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Abstract
Land exclusion (prevention and restriction of access) plays an important role in triggering agrarian conflicts in Indonesia. Previous studies tended to see the state and private companies as the main actors driving the exclusion process, while the reasons behind it were merely caused by the capital. However, the process of exclusion is also led by forestry and nature conservation. This paper aims to explore the case of agrarian conflicts that occur in the Bangko-Bangko National Natural Park, by examining the power of exclusion as a conceptual framework (Hall et al. 2011). By using qualitative research methods, the data were collected through observation techniques, in-depth interviews, and documentation studies. This study reveals that the exclusionary processes are primarily driven by 3 types of power: regulation, force, and legitimation. Regulation is carried out by the state, synergistically with the legitimation of conservation (by the notion of the common good) and the use of repressive means, to secure claim over Bangko-Bangko and prevent local people’ access to the area. The local community has found themselves were tried to exclude from the land they claimed as their own—by using the legitimation of indigenous people—and have resisted this claim from the state.
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INTRODUCTION

As part of the agrarian issue, land or agrarian conflicts in Indonesia are still worth to discuss. Instead of decreasing and leading to resolution, the cases are increasing in number every year. In 2019, based on the final report released by the Agrarian Reform Consortium (Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria/KPA) (KPA 2020), there were around 279 conflicts in various provinces in Indonesia. Most conflicts occurred in the plantation sector with 87 cases, infrastructure sector 83 cases, property sector 46 cases, mining 24 cases, forestry sector 20 cases, agriculture 3 cases. The data from KPA is merely reported the types of conflict that have come out to the public, not including cases that are still below the surface, usually cases that are left unresolved.

The rise of agrarian conflicts is not a new phenomenon either in Indonesia or in various parts of the world. In many studies on agrarian conflicts, mainly in post-colonial countries, the core problem that causes conflict is the privatization and capitalization of natural resources which leads an impact on limiting people’s access to the land (Borras, Edelman, and Kay 2009). In the Indonesian context, since the New Order government era, land disputes have often occurred as a result of state policies aimed at occupying millions of hectares of forest (Peluso, Afiff, and Rachman 2012). In 1967, precisely, the regime claimed about 70% of forest land as state property which was managed centrally and hierarchically under the authority of the Ministry of Forestry (Peluso 2006). In the name of development, the government often used repressive methods (military control, for example) to prevent people’s access to land (Peluso et al. 2012).

These days, forestry conflicts in Indonesia are often triggered by several factors: overlapping claims and regulatory ambiguity over forest areas (Ambarwati, Sasongko, and Therik 2018; Mutolib et al. 2017; Riggs et al. 2016; Yasmi, Guernier, and Colfer 2009), granting concession permits for the private sectors (Safitri et al. 2011; Syafi 2016), ignoring the existence and rights of indigenous peoples/local communities who live in the forest areas (Afiff and Lowe 2007; Dhiaulhaq and McCarthy 2020; Muur 2018). The main problem that has been identified so far is the prevention of land access or exclusion, while the state is seen as actor that having a central role in driving the process. This is legitimated by the regulatory rules such as Law no. 41/1999 on Forestry which allows the institution (the authority of the
Ministry of Environment and Forestry/KLHK), to exclusively claim a forest area as state property (Safitri et al. 2011). The existence of the law shows that the state reuses the concept of Domein Verklaring, a concept used by the colonial government to strengthen its power and legitimacy over people’s lands as state-owned forests (Peluso and Vandergeest 2001).

From previous studies, two general assumptions are obtained: first, the closure / prevention of access or exclusion is carried out by the state and large companies (which manifest as a representation of capital); second, exclusion is done to gain profit or capital interest. However, in the study of agrarian change in Southeast Asia conducted by Hall, Hirsch and Li (2011), empirically shows that exclusion is also driven by other purposes such as reasons of conservation and environmental protection. In fact, justification in the name of the environment and conservation ideology —often framed in an inclusive discourse “for the common good”— has implications for the exclusionary process in conservation zones and protected forest areas (Hall et al. 2011). The exclusion creates both protection and limitations. When land becomes scarce, exclusive access for one or a certain group will create tensions because other people do not have access equally. This is what makes exclusion has a dual form and contains dilemmas for those involved with (Hall et al. 2011; Li 2019). According to Tania Li (2007) study in Lore Lindu National Park (Taman Nasional Lore Lindu/TNLL) shows that the intensification of conservation efforts (the will to preserve) brings resistance rather than support from local residents because they are required to be able to bear the interests of saving the environment, ensuring the health of the earth and a future for future generations. Meanwhile, their access to living space and sources of livelihood is limited as the consequence (Li 2007).

