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Abstract
The implementation of Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages (Village Law) creates a paradox of recognition, especially for indigenous communities which was caused by the contradiction between the value pasang and development practices. The results of previous research have focused more on the use of the Village Fund, the formation of customary villages, and the management and use of customary forests. These findings were used to reconstruct ethnodevelopment in the implementation of the principle of recognition of the Village Law in the Ammatoa Kajang indigenous community. Qualitative data were collected through in-depth interviews and focus group discussions with members and traditional leaders of the Ammatoa indigenous community who understand the ins and outs of village development, culture, community. This paper shows a new paradigm of ethnodevelopment to carry out development in indigenous communities through the identification of customary thinking and development that mainstreams traditions, local knowledge, local wisdom, and the needs of indigenous communities.
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INTRODUCTION

The enactment of Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages (Village Law) has contributed greatly to the implementation of development in villages. Villages in Indonesia are moving fast in developing and utilizing village potential under the mandate of the Village Law. Relatively, the Village Law provides a resolution to open space for inclusive development. However, the breakthroughs and features of the Village Law have shortcomings, especially the regulation of very little resources so that the implementation of the Village Law is unable to overcome the agrarian crisis and ecological crises that occur in the village (Shohibuddin 2016). The agrarian crisis is marked by a bump of regulations on agrarian tenure arrangements between formal and indigenous law, while the ecological crisis is marked by a decline in the carrying capacity of land and neglect of the rights of indigenous communities in natural resource management. The agrarian and ecological crisis that took place in villages, especially in indigenous communities by Sampean, Wahyuni, and Sjaf (2019) occurred because of the paradox of recognition in implementing the Village Law. The paradox of recognition is caused by the contradiction between the wisdom values possessed by indigenous communities and development practices and the country’s imposition in running the bureaucratic system (administrative village) as happened in the Ammatoa Kajang. As a result, according to Zakaria (2000), the village system causes chaos in traditional symbolic meanings and customary authority. The problem of implementing the Village Law can be overcome by enforcing ethnodevelopment to reduce misrecognition and the position of the state in carrying out development in indigenous communities, as implemented in the Ammatoa Kajang in Tanah Towa Village, Bulukumba Regency. Thus, this article is interesting, however will the principle of recognition within the Village Law provide freedom to the Ammatoa Kajang to work out its sort of development? however, is that the spirit of recognition the muse for formulating development programs in the village of the Ammatoa Kajang supported customary needs? Is ethnodevelopment following the spirit of recognition principles?

RESEARCH METHOD

This article is written based on a qualitative research. The Ammatoa Kajang is employed as a case study as a result of the associate institutional shift from cultural establishments to political and
economic institutions. As a part of the object of national policies and case examples in the side of indigenous communities development, the Ammatoa Kajang is positioned during this research as an arena for development and also the object of policies on the implementation of the Village Law over the past six years. As long because the six years of vulnerability are going on, the village building programs and assistance. Tanah Towa Village was used as a look location as a result of sociologically Tanah Towa village incorporates a special characteristic, particularly the Ammatoa Kajang that still maintains its origins in terms of culture, politics, economy, and territory. Tanah Towa Village is additionally the middle of customary governance and also the social order remains in progress today. Also, legally, autochthonic communities get recognition through the Constitutional Court number 35 year 2012 regarding recognition of indigenous peoples. The results of this decision were followed up by the stipulation of Regional Regulation number 9 year 2015 concerning the Affirmation, Recognition, and Protection of the Rights of the Ammatoa Kajang. Subsequently, in 2016, the results of this call were strong by the submission of forest recognition to nine customary communities, one of which is the Ammatoa Kajang. The instrument for exploring qualitative data using in-depth interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) to explore cases of recognition in development practices in the Ammatoa Kajang, Tanah Town Village, Bulukumba Regency, South Sulawesi Province. The authors conducted in-depth interviews with 20 informants and 6 FGD participants. They consisted of members and traditional leaders of the Ammatoa Kajang who understand the ins and outs of village development, culture, and pasang\textsuperscript{4} living in Tanah Towa village\textsuperscript{5}.

\textsuperscript{4}It is defined as messages of ancestral doctrines that have been passed down from generation to generation or passed down from generations since the first humans appeared to this day. Pasang is not written in book form. However, it was passed down based on oral tradition. The results of the interview with the GP stated that Punna a’rako angngisek’i ada’na tau ri Kajang, Akkutaknangko, nasaba’ anre’ ukiri kunne mae. Pasangji i bawang. The meaning is that if you want to know the customs of the Ammatoa Kajang people, ask! because here there are no scriptures, only pasang (Interview with GP, Ammatoa Kajang leader, 23 March 2019).

