

# Women Activist' Narration of The Family Resilience Bill

Siti Kholifah

Sociology Department, Brawijaya University

*ifah\_sosio@ub.ac.id*

**DOI: 10.26821/IJSRC.9.1.2021.9121**

## ABSTRACT

*In Indonesia's process of development, there are attempts to make policies which are based on equality and gender equality. Yet, in reality, RUU KKG (Rancangan Undang-Undang Kesetaraan dan Keadilan Gender/The Bill on Gender Equity and Equality) has always been debated upon. This is because Islamic-based organizations strongly object this draft law using religious arguments. In the middle of the hardships in protecting gender equality issues in Indonesia's legal products from year to year, recently, there was the draft law on Family Resilience (RUU Ketahanan Keluarga). According to the public, this bill is deemed as hurting the issues of gender equality and is detrimental to women, as some definitions in the bill are still unclear. Because of that, this research focuses on how the narration of the Family Resilience Bill is on women activists.*

*The theory of patriarchy is used to dissect the current issues through a qualitative approach, using in-depth interviews to women activists who were chosen through purposive. The results of this research show that the women activists regard that the Family Resilience Bill is not only gender biased, but it is also class and interest biased. The substances of the bill's academic papers have been answered in some of the present regulations, and some even overlap. The women activists encourage the Legislative House to focus on the Elimination of Sexual Violence Bill (RUU Penghapusan Kekerasan Seksual). The presence of the Family Resilience Bill increasingly shows the form of the patriarchal state.*

**Keywords: Family Resilience Bill, patriarchy, gender equality, women activists.**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

All legal products on marriage (including families) are always related to issues of gender inequality. In Europe, in the 1960's and the 1970's, poor women, unmarried men, and colored children have sued the legal discrimination which was arranged based on family status. Most of the issued constitutional laws on families are deemed as not considering the legal impacts, and they often blur the social reality by sacrificing equality (Mayeri, 2017). The series of cases which started from the end of the 1960's then extended the issue of the rights between the parent-child relations in the constitutional area (Nejaime, 2017). The cause is none other than the language usage in the constitution which are often gender-biased. The usage of a masculine language often causes stereotypes and biases to women and other people who do not identify themselves as men (Lagasse, 2018). Because of that, such legal products cannot be included nor passed as a state constitution.

A research on the constitutional regulation shows that basically, the conventional understanding on family law and on constitutional law reside on separated fields. But, sometimes, the two come across when the constitutional law uses the top-down power to determine a new direction for the family law (Nejaime, 2017). Apart from that, the government's policies on families are traditionally deemed as intervening too far on private issues. Even so, the state's power to make constitutions and to manage laws on families can never be liberated from constitutional limitations, thus it keeps on happening (Joyce, 1980). These family laws are deemed as allowing the government to debate and to institutionalize family law policies which may hurt groups who are

historically subordinated and it is also to preserve the existing inequality (Hasday, 2004).

The studies above have shown that in some countries, the family laws have caused a new form of inequality. This condition becomes an important point to analyze the family law in Indonesia in relation to gender issues. In Indonesia, the gender equality issue has always been sensitive to some “groups”, thus inserting the gender equality issue in a legal product has always caused pro and contra. On 2012, RUU KKG (*Rancangan Undang-Undang Kesetaraan dan Keadilan Gender/The Bill on Gender Equity and Equality*) caused strong debates in each of its statutory hearings. This is because the Islamic-based organizations such as INSIST, MIUMMI, Hizbut Tahrir, and Islamic-based parties such as PKS (*Partai Keadilan Sejahtera/Properous Justice Party*) highly objected the passing of that bill. This happens even though governmental organizations such as KPPPA (*Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak/Directorate General of Social Empowerment*, the Republic of Indonesia’s Ministry of Social Affairs, Directorate General of Nutrition Development, and Mother and Child Health of the Republic of Indonesia’s Ministry of Welfare, and also women institutions (National Commission for Women, KPAI, some non-governmental organizations, PSW and Hinduist, Buddhist, Catholic, and Islamic women organizations) have believed the urgency to pass the Bill on Gender Equity and Equality (Arivia & Amzy, 2015).