Such circumstance is similar with the case of agrarian conflict that occur in the Bangko-Bangko National Natural Park (Taman Wisata alam/ TWA) of, Lombok. Along with its designation as a conservation area, TWA Bangko-Bangko must be free from agricultural activities and the residents, which causes resistance from the local community (Rochayati, Pramunarti, and Herianto 2016). This creates a dilemma,

15In historical aspects, terms such as “national parks” and “state forests” are a manifestation of how the Dutch colonial state controlled over forest areas. This power works through the discourse of such terms. See other cases in the Asian region (Agrawal 2001; Bryant 1997).
especially for the Nature Conservation Agency (Balai Konservasi Sumber Daya Alam/BKSDA) as an institution running conservation programs when it shows that, in fact, there is a discrepancy between environmental concerns (conservation) and the interests of local communities. The existence of conservation areas prevents local people’s access to land which has done by the state. According to Hall et al. (2011), exclusion is led by power relations which can be understood through the interaction between regulations, forces, the market and legitimacy. These four elements are conceptualized as the powers of exclusion.

By using the powers of exclusion as a conceptual framework for analysis, hence this article has two main questions: (1) How the exclusionary process could lead an agrarian conflict in the context of the TWA Bangko-Bangko? (2) What are the impacts and consequences that would arise from the exclusion? Based on these questions, the analysis will be focused on analyzing how the power behind the exclusion process works as well as the implications that arise from the exclusionary process in the field.

RESEARCH METHOD

This article is written based on qualitative research procedures by taking a case study as an approach. The data were collected through two sources: primary and secondary. Primary data were gained through field observations and in-depth interviews with 15 selected informants which consist of farmers, trade entrepreneurs, religious leaders, traditional leaders, and other community leaders. Other actors interviewed were the village head and BKSDA-NTB officers. The selection of informants was using a purposive sampling technique, which included elements representing the natives (and immigrants) within the field. The field research were conducted in TWA Bangko-Bangko during September-October 2018. In addition, secondary data were obtained through mass media, reports and documentation data based on related institution from the center to the local government. In maintaining the validity, the study uses triangulation techniques to verify the data. The triangulation technique is carried out by validating data in the field of elements related to conflict issues. The data analysis process in this study is based on reduction and interpretation, namely sorting the information collected into sections, categories, or themes that are partially interpreted by the researcher (Creswell 2014).
THE POWER OF EXCLUSION

The term exclusion has generally been used in agrarian studies, where the tendency of exclusion to describe 2 (two) things, namely as a “condition” and “process”: a condition refers to a situation when a large number of people or certain groups of people do not have access to land; while the process leads to action, often accompanied by repressive means, in which a group is driven off their land by the more powerful actors. However, Hall, Hirsch and Li (2011) have different views in conceptualizing what is understood as exclusion. They reject the romantic view, including the reduction of problems, of the destruction of the harmonious relationship between people and their lands destroyed by the forces of capitalism, the development, and the state.

Instead of seeing an exclusion as a term that is in opposition to the concept of inclusion, as it is commonly understood, in this case the exclusion refers to how certain people or groups are “prevented” from having access to obtain benefits from land (Hall et al. 2011:12). In general, the exclusionary processes are divided into 3 (three) main propositions: (1) how certain groups maintain access to land owned by preventing others; (2) how do certain groups who have access to land lose it; (3) how certain groups that do not have access are prevented from gaining access. As previously mentioned, exclusion is not a random process that takes place in a single trajectory, but it is driven and shaped by power relations. The exclusion can be understood through 4 (four) forms of power: regulations, forces, the market, and legitimacy.