\textsuperscript{5}The existence of the Ammatoa Kajang in Tanah Towa village is divided into two parts, namely Panttarang Embayya (The formal government administrative area of Tanah Towa village) while Ilalang Embyya or Rabbang Seppang (Kajang inside) the residence of Ammatoa Kajang and members of her community who still maintain the pure values of the tide. Membership of the Ammatoa Kajang includes Kajang sub-district and
THE HISTORY AND THE PARADIGM OF ETHNODEVELOPMENT

Paradigmatically, ethnodevelopment is used as a critical attitude towards the political economy paradigm of liberal development (Nieuwkoop and Uquillas 2000; Talalla 1984) which is eurocentric by using the modernity paradigm (Grosfoguel 2011). Escobar (1995) emphasized that development practices as neo-colonial practices and cultural imperialism between the domination of the North and the South. The political economy development paradigm that was proclaimed by the North World shows the unfinished imperialism and the third stage of the colonialization process shows the unfinished imperialism and the third stage of the colonialization process. The political economy development paradigm that was proclaimed by the North World shows the unfinished imperialism and the third stage of the colonization process (Sjaf 2019). The peculiarities of Western development theories are also pointed out by Portes (2015) and Kassam (2002) that Northern thinkers are more concerned with the progress of their respective countries by ignoring the conditions of the South. As a result, the theory of the Northern World is irrelevant to the context of the Global South. For Hettne (2009) development is a value system controlled by development agents that represents the value system of the North, not the South.

A critical perspective towards the term development as a replacement knowledge system, ideology, and colonialization style. Scientists of the Southern World were driven to formulate a special system of knowledge by the west. Grosfoguel (2011) shows that social worth in producing knowledge is partial and tied to geopolitics. Gardner and Lewis (1996) additionally emphasize that knowledge is made supported by a fluid several neighboring sub-districts which have a genealogical relationship (origins) with the existence of the Ammatoa Ilalang Embayya.

6The term geopolitical mapping of South-North countries is used by Latin American scientists to indicate the process of dominating knowledge between European countries, the United States and South containing Latin America.

7The stage of imperialism by Galtung (2019) The stage of imperialism is explained by Galtung (2019) that the imperialism process takes place in three stages, namely occupation, institutionalization through international institutions, and communication. Whereas the imperialism process takes place in three stages, namely occupation, institutionalization through international institutions, and communication. The current imperialism is communication and information imperialism.
social, political, and economic context. The model of universalism and scientific rationalism of western intellectual agents in development practices excludes backward native communities.

The important perspective of Southern scientists, pioneered by resident scientists, found development failures within the southern world that resulted from independence and underdevelopment\(^8\) (Budiman 1996; Sjaf 2019). Then, They reformulated various theories of identity-based development (ethnodevelopment) that had an equivalent spirit because of the social science of degrowth development. The utilization of the term degrowth developed into a movement against the locution of economic process. The means of economic growth in step with Alier (2002) is that the use of an explosive and intensive environment. Therefore, ethnodevelopment prioritizes the principle of property in the use of natural resources under the principles of values inherent in autochthonic communities while not being cornered in economic growth.

Ethnodevelopment could be a new paradigm of participatory policies geared toward ethnicity in Latin America in the 1980s (Chartock 2009; Chernela 2011; De Zaldívar 2008). Stavenhagen (2013) provides special services for ethnic development practices on the rights of local communities or indigenous communities to determine their development. Seymour-Smith (1987) describes the practice of identity-based development (ethnodevelopment) as an ethnic project designed by Latin American scientists to study cultural values in development projects because all this time the development process has been dominated by the power of the national elite. This perspective contrasts with the findings of De Zaldívar (2008) which show a shift in ethnodevelopment practices to ethnophagy\(^9\) practices in rural Andes in Ecuador.

The ethnodevelopment orientation movement occurred when this project was taken over by the World Bank as a model for empowering indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities which began in 1992 by awarding the Nobel Prize to Rigoberta Menchú for his dedication

---

\(^8\)The term underdevelopment the first popularized by Frank (1991) shows that development is a stage to exploit underdeveloped countries.

\(^9\)The term Ethnophagy is used to describe the shift in ethnodevelopment principles and practices related to development policies oriented towards indigenous peoples. Ethnophagy articulation to explain the mechanism of world bank intervention through local elites to carry out neo-colonial development projects in local communities in rural Andes in Ecuador.
to local communities (De Zaldívar 2008). Then in 1993, the World Bank initiated the development of local communities (indigenous peoples) by formulating indicators for measuring mitigation, training, capacity building, and investment preparation. The orientation for the development of the World Bank is economic growth by utilizing local communities. Subsequent ethnic developments provided an entry point for investment and the market economy. De Zaldívar (2008) Ethnodevelopment is a new paradigm of participatory policies aimed at ethnicity in Latin America in the 1980s (Chartock 2009; Chernela 2011; De Zaldívar 2008). Stavenhagen (2013) provides special services for ethnic development practices on the rights of local communities and indigenous communities to determine their development. Seymour-Smith (1987) describes the practice of identity-based development (ethnodevelopment) as an ethnic project designed by Latin American scientists to study cultural values in development projects because all this time the development process has been dominated by the power of the national elite. This perspective contrasts with the findings of De Zaldívar (2008) which show a shift in ethnodevelopment practices to ethnophagy practices in rural Andes in Ecuador.

The ethnodevelopment orientation movement occurred when this project was taken over by the World Bank as a model for empowering indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities which began in 1992 by awarding the Nobel Prize to Rigoberta Menchú for his dedication to local communities (De Zaldívar 2008). Then in 1993, the World Bank initiated the development of local communities (indigenous peoples) by formulating indicators for measuring mitigation, training, capacity building, and investment preparation. The orientation for the development of the World Bank is economic growth by utilizing local communities. Subsequent ethnic developments provided an entry point for investment and the market economy. De Zaldívar (2008) found that development projects carried out in rural Andes areas negate the existence of the state in the process of implementing agrarian empowerment and reform programs. The World Bank is the main authority in decision making, monitoring, and evaluation.