The objection on the Bill on Gender Equity and Equality is also always based on religious arguments, such as the opinion that the bill is against Islamic teachings, as the degree between women and men cannot be equalized; or the opinion that the legal product is a Western product which does not suit Indonesians (Arivia & Amzy, 2015). These arguments are not quite true, but due to the strong efforts in voicing them, it becomes as if they are the truth. Moreover, the Indonesian people’s culture which tends to be religious makes them easily influenced by religious arguments. Because of that, the efforts to achieve gender equality in Indonesia through legal products has always been opposed by religion-based groups.

The condition above becomes an obstacle for the women in Indonesia to achieve gender equality in the family. But the rate of violence towards women always increases each year.

According to the Annual Report of the National Commission for Women on 2020, in the period of 12 years, the violence towards women increased by 792% with the total of 431.471 cases. During the course of 12 years, it increased almost eight fold (Amiruddin et al., 2020). This becomes proof that Indonesia cannot only depend on the National Commission for Women and the Center for Integrated Service on Women and Children Empowerment (*Pusat Pelayanan Terpadu Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Anak/P2TP2A*) to speak up on the issues of equality. The P2TP2A still sees the cases of the violence victims as daily issues, not as marginal subjects who have the right to obtain stately support. This is due to the lack of legal products which specifically protect women (Agustin et al., 2019).

In the middle of the hardships in protecting the gender issues in Indonesia’s legal products from year to year, recently, there has been a draft law on Family Resilience (*RUU Ketahanan Keluarga*). According to the public, this bill is deemed as hurting the issues of gender equality, thus causing pro and contra in the society. Moreover, that bill was included in the National Legislation Program 2020-2024 which was written as a bill proposed by the People’s Legislative Assembly and the Regional Representative Council. In its development, starting from February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2020, it is known that this bill has entered the harmonization process in the Legislative House’s Legislature. This draft law was proposed by five politicians who are Sodik Mudjahid from the Gerindra Party (*Gerakan Indonesia Raya/The Great Indonesian Movement Party*), Netty Prasetiyani and Ledia Hanifa from the PKS, Endang Maria Astuti from the Golkar Party (*Golongan Karya/The Party of the Indonesian Government*), and also Ali Taher from the PAN (*Partai Amanat Nasional/The National Mandate Party*)(ICJR, 2020).

Some of the issues which are deemed as hurting the equality include the usage of sexist languages, the concept of “family” which is gender-biased, the ruling on family roles which tends to be detrimental to women, wrong academic scripts, regarding the sex education in the family, and even the ruling on sexual deviation which does not have a clear definition. This research focuses on the study towards the position of the progressive women figures in voicing about the Family Resilience Bill. Because strangely, the bill which is

deemed as harming women is proposed by 3 women. Because of that, it is also important to understand whether or not the women public figures are aware of the gender-equality issues in that bill. Based on the research of Kholifah (2019), it is shown that only few of the women political figures have awareness towards women issues. This is because they are often bound with a contract on the interest of their background political parties, thus they do not have enough maneuvering room to voice issues on women.

Some researchs on gender relations in families still also emphasize structured approaches of marriage structure and family resilience (Puspitawati, 2019). Apart from that, the researches on the Family Resilience Bill which uses the gender perspective emphasize on literature review (Mahendradhani, 2020; Nursyifa, 2020). These two researchers explain that there are gender inequalities in the Family Resilience Bill which cause controversies in the society, and which further limit the access and the opportunity of women in public spaces. Thus, this research tries to analyze further on how the narration of the Family Resilience Bill is on women activists, both from the academia or from the non-governmental organization circles.