Firstly, regulations are linked to legal instruments and formal rules that provide mechanisms for access to land use. The rules are not merely

---

16Power is a term that invites a lot of debate in social science. Power is often understood as a person or certain group’s ability to influence, control, even dominate others. Sociologists have been trying to explain and define what power is in society: Marxist thinkers, for example, believe that the material basis (capital) is a source of power in society; Meanwhile, Weberian tend to argue that authority is a more legitimate power (Ritzer 2011). Although they appear to be different in form, the two have a substantial similarity: power as something sovereign. However, Michel Foucault proposed a different view of power. In its conception, power is not something that is owned, but as something that is spread (omnipresents) such as a network (Mudhoffir 2013), and as a relational concept (Sudibyo 2019).

17At first glance, these forms of power are similar with Michael Mann typology of power in his book The Sources of Social Power (1986), namely ideology, military, economics, and politics. Although similar, the typology of power between them has the difference, especially in the historical context where Mann pulled far back in the pre-emerging era of nation-states (Mann 1986).
limited to formal, legal-rational, and other positivistic rules, but also it is included the informal rules (such as costumary law community). By the definition, hence the government does not merely act as the main actor who have the right to regulate, yet it is made by the local communities and indigenous people as well. Transnational organization could also be considered as an actor that intervene in the management of land issues in Southeast Asia (Hall et al. 2011:27). The second power concerns force. The force manifests in the act of threats, violence, or similar coercive practices. Coercion is often carried out by the state apparatuses such as military and police institutions. In Weber’s point of view, the state is the institution that has the authority to use coercive practice in modern society (Ritzer 2011). However, the exercise of force is not merely monopolized by the state and its apparatus but also is used by non-state actors such as the mafia, security guards, and so on (Hall et al. 2011). Even small farmers who fight against the state by doing either forced occupation or intimidation are forms of force as well.

The market is also an important form of power. Markets restrict access to land through prices and the provision of incentives that favor certain individual or group claims to land exclusively. The land market is a pivotal aspect in determining who are able and unable to access land. The market is a source of great power in driving the dynamics of land access. The last one is legitimation. This power establishes the moral basis or justification for an individual or group to claim land exclusively. The last power is legitimation. Legitimation supports other powers—regulation, force, and market—that constitute the actions that obtain social and political support from others. There are several types of legitimation used as justification, for example, indigenous peoples, citizenship, development, and conservation and so on (Hall et al. 2011:31). The function of legitimation is clearly to provide moral values by the notion of “common good”.

Each power does not operate relatively autonomously, rather it is related and embedded to one other. These powers form—what Hall, Hirsch, and Li called—a process of ‘exclusion’. These terms could not be separated from its relation to power. Instead, exclusion needs to be understood in terms of process and access, not inclusion, as has often been discussed so far by other scholars. In this context, exclusion tends to talk about preventing access to land. Hence, it avoids the dichotomy between exclusion and inclusion with their evil and good character, yet sees it more precisely as an inevitable process on land grabbing since
Inclusion for certain land uses and users means exclusion for others (Hall 2011:6). Therefore, the analysis tends to focus on two aspects, namely the process and the actors: ‘process’ in the sense that how power operates and exercise in encouraging land exclusion; while the ‘actor’ will focus on the question of who wins and who loses in the process of exclusion. By considering these aspects, the article locates its attention to both the conflict and the tension.

THE EMERGENCE OF TWA BAngko-Bangko: THE WILL TO CONSERVE

According to the Decree of the Minister of Forestry No. 89/kpts-II /1983 dated 2 December 1983, the Bangko-Bangko area was zoned as Permanent Production Forest (Hutan Tanaman Produksi/HTP). The Bangko-Bangko is an area located in the administrative of Batu Putih Village, Sekotong District, West Lombok. By referring to the regulatory rule, it enables the state or others who have land concession, to manage the forest in terms of producing whether logs and non-logs. At the time, the forest area of Bangko-Bangko was under the jurisdiction of the institutions of state forestry (Dinas Kehutanan NTB).