10Market economy in the view of Polanyi (1994) is an economic system that is controlled, regulated, and directed by the market itself. The order of production and distribution of goods and services is entrusted to a private mechanism (self regulation market).
A different view from Davis (2002) that local community-based development carried out in Latin America is successful. The steps taken by the World Bank in practicing ethnodevelopment according to Davis (2002) are strengthening human resources and social capital through investment in education. A development project carried out by the World Bank by mainstreaming the participation and recognition of local communities (indigenous people) at the regional, local and national levels in policy making. The difference in views between De Zaldívar (2008) dan Davis (2002) in seeing the World Bank’s role in identity-based development practices requires a paradigmatic re-examination and development practices in Latin America to be contextualized within indigenous communities in Indonesia. In seeing the World Bank’s role, the practice of identity-based development requires a paradigmatic review of development practices in Latin America to be contextualized within indigenous communities in Indonesia.

The emergence of the idea of ethnodevelopment cannot be avoided from the context of the native Latin American people. They fell into the process of corporatism and internal colonization carried out by the national elite (Kassam 2002). Colonialization and ethnic discrimination by national elites led to higher poverty, sexual violence, ethnic discrimination and social inequality in local Latin American societies (Davis 2002; Kassam 2002; Nieuwkoop and Uquillas 2000; Partridge, Uquillas, and Johns 1996; De Zaldívar 2008).

Paradigmatically, ethnodevelopment is used for the need to eliminate forms of racial discrimination, ethnocide, and remnants of colonialism (Partridge et al. 1996). According to Talalla (1984) ethnodevelopment is a social movement for economic development of ethnic minorities (indigenous communities) towards the dominant community. Community development is carried out through a synthesis of local culture and a modern economic system. Talalla (1984) also emphasizes increasing the capacity of the economy and human resources to compete with the dominant ethnic groups in Malaysia. Talalla’s view (1984) is almost the same as the World Bank, with its emphasis on increasing human resources and social capital to access markets and economic equality. Broadfield (2018) is almost the same as the World Bank, with its emphasis on increasing human resources and social capital to access markets and economic equality.
Different from previous views, Kassam (2002) actually sees ethnodevelopment as the identification of development thinking.\(^\text{11}\) Kassam (2002) takes the idea of an activist named Hundee who views culture as a fundamental force in carrying out social and economic change. Likewise with Portes (2015) who emphasizes cultural values as a differentiator for the actions of community organizations towards social and economic changes in society.

From the diversity of ethnodevelopment perspectives, we can draw a common thread that the ethnodevelopment paradigm is a paradigm of liberation (liberation) and recognition (recognition) of the existence of indigenous communities. In this article, ethnodevelopment is put in the framework of liberation, recognition, the politics of development without growth (degrowth), revitalization of customary institutions, and increasing cultural awareness. The development model that takes place in customary communities is based on the principle of awareness that indigenous communities have. The difference between the ethnodvelopment practices of Latin America and the Bank in this paper is not in the form of imposition (intervention) as has been done by the World Bank or philanthropic institutions in Latin America. However, development is initiated by indigenous communities based on the principles of values and awareness inherent in the customary community. In the principle of liberation and recognition, indigenous communities must be able to consolidate their cultural elements through independent decision making and direct development based on their needs. Indigenous communities are free to determine their destiny fairly and independently.

**ETHNODEVELOPMENT URGENCY IN VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT**

This ethnic-based development model is inclusive and paradigmatically open to suit the socio-cultural community. The principles embedded in ethnodevelopment are relevant to the Village Law which includes the principle of recognition as a form of recognition

\(^{11}\)This view is consistent with the International Labor Organization (ILO) convention in 1990, namely that strategies to address problems related to indigenous peoples must be based on informed participation of indigenous peoples themselves. Granting this recognition to the indigenous community to the international development agency is an honor to the indigenous community to organize and develop their own community according to the initiatives or ideas of the local community.
of the diverse indigenous communities in Indonesia. Referring to data from the Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago (AMAN), there are around 2,359 indigenous communities with 27 million members living in the territory of Indonesia. This data is supported by data from the Customary Territory Registration Agency (BRWA) that there are 839 customary territories consisting of 27 certified, 130 verified, 632 registered, and 50 accounted (BRWA 2020). The development and implementation of ethnodevelopment in the context of nationality is urgently needed to carry out inclusive development practices. Data released by AMAN and BRWA show that there are still many indigenous communities who have not received special rights according to the principle of recognition.

Figure 1. Position of indigenous communities in ethnodevelopment paradigm

The government’s policy programs have not yet freed indigenous communities from formulating their desired development models. A development that views indigenous communities as a form of cultural, social, political and economic institutions that can influence social and national change. Ethnodevelopment practices must free local communities or indigenous communities to determine their future direction as economic, political, and cultural subjects to carry out development programs. Figure 1 shows the position of indigenous communities.
communities in the ethnodevelopment paradigm. Recognition given to communities must be able to position and strengthen indigenous communities economically, politically and culturally in development practices.

