.

Kearney, M. 1995. "The Local and the Global: The Anthropology of Globalization and Transnational-ism". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:547-565.

Kellner, Douglas. 2002. Theorizing Globalization. *Sociological Theory* 20 (3):285-305.

Laoire, N. 2007. The green green grass of home'? Return migration to rural Ireland. *Journal of Rural Studies* 23 (3):332-344.

Lemelle, SJ, and RDG Kelley. 1994. *Imagining Home: Class, Culture, and Nationalism in the African Diaspora*: Verso Books.

Leung, MWH. 2003. Notions of Home among Diaspora Chinese in Germany. *The Chinese Diaspora: Space, Place, Mobility, and Identity*:237.

Lewellen, Ted C. 2002. *The Anthropology of Globalization: Cultural Anthropology Enters the 21st Century*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.

Lovell, N. 1998. *Locality and Belonging*. London: Routledge.

Marshall, D. A. 2002. Behavior, Belonging, and Belief: A Theory of Ritual Practice. *Sociological Theory* 20 (3):360-380.

Olwig, Karen Fog, and Kirsten Hastrup. 1997. *Siting Culture: The Shifting Anthropological Objects*. London and New York: Routledge.

Persoon, Gerard. 1983. Wij met elkaar (Awak Samo Awak): de Minangkabau in Jakarta, Anthropology, Rijkuniversiteit Leiden, Leiden.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 2004. *Globalization and Culture: Global Melange*. Lanham: The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group Inc.

Rodman, Margaret C. 2003. "Empowering Place: Multilocality and Multivocality". In *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture*, edited by S. M. Low and D. Lawrence-Zuniga. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Savage, Mike, Gaynor Bagnal, and Brian Longhurst. 2005. *Globalization and Belonging*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.

Tomlinson, J. 1999. "Deterritorialization: The Cultural Condition of Globalization". *Globalization and Culture, Chicago*:141-149.

Turner, V.W. 1995. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure*. New Jersey: Aldine.