In the following years, the area changed its status. Through the Minister of Forestry (Kementrian Kehutanan) Decree No. 664 / Kpts-II / 1992 on 1 July, the Bangko-Bangko area changed both its status and function from a permanent production forest to a National Park Nature (Taman Wisata Alam/TWA) afterward. Since the regulation was implemented, the measurement of area boundaries was carried out in 1999 which was thereafter reinforced by the Minister of Forestry Decree No. 418 / Kpts-II / 1999 on June 15 as a legal basis. Accordingly, the 2,169 Ha of land is governed under the authority of the Natural Resources Conservation Agency (Balai Konservasi Sumber Daya Alam / BKSDA).

The TWA Bangko-Bangko has functioned for several purposes: tourism and recreation, research and development, education, and cultivation support activities, which are under Law No.5 of 1990 concerning Conservation of Living Natural Resources and Ecosystems. The existence of objects in the TWA area has been regulated in a formal regulation, there are at least 3 (three) products: (1) Law No. 41 of 1999 concerning forestry; (2) Government Regulation No. 28 of 2011 regarding the management of nature reserve areas and nature
conservation areas; (3) Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry No.P76/MenLHK-Setjen/2015 concerning Criteria for National Park management zones and management of Nature Reserves, Wildlife Reserves, Grand Forest Parks and Nature Tourism Parks. Referring to the Minister of Environment and Forestry decree, there are several management blocks of the area: (a) protection block; (b) utilization block; (c) traditional blocks; (d) rehabilitation block; (e) religious, cultural, and historical blocks; (f) special block.

Figure 1. The territory of TWA Bangko-Bangko, West Lombok

By considering the regulations above, especially at point (b), it clearly shows that people’s residents or any activities related to agricultural are prohibited. Subsequently, it is not merely the regulation changes the status of the area but also it changes the status of its residents. A local community that had existed within the area are considered as illegal settlers and squatters owing to the policy and law. Since the area is designated for the conservation on behalf of environmenta concerns, TWA of Bangko-Bangko should be ‘sterile’ from settlement and its dwellers.

In terms of law enforcement, several actions were taken by the authority. The BKSDA, for example, forced the people out from the area of Bangko-Bangko because they against the law. Besides, it was an attempt to prevent potential damage to the forest by the people. But at the same time, ironically, the action is understandable since many people
considering that there has been damage to forests throughout Indonesia. The damages are affecting almost all existing forest functions, including production forests, protection forests, and conservation forests. In the name of conservation—or by the notion of ‘common good’—like the support of legitimation behind, the BKSDA is an apparatus given a role in protecting and saving forests by the state.

The people refuse to the existence national park nature. They also resist being considered as illegal residents. Currently, there are 241 households spread across 5 (five) regions (see table 1), namely: Pandanan, Kablet, Pemalikan Agung, Penjaringan, and Pemalikan Alit. Owing to the circumstance, the area was governed by the local community self-sufficiency. These 5 (five) regions are similar with the concept of Rukun Tetangga (RT) administrative in general, where there is a head who organizes the people yet informally governed.

Table 1. Corruption suspects and defendants based on position 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Residents</th>
<th>Name of Head</th>
<th>Number of households</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Pandanan</td>
<td>Marsan</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kablet</td>
<td>Pele</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Pemalikan Agung</td>
<td>Sahwi</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Penjaringan</td>
<td>H. Arpan</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Pemalikan Alit</td>
<td>Suhaimi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Author’s Primary Data (2018)

The people argued that they had lived within the area of Bangko-Bangko before it was officially claimed by the state authority under the name of TWA. Yet, the regulations made farmers (the most common livelihoods in the field) to be considered as ‘encroachers’ because their activities are located within the area of TWA. From the local community point of view, the circumstances brought about injustice for them. Since the people were not involved in the process of decision making, thereby the regulation tried to exclude them from the land by considering the people as forest destroyers. On the contrary, the people disagreed to be labeled as that because it was untrue. They believed that the label was
created by the state intentionally as a tool to make them guilty. Then, it caused people resistance toward the bad stigma.