In ethnodevelopment practices, by Setiawan (2017) the state must give authority and power to indigenous people to access basic resources for their social reproduction, including food security and health conditions. This authority and power is related to strengthening customary institutions and subsistence production patterns of indigenous communities. This view is different from the position of indigenous communities in Indonesia in Figure 1, which are in quadrants I, III and IV who are weak politically, economically and culturally. Indigenous communities in Indonesia are unable to access sources of basic necessities. Then, the position of customary communities and not customary communities does not have significant differences in development practices.

The weakening of indigenous communities must be strengthened through ethnodevelopment practices that free local communities or indigenous communities to determine their future direction. Development practices carried out by indigenous communities must be based on identity or a form of development determined by the indigenous community. The spirit of development comes from the internalization of the principles of recognition and subsidiarity of the Village Law. These two principles provide a very large space to give authority to indigenous communities to determine the form of development they want. Ethnodevelopment development in the context of Indonesian nationhood is very much needed in recognizing, respecting and elevating the status of indigenous communities who are always excluded from the development processes that take place in Indonesia. The Village Law lays the foundation of ethnhodevelopment through the principles of recognition and subsidiarity.

In the Village Law it is explained that the principle of recognition is defined as recognition of the right of origin. Recognition of the rights of origin referred to in the Village Law, namely those that are still alive and in accordance with the development of community life and the principles of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. Meanwhile, subsidiarity is a village-scale local authority. Village-scale local authority is the authority to regulate and manage the interests of the village community that have been effectively carried out by the village or have
emerged due to village developments and village community initiatives, including boat moorings, village markets, public baths, irrigation canals, environmental sanitation, service posts integrated, art and study studios, as well as village libraries, village reservoirs, and village roads. These two principles, in essence, support each other and cannot be separated. In different contexts, this principle can be mutually negated if it is derived in the form of village development and activity programs in indigenous communities.

The problem with these two principles is the failure to interpret the principles of recognition in the derivative products of the Village Law, starting from government regulations, ministerial regulations, to regional regulations which are translated into the form of development authority and programs. In the Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 44 of 2016 concerning Village Authority (Permendagri 44/2016) it is clearly regulated in article 6, namely authority based on origin rights and village-scale local authority. The same explanation in the Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Region, and Transmigration Number 1 of 2015 (Permendesa, PDTT 1/2015) Regarding the Guidelines for Authority Based on Origin and Local Authorities at Village Scale and Permendagri 44/2016 failed to interpret the principle of recognition as a form paradigm movement and struggle for recognition of the existence of indigenous communities in Indonesia. Recognition translated into the Village Law cannot be limited to village administration or the scope of the standard village programs offered by the government because customary communities in Indonesia basically cover or exceed the existing village administrative boundaries. This principle is contrary to the explanation of the principle of recognition of the Village Law which is determined based on living inheritance, village initiatives, and village communities.

Questioning the position of the recognition and subsidiarity principles in the implementation of the Village Law is very important to do to trace the position or existence of customary communities in the Village Law. This tracking is carried out as an effort to revitalize the roles of indigenous communities as community entities that must be recognized as citizens. The existence of indigenous communities must be ensured in the human development, empowerment and development agendas and not set aside as a community entity that must obtain their rights. Agusta (2017) argues that building indigenous communities must include two things. First, recognition of the existence of indigenous
peoples and customary villages. Second, subsidiarity over customary authority; and sustainable development of indigenous development areas.

The model of building indigenous communities referred to by Agusta (2017) is still difficult to find relevance in implementing the Village Law. The results of research conducted Sampean et al. (2019) found that the practice of development taking place in indigenous communities is still paradoxical because it is not in accordance with the principle of pasang, as happened in the Ammatoa Kajang. Their existence which is a structural part of the formal government system of Tanah Towa Village has led to mistaken recognition among the indigenous community. This is because the derivative of the Village Law through Permendagri 44/2016 and Permendesa, PDTT 1/2015 only legitimizes the development of indigenous institutions, not autonomous indigenous institutions and runs a self-governing system based on the rights of origin. Thus, the need for development and mentoring of indigenous communities must be accompanied by a change in the development paradigm, from capitalistic to a development paradigm based on the basic needs of indigenous communities. Timotius (2018) states that the village or indigenous community should be the executor of its own development. Therefore, ethnodevelopment provides a place for indigenous communities to determine, design, and direct the changes that take place within the community.

The implementation of ethnodevelopment in indigenous communities provides a large space to organize, manage, and utilize all its potential and resources. The existence of the principle of recognition in the Village Law protects indigenous communities and ethnic minorities in the village from the cultural and economic ethnocide process indigenous communities. Stavenhagen (2012) states that in the context of a pluralistic society or “melting pot” area, national integration policies and national cultural development implies an ethnocide process, namely the deliberate destruction of culture and economy. The Village Law denies ethnocide by presenting “recognition” in one of its articles. The principle of recognition needs to be linked with indigenous communities as identity-based development agents.
INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES AS AGENTS OF DEVELOPMENT

The enactment of the Village Law is the first step in rural reform by distributing authority to the smallest community organization system in the national context. The redistribution of authority in question is the implementation of a hybrid government system, self-overning community and local self-government. Self-governing community as a governmental society, namely a community that manages and regulates itself (Eko et al. 2014). The self-governing community entity is an indigenous community with a primordial paradigm of governance, solidarity and mutual cooperation. This government system is recognized on the basis of recognition by the redistribution of the authority of the right of origin. This redistribution of authority places indigenous communities as agents of village development.