In dissecting this problem, this research uses the patriarchy theory to analyze how the entire structures of the society, including those in the social, cultural, political, and legal fields have created gender inequality as they have been controlled by the masculine culture. The patriarchy concept has a long history in its use between the social scholars, which emphasizes the domination of men both in the domestic and the public areas. There is even a domination in the social area where men usually hold the power positions politically, socially, economically, and in work life, meanwhile women are not given any access at all to those positions (Partini, 2013). Even so, in the patriarchal culture, it does not mean that women do not have the access to power, nor have they totally lost their sources of influence and rights. But, if there are women who reach positions of power, they are still under men's control, and their number is very few (Hartmann, 1976). Because of that, in the patriarchal culture, women are always positioned under the men's control.

Walby (1989) explained that the patriarchy cannot be abstracted into an integral concept, but it is divided. This is because

patriarchy has six different structures, such as: patriarchal production mode, violence of men, patriarchal relations in sexuality, and patriarchal relations in cultural institutions, such as religion, media, and education. In this research, it tends to use the structure of the patriarchal relations in the state (the patriarchal state), where the patriarchal state may be understood as the exclusion of women from the access to the state's resources and the stately power. The patriarchal relations in the state still have a set of significant effects on the gender relations. For instance, the formation of regulations or legislations which exclude women; the rulings on divorce and marriage; the rulings on reproduction, by legalizing or criminalization of abortion; contraception and new reproduction technologies; the rulings on wage discrimination; the rulings on sexuality; based on the courtly decisions on the child custody of lesbian mothers or on men's homosexuality; prostitution and pornography; violence of men, with the courtly practices on rape or beating cases; the rulings which are referenced from belief systems, for example, which regulates the parameter on where women may operate (Walby, 1989).

This research uses the qualitative approach to collect data by interviewing some informants, who have focus on gender issues, especially regarding the Family Resilience Bill. Apart from that, this research also elaborates with secondary data which are sourced from the writer's notes, historical reports which are arranged in documentary data archives which are related to the research, books/references, or journals which are related to the research problem, and also the internet, articles from the newspapers with the data which are related to the research's issues.

The informants in this research are determined purposively with the criteria: people who know or understand the issues on the family resilience and focus on the issue in fighting for gender equality in the Malang, East Java. The informants in this research are: Nara who is an activist from *Koalisi Perempuan untuk Kepemimpinan* (KpuK/The Coalition of Women for Leadership), Indah who is an academician and a woman activist from NU (*Nahdlatul Ulama/Revival of the Religious Scholars*), Lani who is an activist from Rumah Mitra Perempuan (RUMPUN/Women Partnership House), Imy who is an academician and also an activist of Women

Crisis Center Dian Mutiara, and Lia from Resister Indonesia. The names above are pseudonyms.

## 2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 2.1 Polemics of the Family Resilience Bill

The Post-entrance of the Family Resilience Bill in the National Legislation Program, many circles of the Indonesian society start to discuss about this bill. This is because the draft law which was proposed by Golkar (*Golongan Karya/The party of the Indonesian Government*), PAN (*Partai Amanat Nasional/The National Mandate Party*), PKS (*Partai Keadilan Sejahtera/Properous Justice Party*), and Gerindra (*Gerakan Indonesia Raya/The Great Indonesian Movement Party*) still needs further analysis. Basically, the contents of this draft law do regulate many things, starting from marriage, family life, child custody, and even residences. Yet, the proposal of this draft law is deemed as intervening private areas and inconsiderate of the socio-cultural aspects of the society. Worse, this draft law which consisted of 146 articles is also deemed as discriminating the women's roles in the family. This is deemed as contrary to the spirit of gender mainstreaming which had been regulated in the Presidential Instruction No. 9 of 2000 on Gender Mainstreaming, thus it must be further analyzed and criticized.

Some articles which need to be criticized are first, Article 16 clause (1) on the obligation of the family. The clause (1) of this article is deemed as reducing the role of the religion, rather than talking about more urgent family matters. Then, Article 24 clause (2) is deemed as too abstract to be carried out, as it does not have a precise nor an accurate measurement. Meanwhile, in a legal procedure, each article must be able to be proven precisely and measurably. Then, Article 25 also regulates the obligations of the husband and wife in family. This is the article which is most contradictory to the spirit of gender mainstreaming. The discrimination of the women's roles may be seen in articles (2) and (3).