By considering all the descriptions above, the discourse on environmental concerns is the key to legitimation for supporting the regulations of TWA Bangko-Bangko. Both legitimations and regulations played a key role in terms of driving the exclusion of land access. The case of TWA Bangko-Bangko reveals that there is an asymmetric interest between the state and society. Moreover, the circumstance was similar in the case of Lore Lindu National Park (Taman Nasional Lore Lindu or TNLL). The conservation discourse behind the formation of TNLL has changed the status of farmers to encroachers, collectors of forest products to looters, and legalized the exclusion of people from the land (Li 2007). The reasons for environmental concerns in recent decades have indeed entered to spatial planning and how the land is used. Justification on behalf of the environmental discourse, however, has a detrimental effect: it creates conflict and tension between the local community and the state authority.

In the 1990s, in Indonesia national park-based conservation received the support of number of donors and NGOs, and half of its funding came from this source (Li 2007). Environmental preservation reasons are embedded in land management in Indonesia. However, this has an unintended consequence, where conflict arises between communities and policy makers. Meanwhile, the designation of national parks or conservation areas is more influenced by global norms which state that owning a national park is part of a modern state; where a country without national parks would seem unusual (Hall et al. 2011).

In sum, conservation areas prevent people directly from accessing the land. Although the conservation area offers sustainability for the environment, at the same time it potentially excludes people from their living space. Thus, the emergence of the conflict in Bangko-Bangko was triggered by two forms of power, namely legitimation and regulation. While regulations legalize the status of Bangko-Bangko as a national park nature (conservation area), legitimation underpins this aspect of regulation by framing the environmental reasons behind. In the next section, an explanation will be elaborated further on the dynamics of the conflict and its consequences.
POWER CONTESTATION: LEGITIMATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS VS INDIGENOUS PEOPLE

In fact, the tensions between the local community and the BKSDA have been occurring since 1998, which marked the beginning of reform. It was triggered by BKSDA’s action to evict the people who were considered as encroachers or forest destroyers. Previously, the local community used the land in TWA Bangko-Bangko as a settlement, and as an area for farming. From the perspective of BKSDA, the people of Bangko-Bangko were against the law. Therefore, in terms of law enforcement, the BKSDA tried to evict them from the area.

On the other hand, people certainly refused to be excluded from their land. They rather fought back against the eviction efforts by the authority. Back to 1986-1987, when the area was still a production forest, there were several conflicts between the local community and the Forestry Institution. The action taken by the institution was the repressive means, which both eviction the people residents and destroying their crops are common practice. To justification these actions, environmental concerns were used as a legitimation. For the people of Bangko-Bangko, this does not make sense at all. They believed that environmental concerns should not contradict with its people’s behalf and rights over land. The authority could trust the local community responsible for land governance if they are given the opportunity. Yet, the state tended to exclude them which caused people resistance instead.

According to Afiff and Lowe (2007), the concept of indigenous peoples is often used as a means of strengthening community rights against state, or corporate, claims to land. The formation of a community as adat is not a natural result of any certain affiliation between communities and lands, places, or traditions, but is a response to the possibilities and limitations of political discourse in Indonesia. Both argued that the framing of “indigenous” identities was not merely a mimetic description of the real types of people in the world, but as a spread of political discourse and a framework for political action (Afiff and Lowe 2007). Indigenous identity in other words emerged as a solution to the problem of corporate privatization, and state control over natural resources. Although land grabbing is often framed in terms of ethnicity and indigenous identity, otherwise, communities in conflict
with local state actors tend to be excluded from the status of indigenous peoples, and therefore the state tends to deny their land rights claims (Muur 2018).