In a different dimension, the state also delegates village-scale local authority which is enshrined in the principle of subsidiarity. This redistribution of authority is to run the local government system or village government (local self-government) as the smallest organization in Indonesian society. This model of government has a systemic and structural paradigm (Putra 2019). His government system will carry out a structural-formalistic function that will regulate the administrative processes and legal-formal rules in state institutions. In this aspect, the principles of recognition and subsidiarity do not experience a contradictory relationship when we look at the dichotomy perspective between indigenous communities and local (village) government standing alone. Likewise, when using a pragmatic interpretation of the provisions of Article 8 of the 1945 Constitution, which views that the position of the village is no longer a community organization (self-governing community), but as a government organization. As a consequence, the village becomes an autonomous legal subject to carry out three main functions: public regulation, public goods, and empowerment.

Indigenous communities and village have a government system that is still ongoing and run in parallel. Paradoxes began to emerge when the implementation of the Village Law in villages that had indigenous communities, as happened in the Ammatoa Kajang. Their government system runs parallel to the formal system of government and indigenous community government still exists that regulates cultural customs.
and traditions. The significance of the government, the influence of the indigenous community, has not been able to intervene in the formal government that development practices must be cultural and accommodate customary needs both politically and economically. The findings differ from the concept of village government by Eko et al. (2014) which is hybrid with orders from customary villages or other names or in a pragmatic interpretation, villages that have customary communities are automatically designated as customary villages. Desa Tanah Towa fulfills these prerequisites but is not designated as a customary or indigenous village.

This paradox of recognition confirms that the Ammatoa Kajang customary community and its territory are still imposing on infrastructure, education, health and economic development. Model authority that takes place in development practice in Tanah Towa Village is the village-scale local authority (subsidiarity) not the authority of the right of origin. Development practices that dominate the concretization of road infrastructure, irrigation and public service facilities are in accordance with central government budgeting or administrative standards. Development practices carried out in Tanah Towa Village are in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity. However, it is not in accordance with the principle of recognition because it contradicts traditional values or the doctrine of pasang that are embedded in the Ammatoa Kajang customary community.

The paradox of recognition that took place in the implementation of the Village Law can be seen in Figure 2 of the typology of village government systems and customary communities as legacy products of the previous regime. Figure 2 shows that in general the typology of village government systems and customary communities can be seen in two general typologies, namely symmetrical and asymmetrical. Symmetric typology shows the power of government which is equal, equally strong or equally weak, while asymmetric shows the dominant or weak power between formal or customary communities.

Customary and village communities have a government system that is still ongoing and run in parallel. Paradoxes began to emerge when the implementation of the Village Law in villages that had customary communities, as happened in the Ammatoa Kajang customary community. The customary community government system runs parallel to the formal system of government and customary community government still exists that regulates cultural customs and traditions.
The significance of the government, the influence of the customary community, has not been able to intervene in the formal government that development practices must be cultural and accommodate customary needs both politically and economically. The findings differ from the concept of village government according to Eko et al. (2014) which is hybrid with orders from customary villages or other names or in a pragmatic interpretation, villages that have customary communities are automatically designated as customary villages. Desa Tanah Towa fulfills these prerequisites but is not designated as a customary or indigenous village.

This paradox of recognition confirms that the Ammatoa Kajang customary community and its territory are still imposing on infrastructure, education, health and economic development. Model authority that takes place in development practice in Tanah Towa Village is the village-scale local authority (subsidiarity) not the authority of the right of origin. Development practices that dominate the concretization of road infrastructure, irrigation and public service facilities are in accordance with central government budgeting or administrative standards. Development practices carried out in Tanah Towa Village are in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity. However, it is not in accordance with the principle of recognition because it contradicts traditional values or the doctrine of pasang that are embedded in the Ammatoa Kajang.

The paradox of recognition that took place in the implementation of the Village Law can be seen in Figure 2 of the typology of village government systems and indigenous communities as legacy products of the previous regime. Figure 2 shows that in general the typology of village government systems and indigenous communities can be seen in two general typologies, namely symmetrical and asymmetrical. Symmetric typology shows the power of government which is equal, equally strong or equally weak, while asymmetric shows the dominant or weak power between formal or indigenous communities.

The division of the two typologies is further divided into four quadrants analysis of indigenous communities in the village government system in Indonesia. In the first quadrant asymmetric typology, the borders and governmental system of the indigenous have been destroyed and the ongoing government system is the administrative village government system, this village typology is to describe villages in general on the island of Java and outside Java, where the indigenous...
peoples have been destroyed in colonial and New Order era; in the first symmetrical typology of the second quadrant, the typology of village government systems and indigenous communities is symmetrical. This second quadrant is the ideal type of state institutional system, when the village has a indigenous community, a indigenous village is formed or recognizes the indigenous community; The third type is the second asymmetrical type in the third quadrant, the position of development to indigenous communities with a strong formal (de jure) government system and indigenous institutions and various tools of community assistance (de facto). Fourth, the symmetric typology of the two fourth quadrants, the existence of a weak government system and weak indigenous communities, the linkages between the indigenous community government system and the formal government are weak. This typology represents Papuan communities and tribal children who are not directly tied to the state system. In this typology, the national awareness of indigenous communities has not yet been internalized in the community. This indigenous community is a society that is separated from the formal administrative bond structure.