In the articles above, it can be seen that the authorities in the family matters are divided based on gender. But the authority on task division for family members is gender-biased, this is because the job division should not really focus on

genders. As believed by the gender mainstreaming, women and men have the same rights without consideration of gender. Apart from that, this article clearly has violated the international human rights which had mandated the states to guarantee and to fulfil the basic rights of their citizens, which include to respect, to protect, and to fulfil. This article has also violated the decisions of the CEDAW (Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women) which was ratified by the United Nations, mandating all countries to not discriminate roles based on gender, and guaranteeing the same rights between men and women.

The next article which also experiences deficiency is Article 33 on the obligation of the family to be responsible in fulfilling the rights of Clothing, Food, and Livable Home. This article is also a form of discrimination towards the group of poor families. Apart from that, it is also contradictory to the government's obligation in being responsible in bringing welfare to poor families. In this draft law, the poor families' burden of welfare is imposed to the families themselves. If this draft article is applied, the poor families may be categorized as violating the law. This is ironic as the fulfilment of clothing, food, and livable homes for the poor must be the responsibility of the state, instead of a legal offense. Then, the safety guarantee against sexual violence should also be a problem which is solved in a macro manner, instead of burdening it to the micro level. This is because sexual violence is a problem which is mostly caused by a more extensive structure of the social environment.

The next articles which cause debates are Articles 85 and 86 on sexual deviation. Article 85 concretely discusses the Bondage, Dominance, Sadism, and Masochism (BDSM) behavior. This article is followed by Article 86 which mandates the family to report family members who have sexual deviation to the government so that they may obtain immediate rehabilitation and treatment. Even so, this article results to debates, which mostly regard the measurement and how this article will be applied. Apart from that, sexual deviation behaviors are regarded as law-violating actions without consideration of the society's socio-cultural context.

Apart from the articles above, there are many contents of the Family Resilience Bill which overlaps laws which have already existed. This is

because some of the things written in the Family Resilience Bill are already regulated in some other regulations, such as the Law on Child Protection, the Law on the National Education System, the Law on Marriage, the Law on the Eradication of Household Violence, the Law on Labor, the Law on Civil Administration, the Law on Health, the Law on Pornography, the Law on Information and Electronic Transaction, and the Law on Housing and other Residential Areas. Moreover, this draft bill is also regarded as having the tendency to regulate morals rather than the law itself, and not all moral affairs may have its constitutional regulations made. Thus, the state may focus on public affairs instead of private ones.

## 2.2 The Family Resilience Bill in the Discourse of Women Activists

There is a continual debate on the Family Resilience Bill, regarding the contents, the language usage which contains gender bias and class bias, and the articles which overlap other regulations. This encourages women activists to voice the importance of the gender equality issues. During the interview, the women activists give clarity on who have the agenda to pass this bill, as stated by Indah and Lia as follows:

This current bill weakens the women's position even more ... It is enough with the current Family Resilience Law. This bill is brought by PKS party people who are paranoid with gender and the Legislative House Members who like household violence. I believe that this (Family Resilience Bill) is unnecessary ... because it should not even exist. (Interview with Indah, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2020)

This Family Resilience Bill is highly discriminative, the points burden women, both those who are housewives and those who work – it is very burdening. The first is, why is it burdening, because the bill gives the perspective as if only women are responsible for managing the household, meanwhile the household is the responsibility of both parties, both the husband and the wife. And in this bill, all of those responsibilities are burdened to women ... The point here are the rights of the husband and the rights of the children – it intends to fulfil the rights of the husband and the children – but unfortunately, they do not

consider the rights of the wife in this bill – it doesn't exist! (Interview with Lia, August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020)

This Family Resilience Bill was proposed by five politicians, who are Sodik Mudjahid from the Gerindra party, Netty Prasetyani and Ledia Hanifa from the PKS, Endang Maria Astuti from the Golkar, and also Ali Taher from the PAN (ICJR, 2020). Three of the five politicians in the Legislative House who proposed this bill are women, and this condition strengthens the study of Kholifah (2019), who found that the women's involvement in the political field does not directly give contributions to the issue of upholding gender equality. Worse, the patriarchal culture has been rooted in the mindsets and in the perspectives of the politicians, even those who are women. This even further shows that the 30% legislative quota for women is only a representation of gender, but it is not a representation of the lifting of the gender issues which is hoped to encourage Gender Mainstreaming in the development.