Figure 2. The paper said that ‘this land owned by the indigenous people’

The feeling of being a victim of injustice in turn connects the community to various other civil society organizations both in local and national. In 2009, there was a meeting between the community and Indigenous Peoples Alliance of the Archipelago (Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara/AMAN). Since then, they have become a member of the 1003rd AMAN and have received support to struggle for their land rights. By joining as a member, land ownership claims by indigenous people were voiced as a moral basis. This counter-narrative was used by the community in countering the discourse of environmental concerns from the state-authority. This was also an attempt for shifting the bad stigma of forest encroachers attached to them. In October 2010, dozens of people came to the West Nusa Tenggara Governor’s Office to question land ownership in the TWA Bangko-Bangko. Together with the Institute for Research and Community Service (Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat/LPPM), the people demanded that the government should re-measure the boundaries of the forest of Bangko-Bangko. People believed that they belong to the land in the name of indigenous people’s rights (as their basis of legitimation). Exclusive access over the land for one will certainly cause exclusion for others. The issue of access is at the center of problems in land conflict, whether it is a confrontation in the field or the policy arena.

In 2012, the conflict escalated as Lalu Masrik, one of the local community leaders in Bangko-Bangko, was imprisoned by the authority.

18The information details are published at: https://mataram.antaranews.com/berita/19797/masyarakat-adat-pertanyakan-kepemilikan-lahan-twa-bangko-bangko
since he was considered to provoke people to resist. Due to his actions, Masrik was sentenced to 10 months in prison by the Mataram District Court on May 2, 2012, and a fine of IDR5,000,000 (five million), but he received a 5 (five)-month prison term subsidy. The resistance was taken by the local community as a reaction to the intimidating and repressive actions by the authority itself.

In the following years, tensions between the community and the BKSDA began to decline in intensity. Yet, the circumstance is more precisely said as the neglect of conflict by the authority. On the one hand, BKSDA, as the authority, argues that it is in a difficult situation. Due to limited resources, the institution was unable for enforcing the law and policy as expected. Also, BKSDA does not have a compensation scheme for relocating the people from the TWA. On the other hand, the population in the TWA Bangko-Bangko will grow in number each year. The consequence is that land requirements for housing and farming will be increased. Thus, the residential area may expand. Also, with the development of tourism potential in the TWA Bangko-Bangko area, the community’s livelihoods continue to increase, and simultaneously they will be reluctant to leave the area.

From a historical perspective, agrarian conflicts in Indonesia have emerged in almost all regions, especially since it was marked by the end of the New Order era in 1998. The increase in the conflict was caused by changes in social structures and institutional which was marked by the process of decentralization power of authority. During the authoritarian regime of the New Order, the government massively grabbed the land into state property, for various reasons such as the modernization and the development. The deployment of the military apparatus became a repressive tool that was often used to promote the interests of the ruling regime. Meanwhile, those who resisted will easily be associated with the Indonesian Communist Party (Partai Komunis Indonesia- PKI), or in another sense as an enemy of the state (Mulyanto 2018). Since the fall of Soeharto, when strict state control has weakened, there have been demands for indigenous peoples’ sovereignty over land almost in all over the region (Afiff and Lowe 2007).

Looking back to the TWA Bangko-Bangko case, the resistance was taken by the local people to fight against on state claimed over the land. The counter-narrative of ‘indigenous peoples’ (making claims such as rights to life, social justice, and indigenous rights over the land) has played an important role in supporting the practice. Nonetheless, this
does not mean that people’s movement will run smoothly as expected. The power of coercion eventually becomes an inevitable part when mass resistance from the local community occurs. The authority used repressive means such as intimidation, land destruction, and violence to evict people who live within the conservation areas. Certainly, these actions are justified and supported by regulatory powers and environmental legitimacy as a moral basis.

Even though they have struggled, this does not mean that community resistance is going as expected. The power of coercion becomes an inevitable part when mass resistance or resistance from community groups occurs. BKSDA uses repressive methods such as intimidation, land destruction, and violence to exclude communities in conservation areas. This action is justified and supported by regulatory powers and environmental legitimacy as a moral basis. Meanwhile, the community continues to fight while using their ‘indigenous’ identity to establish their basis for legitimacy. The identity discourse used as the basis for the Bangko-Bangko people’s resistance to the determination of TWA by the state affirms the thesis of Hall et al. (2011) who argue that exclusion has multiple forms. The implication results in direct debate and conflict on the ground about who has the most right to decide and who is not. Thus, preventing access was carried out by both parties, the community with the legitimacy of the indigenous community while the BKSDA with the legitimacy of environmental protection as well as structural force: structure versus culture.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF EXCLUSION