In Figure 2, the typology of governance that runs in the Ammatoa Kajang, Tanah Towa Village is in the third quadrant with the second asymmetry in the third quadrant. De facto, the Ammatoa Kajang exists as a customary and cultural institution in regulating society. However, the establishment of indigenous institutions or customary institutionalization into political and economic institutional systems does not occur by forming customary villages. The dominant system of government is the administrative village government system inherited from the New Order government system. In the dimensions of the practice of developing the Ammatoa Kajang, it is institutionalized as a form of political and economic institutions. This process of change was strengthened by the Bulukumba Regional Regulation number 9 of 2015 concerning the Affirmation, Recognition of Rights, and Protection of the Rights of the Ammatoa Kajang Indigenous Community (Perda Bulukumba 9/2015) and the Regent Regulation Number 40 of 2018 concerning Empowerment of the Ammatoa Kajang Indigenousy Law Community (Bulukumba Perbup 40/2018). These two regulations legitimize the juridical change of customary community institutions from indigenous or cultural institutions to political and economic institutions. However, it does not give political power or political
sovereignty to the Ammatoa Kajang as an order system that has its indigenous laws and institutions to carry out its system of government.

Figure 2. Typology of village government systems and traditional community

The placement of indigenous communities, in the third quadrant with the characteristics of asymmetrical governance, is culturally prominent. However, they are marginalized in political power and the implementation of a system of regulating community members. The indigenous arrangements of the indigenous community were imaged (intervened) with the formal village government system. In terms of political power, indigenous communities do not have the authority to intervene in the power of formal government. The power possessed by the Ammatoa indigenous community is only based on cultural power and the symbolism of the pasang doctrine. Cultural power is the power attached to the Ammatoa symbol as a traditional leader or guardian of pasang. This power continues to decay due to the influence of the practical political practice of direct elections and the transfer of authority to the formal government. The decay of this power made Ammatoa’s power and charisma as a customary leader unable to hold back the ongoing development practices in Tanah Towa village. In fact, Ammatoa is compromising on development practices that take place in Rabbang Seppang (inside Kajang).

Tanah Towa Village as a formal government system or administrative village is only able to exercise village-scale local authority (subsidiarity) by involving the participation of indigenous peoples and traditional
leaders. However, this participation is not able to encourage custom-based development practices in accordance with the authority of the right of origin (recognition) which reflects the institutional recognition of indigenous communities; economically empowered, politically sovereign, and culturally strong. The proposals offered by indigenous communities will be evaluated again at the Bulukumba Community Empowerment Service as a development program to be implemented in Tanah Towa. The results of the evaluation eliminate programs related to the basic needs required in performing rituals or customary needs.

The tug of interests and the influence of power in development practices between representatives of customary communities and formal government occurs in the deliberation. The participation of members of the customary community represents themselves from the part of the formal government as customary stakeholders from the village, not as their representation of the indigenous community culturally which carries pasang vision that is internal to the community. This reality is confirmed in the results of the GP interview that:

“Ahh..injo ri pembangunan desayya, narikua PMPM Mandiri, nakua’minto’mi Musyawarah antara dusun, bawahannya pak dusun, ngera pak desa, eeh Dusun,nu ngrai pak desa mingka ngerai pak desa tala nassapi Pak RK Sombu napau, ka napaumi ussulu’ku nakke pemimpin rapa’ anjo, eeh Gorong-Gorong (Ceddang), Panampungan ere, pa’sereang ngere injo, mangki nakuai pak desa, nie riare pemangku adat dusun, pemangku adat desa, injo Lalang riada’a pemangku adat dusun, pemangku adat desa, nasitujuiji injo Lalang iyamma Ammatoa, Punna risareangko, punna risareanko, nakku ussulu ji nakke, gitte kunne nie battasa’na, iya pantarang, la madoenga, Kulle ripajariang ri pak desa, injo anggaranga napa mange ri pak desa iya nu lalanga mae talia iyamma tantangi, batasa’na iyyama ma tantang, nasaba nu riolo battasayya nanampa Iyya Amma appau, punna mae tau ngera ri Amma iyya tala kusareangko iyya, anre riolo, apa saba’na anre riolo, kunna anre riolo, moderengi tawwa, talang tama’pi suloa, ee sulu panttarang tala ni pantama I mae, iya ya kebiasanna to’mi inne kunne, iya minne pak RK lampami ussulu ku, attajanmi injo mae assele, Iyaji kullu ri sareang punna pakkahaji’ tala rie tau tangnga tangkasa, tala ria tau tangnga haji’na, minna punna nani modern iyya, nanu panttara, nanu pantama maiyya, tala nasareangko Ammatoa (Village development from the PNPM
Mandiri programs which is discussed jointly between hamlets, his subordinates are the hamlet [RT, RW], Pak Desa invites Pak RT to propose the program. Pak RT was no yet clear on what he wanted, the meeting leader had suggested Ceddang (gorong-Gorong), pase'reang ere [water storage]. However, the village sir said it was said that the hamlet customary stakeholders and village customary leaders within the customary community. Will this proposal be approved by Amma? If Amma gives consent we propose because I only propose. Because, here we have a limit, in the outer customary community, matters relating to modernity can be decided by the village pack, even so the budget is managed by the village head. Part of the Ammatoa customary community, not the challenging Ammatoa. But, Ammatoa [pasang] limits that challenge modernity. Because, the pasang are present earlier than Ammatoa itself. If we convey to Ammatoa this proposal, this proposal will not be accepted by Amma because these proposals did not exist in the customs of the indigenous community. If it is not passed down from our ancestors, it means that it is in the modern category. The RT’s proposal has been agreed upon in deliberations and is awaiting approval from the district and central parties. Ammatoa will agree if they give goodness because no human being is unclean, there is no human being that is not good. “ (interview, GP, Ammatoa Kajang leader, 23 September 2019)