The Women in Development perspective is still applied in the legislative realm, where women are merely inserted into the legislative house so that their representation are visible in the politics. But there is a lack of attention towards the gender issues and the gender strategic issues. This further confirms that the women's election in the legislative house tends to be due to the social capital that they have with the political elites compared to their capabilities or their personal qualities (Kholifah, 2020).

The Legislative House members from PKS and also those who have the interests to preserve patriarchy further show their agenda to maintain the puritan Islamic ideology. Even, Lani sees this bill as the suggestion of groups who are suspicious on things which then inflict fear. She gives an example, like someone who is scared of people whose hijabs are too opened, thus obliging it to be closed, and such actions are carried out by paranoid people (Interview with Lani, August 16<sup>th</sup>, 2020). Further, Lani emphasizes that the outer skin of the Family Resilience Bill looks good, but much of its contents cause controversies where the state intervenes private spaces.

Apart from that, Article 25 of the Family Resilience Bill regulates domestic activities which are regarded as women's obligations and responsibilities. This situation shows that what is

happening is not merely discrimination towards women, but it also castrates them, as if the women's role is only limited to the domestic areas and that it is enough for them to merely become housewives (Interview with Lani, August 16<sup>th</sup>, 2020). Apart from that, she emphasized that the bill regulates how a family is deemed as "normal" if it consists of a father, a mother, and children. Though in reality, a nuclear family does not only consist of a father, a mother, and children. Sometimes, there are also migrant families, which consist of the grandmother/grandfather and the grandchild or a father with a child, or a mother with a child. This is also highlighted a lot by Nara, an activist of the Coalition of Women for Leadership as follows:

The academic script document and the draft substantively contain many rights which become a burden towards women, for example, in one of its articles, there was a very specific ruling on the wives' tasks, as if an ideal figure of a wife is like that, or in the beginning chapter, in the general stipulations, there is already the potential to discriminate women who are single parents, as if the single mom category is not an ideal condition, it is as if she is in a critical condition or a family which is in crisis or unideal (Interview with Lani, August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020).

This Family Resilience Bill is not only gender-biased, but also class-biased. For example, to avoid sexual harassment or incest, there must be the separation of rooms between family members, where this condition may only be fulfilled by families who are economically capable. In reality, the cases of sexual harassment or incest do not only happen to poor people whose rooms are limited, but also to middle-up families who have complete facilities, as explained by Nara as follows:

Regarding the regulation of the infrastructure or the home facilities, it is stated that apart from having ventilation, the rooms must be separated to avoid incest. Meanwhile, a lot of the incest victims who report to a service institution such as ours or a lot of the data which we receive are from upper-middle families. It means that the families who provide the facility where each child has his or her own rooms, and some even have their own bathrooms, incest still happened. So, how can such a thing be inserted in the regulation? It means that if this condition is

deemed as an unideal family, what if a family could only afford to rent a room for the whole family? Every one of them will be deemed as unideal. Then, the government comes and regulates it. Okay, we agree that the government has the obligation to fulfil the people's basic rights such as clothing, food, and shelter, but how strong is the state in facilitating all that? (Interview with Nara, August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020).