The emergence of TWA Bangko-Bangko as state control over forested land was triggering conflict vertically (state vs society). Despite its vertical dimension, conflict in TWA Bangko-Bangko also caused tension horizontally between the local communities with the local government of Batu Putih Village. The dispute between them was initially triggered by the desire of the people of Bangko-Bangko to be administratively integrated with Batu Putih Village. But the institution reluctant to fulfill the requirements since the area of residents remained existed within the national park nature territory, which is the same as against the law. Meanwhile the solution that was once offered by the village government was that if they want to administratively integrated, the community should be willing to move their settlement out of the
area. Otherwise, the community refused and remained to survive in the TWA Bangko-Bangko; they insisted on defending their right over the land.

The community holds the status of an illegal resident consequently. Most of the people living in the TWA do not have official identities cards (Kartu Tanda Pendenal/KTP). In turn, it is difficult for people to have their rights as citizenship, particularly, in terms of access to basic services such as education, health, and clean water. Throughout the day, these things are fulfilled self-sufficiency by the community. The people in TWA Bangko-Bangko live as isolated and far from civilization. At this stage, the conflict brings about a dilemma. The BKSDA as the authorities cannot just evict everyone, because eviction is very expensive and will potentially result in a massive wave of resistance not only in the local community but nationally concerns. This problem caused BKSDA to make prolonged omissions and made the situation even more complex and complicated. Given the increasing number of settlers and the need for land in the TWA Bangko-Bangko area, an increasing number of people will fight against BKSDA. On the other hand, the persistence of communities in the national park nature area shows how weak the regime is in demonstrating their sovereignty, while the use of force will only further emphasize the government’s inability to act wisely and create welfare for its people (Li 2007).

However, the emergence of conflict has the most detrimental impact more on the people of Bangko-Bangko. Communities living in the conservation area hold the status of forest encroachers, forest destroyers, and even illegal settlers. These various identities are the logical implications of the regulations that support the existence of TWA Bangko-Bangko. As long as the conflict remains unchanged, the local community will continue to be under the BKSDA’s power over the land. Besides, during that time the people will be excluded from its right to obtain basic services like other citizens in general.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded so far that there are 3 (three) forms of power that form exclusion in the case of agrarian conflict in TWA Bangko-Bangko: regulation, legitimation, and force. As has been shown that these powers are not relatively autonomous and independent yet are intertwined and embedded with one another.
The emergence of the TWA Bangko-Bangko area as conservation involves regulatory power with the discourse of conservation and nature protection as the basis of its legitimations. These legitimations and regulations are a form of dominant power used by BKSDA, as the state’s representative, in making efforts to prevent access to the TWA area from the community. Even though the conservation area provides a sustainable offer for the environment, at the same time this has an impact on the eviction of the local community through which the authorities have pursued repressive and intimidating methods (as a manifestation of coercive power).

However, the existence of TWA was rejected by the local community. Resistance emerged from the people regarding the existence of TWA and the repressive practice that carried out by BKSDA. Local people are forced to bear the burden of saving the environment as their responsibility, while there is no compensation whatsoever. Thus, local people fought in various ways. The legitimacy of ‘indigenous people’ played an important role in supporting this resistance. Apart from the claims of indigenous peoples as the basis of legitimacy, other terms such as right to life and social justice were promoted as reasons for reclaiming land. This method is a counter narrative of the regulatory power and conservation discourse maintained by the state over the Bangko-Bangko area.

Claims of land use and regulation based on environmental concerns by the state are in fact contrary to claims of community sovereignty over land. Therefore, of all the forms of power that have been identified, legitimacy is the source of power that most plays a role in driving the land exclusion process between the local community and the government: Community with indigenous claims, while BKSDA with environmental preservation. However, local communities remain the group that is more affected by the ongoing conflict. Having the status of encroachers, forest destroyers and illegal residents, makes it difficult for the community for gaining access to basic service rights as citizens. In the end, the consequences of TWA’s existence are not only to exclude community rights to the land, but also to be socially excluded because it intersects with the dimension of basic fulfillment rights.
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