The results of interviews with GP community leaders show the history of the implementation of the PNPM independent development program carried out during the administration of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY). Development practices that are carried out prioritize the results of deliberation and the involvement of traditional leaders who are within the formal village government structure itself. The proposals offered in the deliberations show a contradiction between the value pasang and the programs set out in the deliberations. This practice continues in the implementation of the Village Law placing the Ammatoa Kajang in the third typology, asymmetric, the customary community as the agent of developing the village. This is different from the field findings that show indigenous communities are the object of infrastructure development, tourism and economic empowerment. The indigenous provisions derived from pasang (ancestral messages) were compromised through negotiations with the Ammatoa Kajang. In this
case, Ammatoa as the guardian of pasang and the highest leader of the Ammatoa Kajang.

“In Benteng, some of the buildings that are completely permanent, such as using foundry, have not been able to and have not been allowed, so this year I am building a posyandu as they used to be the wood here, there has not been any permanent building, only the roads are still good. If the building here has not been left, it is also a permanent building that is like a building, yes, unless the road has been repaired, the community or customary leaders have let it be only a few years and the bridge that we are crossing has been ready for work since 2008 , the implementation of 2017 was the same as before, the village, the village divider, the bridge that we briefly passed this 2017 has also been designed for a long time but was not allowed and carried out in 2018 and in Zulkarnaim’s area there is also no development that we touch because several times we entered the Ammatoa do not want to let even though already free there the motor car and enter in it You can get it right, besides the elementary school, Ammatoa prohibits it ”(in-depth interview with the Village Secretary of Tanah Towa, 26 March 2019).

Figure 3 Car Ownership of Indigenous Community Members in Sobbu Hamlet (Rabbang Seppang or Ilalang Embayya area

![Source: author’s documentation](image-url)
The quotation from the interview of the Tanah Towa Village Secretary above shows the negotiation struggle between Ammatoa, who kept the tide from 2008 to not receive anything that smells of ancestral heritage (pasang). The ancestors of the Ammatoa Kajang have never had the tradition of foundring roads and renovating irrigation. Negotiations between the village and Ammatoa had a common ground between them in 2017, the adat party compromised development practices, the road foundry project in the hamlet was carried out in 2017 and the permanent construction of a bridge in 2018 in the Kajang Dalam (Ilalang Embayya) Adat area. The results of development practices can be seen in Figure 4. Development practice in Figure 4 is the result of the realization of the implementation of the Village Law which is contrary to the value of pasang. This contradiction is not in accordance with the principle of recognition which respects the original rights of the Ammatoa Kajang that have been passed down from generation to generation. What Ammatoa still prohibits is that the construction of houses and public service units in the inner customary area (Ilalang Embayya) cannot be built permanently. The results of interviews with GP and the Village Secretary of Tanah Towa show the process of contestation in development practices. This contestation is shown in the conflict between cultural power and the power of village government. Cultural power is represented in maintaining culture based on the principle of pasang of formal government power representing the power of intervention for the implementation of development projects taking place in Tanah Towa village. In front of the community, the Ammatoa
Kajang has a weak position in rejecting the forms of development taking place in Tanah Towa Village. In addition, in development practice implementing the Village Law requires space for budget absorption and infrastructure development. In this aspect, the village government or the Bulukumba district government must find a formulation of development forms that are relevant to the context of indigenous communities. The development formulation must be based on the needs and values formed in the indigenous community. Development to be implemented in the Ammatoa indigenous community must mainstream the right of origin (the principle of recognition in the Village Law). No, the principle of subsidiarity of village-scale local authorities. Indigenous communities must be agents of development in accordance with the first symmetric typology of the second quadrant.

THE POLITICS OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE VILLAGE BY THE AMMATOA KAJANG

Placing indigenous communities into the first symmetrical typology of the second quadrant as agents of development must start from developing village politics. Development village politics is a development initiative that starts from the initiative of the village community. In the context of Tanah Towa Village, development must be initiated by members of the customary community as subjects or agents of development to maintain the sustainability of the customary area. This legitimacy is strengthened by the Village Law which is put in place in several basic principles that accompany development practices. The basic principles according to Kurniawan (2015) consist of Catur Sakti Village Law and Trisakti Nawa Sakti. The basic principles can be seen in table 1.