This further shows that this bill does not analyze the cases of violence and sexual harassment which happen in the society holistically enough, that it is not only the case of economy, but it also regards the understanding on how important it is to give education on gender equality values and mutual respect. If this bill is passed, what will the government do to the poor families who cannot fulfil these stipulations, considering that the poverty rate in Indonesia by March 2020 experienced a 9,78% increase, with the total of 26,42 million people (BPS, 2020). The formulation of this bill should also consider the state's financial burden as stated by Ilmy, an academician and also a WCC activist as follows:

Do you know how many percent of the poor people have extremely simple homes? Many of them are tiny and ineffective. If they cannot provide ideal homes, what is the solution? Will the government give such houses? If so, where does the money come from, considering that there currently are more and more poor people. Before, the rate of poor people was 20-25% from 260 million people. Thus, how many houses must be provided, and using whose money? So, in the empirical practice, it will become a financial burden to the state. The points in the academic script on the second chapter, it discusses the state's financial burden. Have the policy makers considered it? (Interview with Ilmy, September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2020)

This shows that the bill is not made based on the reality in the society and without considering the responsibilities of the state if this bill is passed. This condition will be dangerous as the draft law made is highly ideal, but it is not based on the issues in the society, thus in its implementation, there will be many things which are not according to the reality in the society.

Further, Ilmy explained that there is the principle of justice in this bill but without gender equality and equity, there is the non-discriminatory principle, but without consideration of the power between the genders, etc. (Interview on September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2020).

Apart from that, Nara also stated that the ruling on this bill also underestimates the parents, thinking that they cannot give good names to their children, thus it must be regulated in the Family Resilience Bill (Interview with Nara, August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020). Parents are obligated to give good names to their children, as in the Islamic teachings, a name is a prayer. This condition further sharpens the problems of this bill, as it is not only gender-biased and class-biased, but also religion-biased, where the regulation is made based on the teachings of a certain religion, in this case the religion which is embraced by the majority of the population. This is in line with Lani's opinion as follows:

The case of religious obedience should be the affair of religious scholars, not the Legislative House. This is what I meant by inconsistency: religious obedience is the affair of a religion-related institution. Even the Ministry of Religion cannot manage religious obedience, thus how can the Legislative House do so? Thus, it is wrong, which is the private level? That is private. The relations with God are regulated ... it is not allowed. It is not a characteristic of a modern state nor a characteristic of a modern law. (Interview with Lani, August 16<sup>th</sup>, 2020).

The spirit of this bill's academic script is as if it emphasizes the freeing of the Godly spirit. But in reality (by seeing the parties who proposed this bill: PKS, Gerindra, Golkar and PAN) it is not a regulation which protects its people, but on the contrary it binds the citizens and bringing them to become more conservative, by emphasizing on puritan religious ideologies. The women activist figures who were informants of this research emphasized that the Family Resilience Bill should not be passed, nor should it even exist. There are some reasons suggested by these women activist figures as follows:

1. The academic script of this bill has substantially been answered in some of the existing laws and regulations, such as the Law on Child Protection, the Law on the Eradication of Household Violence, the Law

on Labor, etc. Thus, the passing of the Family Resilience Bill will overlap the existing laws.

2. The Legislative House should focus on the Bill on the Eradication of Sexual Violence to handle violence which is increasingly rampant in the society, but the law does not take the side of the victims. This causes injustice, especially to women.

The controversy on the Family Resilience Bill further shows that the war on discourse is not only related to the issues of gender equality and justice, which is shown in some of the articles which further discriminate, marginalize, and subordinate women. But there is another issue behind this draft law which is gender-biased, class-biased, and interest-biased, which is religion-biased. The theological and the spirituality contexts which they try to lift in the name of family resilience is actually the strengthening of the puritan Islamic ideology to reach the goal of establishing the caliphate system in the Republic of Indonesia's Unified State. This is even more worrying, as the law which is hoped to protect its people, but in its practice, it intervenes and does not protect the marginal groups.

### **2.3 The Family Resilience Bill as a Form of the Patriarchal State**

The Family Resilience Bill is an urgency of the gender inequality which involves the agenda to extensively preserve the patriarchal cultures in the stately structure. This is an impact of the exclusion of the women's participation in the state area. As a result, they lack power in the gender political strengths which are brought to run the state, thus resulting to unequal legal products. Another reality is that in Indonesia, women still do not have the same roles in the state as men, in the sense of quantity, as there is a high inequality between the number of men and women in the government.

A similar consideration also applies in the various stately fields, such as the court, defense, and legal systema, where the women's voices are not represented, and the decision-making positions are dominated by men. This causes them to not have much power to handle the problem resolutions which are detrimental to women, thus causing an imbalanced relation in all policies, programs, and legal products which are made. This is a gravely

serious problem, where according to Walby (1989, 1994), the first step to treat the problem of gender inequality is by giving the same room to men and women in the governance. The achievement of citizenship by the men will give significant impacts towards the forms and the degrees of gender inequality in a state.

The aforementioned important thing is a citizenship project which is opened for both men and women to form a discrimination eradication. The political citizenship awareness of women is more important to be considered in the analysis of change in the gender relations. Even so, the interpretation on the importance of political citizenship depends on the state and political theories in the gender relation theory. The success in the change of the feminism century is seldom written in the reports on changes in the gender relations, even though there are movement impacts towards the women's formal political rights, access to education and work, civil rights, such as positions as judges, or the courage to leave an unwanted marriage. The inequality of political roles is the basis of the transformation, from private to public patriarchy (Walby, 1989). Without the victory of the women's political roles, civil or social citizenship cannot be experienced by women.

But an interesting thing in the Family Resilience Bill case is that it is actually proposed by some women, who in their position in the government have the potentials to use their political roles to voice gender inequality. But, the contrary happened, as they actually proposed a bill which has the potential to further limit the women's roles in the family. This shows that the main problem is not merely the inequality of the women's political roles, but there are also influences from the cultural factor. This results to the women's representation in the legislative as merely an extension of the patriarchal culture, which does not have any significant influences towards the fight for gender equality.

A cultural factor which is prominently visible in this case is the factor of religious interpretation. Historically, the religion has become a crucial patriarchal discourse, which places forms of correct behaviors for men and women. The politization of these behaviors vary, starting from the role division in the family, up to the regulation on the women's behavior in the public realm (Walby, 1989). In Indonesia, the culture of religion

is very strong, thus an unequal interpretation is often normalized in the social life. Some discussions in the media also show that the religious issue becomes the main factor for the proposal of this bill.

Basically, the issue on the application of the Islamic law has always intersected with the caliphate issue. This is because the Islamic revivalists in Indonesia are always involved in the constant efforts to mobilize various resources which will be directed to develop the objective of a pro-Sharia ideology. Almost all Islamic revivalist movements in Indonesia agree that Islam cannot only be regarded as a theological reference which is present in the religious rulings such as daily prayers, fasting, pilgrimage to Mecca, etc. They praise Islam's virtues which function well as rulings and methods to regulate all aspects of life, such as regulating the political and public affairs, thus this movement will not stop in encouraging the implementation of the Sharia law (Munabari, 2017), even though the implementation of Sharia from each movement is different. For example, HTI strongly believes that the implementation of the sharia must be carried out simultaneously with the reestablishment of the caliphate. Meanwhile, FPI disagrees with that concept, and opines that there is no need to establish an Islamic state in Indonesia, Indonesia only needs to defend itself with the Islamic law as the footing.

In the end, the Family Resilience Bill is only filled with the reduction of Islamic laws which are interpreted using a gender-biased perspective. Because of that, the number of women in the legislative house cannot guarantee that there will be the fight for the strategic needs of women which are so far still discriminated, marginalized, and subordinated. This is because the women politicians who became the legislative members are not representations of the women's fight to voice gender equality in various sectors, but they are just an extension of each of their parties. Thus, the parties' interests – which are still dominated by patriarchal cultures – are prioritized. This further strengthens the fact that gender issues are not strategic issues for the women who are legislative members, thus this is in line with the study of Kholifah (2019) which found that political support in the grassroots level is not aware of gender issues even though there are women figures in that community who become public leaders.

### 3. CONCLUSION

Basically, the relation transformation between the public and private lives is still issue which seems to be unresolved in Indonesia. This situation shows that the effort to limit and to bind the women's movement in the family by various bill proposals. The women activists regard that the presence of the Family Resilience Bill does not strengthen the position of women. Ironically, women become more discriminated, marginalized, and subordinated both in the domestic and the public realms. Apart from causing gender bias, this bill is also class-biased where lower class people become more discriminated. There is also the interest bias and the religion bias which is caused by the interests of some political parties, especially those which are Islamic-based to strengthen the puritan Islamic ideology which they embrace. Because of that, if the political realm is an important factor in voicing the gender equality, thus the Women in Development perspective which merely inserts women in the politics through 30% quota must be changed into the Gender Mainstreaming in Development perspective which has so far been the program of the central and the regional Indonesian governments. Thus, what becomes the main agenda is not to merely to release women from the doctrines of traditional gender values in the family, but men must also have the same knowledge on the values of gender equality. The male-dominated households still become an unresolved problem, especially if the Family Resilience Bill is passed as law, which may exclude the women's roles in the public and private sectors.

### 4. REFERENCES

- [1]. Agustin, R., Suparno, I., Samsidar, & Sandiata, B. "Integrated services that empowers: results of P2TP2A assessment in 16 provinces" *Jurnal Perempuan/Women Journal*, 24(1), 53–65, 2019
- [2]. Amiruddin, M., Tardi, S. A., Hutabarat, R., & Ratnawati, R. "Pers releases and fact sheet of national commission on violence against women (Komnas Perempuan) 2020," *Komnas Perempuan*, 2020.
- [3]. Arivia, G., & Amzy, N. "Rejection on gender equality draft legislation: a neglect against Indonesian women's cultural history," *Jurnal Perempuan/ Women Journal*, 20(3), 231–240, 2015.
- [4]. BPS., "The percentage of poor population in March 2020 increases to 9.78 percent," Jakarta, 2020.
- [5]. Hartmann, H., "Capitalism, patriarchy, and job segregation by sex," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 1(3, Part 2), 137–169, 1976.
- [6]. Hasday, J. E., "The canon of family law," *Stanford Law Review*, 57, December 2004.
- [7]. ICJR., "ICJR: The family resilience bill marginalize the role of religion and culture, as well insults the poor people," Jakarta, 29 February, 2020
- [8]. Joyce, J., "Developments in the law: the constitution and the family," *Havard Law Review*, 93(6), 1156–1383, 1980.
- [9]. Kholifah, S., "Relations between political parties and Islamic boarding schools," Malang, 2019.
- [10]. Kholifah, S., "Capital exchange between Islamic boarding schools and political parties in the 2019 election," *Wawasan: jurnal ilmiah agama dan sosial budaya/religious and socio-cultural scientific journal*, 5(1), 43–56, 2020.
- [11]. Lagasse, K. M., "Language, gender, and Louisiana law: removing gender bias from the Louisiana civil code," *Loyola Law Review*, 64(8), 187–212.1, 2018.
- [12]. Mahendradhani, G. A. A. R., "Analysis of the draft law on family resilience related to women's empowerment," *XYAVAHARA DUTA*, XV(1), 43–50, 2020.
- [13]. Mayeri, S., "Intersectionality and the constitution of family status," *Constitutional Commentary*, 32(2), 377–412, 2017.
- [14]. Nejaime, D., "The family's constitution," *645(1972)*, 413–448., 2017.
- [15]. Nursyifa, A., "The draft on family resilience law in the perspective of gender sociology," *Jurnal Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan/ Journal of civic education*, 7(1), 55–68, 2020.
- [16]. Partini., "Gender bias in bureaucracy," *Tiara Wacana*, 2013.
- [17]. Permata, A.-N., "Ideology, institutions, political actions: Prosperous Justice Party

- 
- (PKS) in Indonesia,” *Asien*, 41(Oktober), 22–36, 2008.
- [18]. Puspitawati, H., Azizah, Y., Mulyana, A., & Rahmah, A., “Gender relations, family resilience and quality of marriage in the families of fishermen and farm workers,” *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga Dan Konsumen/Journal of family and consumer science*, 12(1), 1–12, 2019.
- [19]. Walby, S., ”Theorising patriarchy,” *Sociology Journal*, 23(2), 213–234, 1989.
- [20]. Walby, S., “Is citizenship gendered,” *Sociology*, 28(2), 379–395, 1994.

*i*Journals