Table 1 The Village Political Jargon in the Village Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Catur Sakti Village Law</th>
<th>Trisakti Nawa Cinta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>The village is politically sovereign</td>
<td>Sovereign in politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>The village is economically independent</td>
<td>Independent in economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>The village is culturally dignified</td>
<td>Personality in Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Socially Powered Village</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors
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The basic principles of the Village Law according to Kurniawan (2015) as social capital embedded in the Village Law which will bring benefits to the Ammatoa Kajang. This conception was reformulated by Yustika (2019) in the framework of the structural theory of development from the Marxian tradition. He views that the implementation of the Village Law is a new chapter in the character of Indonesia’s development. The new character meant (Yustika 2019) namely the concept of development which contains three ideals, namely developing from the periphery, increasing the people’s economic productivity, and economic independence. This new character must be introduced into local development practices in accordance with the needs of the Ammatoa Kajang. Increased productivity and economic independence are not interpreted as the achievement of statistical figures. However, the fulfillment of the basic rights of indigenous communities in accessing resources and in implementing a self-governing system.

The basic principles in the Village Law are used to formulate the form of development and empowerment of the Ammatoa Kajang through a village development model to reverse the Tanah Towa Village crisis. This reversal is strengthened through the implementation of two principles of recognition and subsidiarity which always accompany the basic principles of building a village or village building centered on a democratic society, initiated from below, autonomy, independence, locality, participatory, and emancipatory (Eko et al. 2014). This development model according to Kurniawan (2015) is not known in the New Order development tradition or in the Western development theory tradition. The phrase village build or develop a village is attached to the principles of an economic system still adhering to the principles of progress and profit orientation which are contained in the market economy in exploring rural resources.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VILLAGE LAW IN THE PRACTICAL REALM

Novrian (2017) is the enactment of the Village Law which provides a reversal of the rural crisis by forming and strengthening Village-owned Business Entities (BUMDesa) which accommodate customary interests and needs. The steps that must be taken according to Novrian (2017) are first, alleviating inequality based on agrarian reform to ensure land tenure for tenants and granting recognition of customary wikayyah
to indigenous communities; second, BUMDes based on providing indigenous needs must adopt a network system between advocacy movements and academics in urban areas to strengthen the position of indigenous communities; third, the establishment of BUMDes must provide clarity on protocols for control of natural resources, capital and customary communities in the village. The main task is not only profit, but to restore human and resource relations, not exploitation relations. BUMDes plays a role and functions as a consolidation of the livelihoods of indigenous community members.

The Village Law in the context of indigenous communities Simarmata and Zakaria (2017) The Village Law has provided opportunities to use resource lands and is suitable for use by customary communities whose government institutions have been integrated into the formal or administrative village government system. These opportunities become ambiguous when mainstreaming the principle of subsidiarity over the principle of recognition. In the implementation of the Village Law in the Ammatoa Kajang customary community, village-scale authority is more dominant than that of the right to suggestion. As found in this research, the local wisdom and pasang values of the Ammatoa Kajang are out of sync with ongoing development projects. This paradox shows the determination of the exercise of authority in planning development. The difference between these two principles can be seen in table 2.

Table 2. Differences in the principles of subsidiarity and recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Subsidiarity</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Village government</td>
<td>• Customary law institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sector</td>
<td>• Traditional ownership of rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tilling the position of head of traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>village and traditional village apparatus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tenure of the head of the traditional village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Village development</td>
<td>• Management of traditional village treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Customary land management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The difference in the principle of subsidiarity and recognition in table 2 is explained in the Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Areas, Number 1 of 2015 concerning Guidelines for Authority based on Origin Rights and Village-Scale Local Authorities (Permendesa PDTT 1/2015). In the four aspects above, the explanation of recognition is more specific than subsidiarity as a village-scale local authority. Then, the application of recognition as the authority of the right of origin is emphasized in traditional villages that have been formally formed. In the case of the Ammatoa Kajang in Tanah Towa Village, it still has the status of a formal village (administrative village), the indigenous community merges into a formal village so that the authority of the rights of origin is neglected. The village development aspect tends to ignore customary values, which are embedded in customary communities.

The implementation of the Village Law in the political aspect is the arrangement of the village government system and village officials based on bureaucratic rules. The arrangement of the organizational structure for indigenous considerations was neglected to meet administrative requirements in the recruitment of village officials, traditional leaders, and hamlet heads. These administrative requirements include a diploma, family card, resident card, and certificate of good behavior. This problem was disclosed by the MA that:

“In Tanah Towa Village, specialization should be made in regulating and administering the village government. For example, in appointing village officials, heads of hamlets, RT / RW, as well as village officials / technical personnel, can be appointed based on experience and understanding of culture, customs, history, and traditional
teachings. does not rely on general requirements like those in other villages in general. For example, the requirement for village apparatus is a maximum of 34 years, above that age can no longer be accepted and several other formal requirements. “ (Interview with MA as a religious figure, 28 February 2019).

On the economic aspect, development practices are being intensively carried out by infrastructure development in the Ilalang Embayya customary areas. These practices can be seen in Figure 2 which shows their acceptance of progress with private vehicle ownership. Figure 2 is taken in the area of Sobbu Hamlet which partially can be crossed and entered by cars, motorbikes, and using lighting from modern technology. However, these tools are of limited use. In this area, a culvert (ceeddang) procurement project has also been included for the canals around residents’ roads. Meanwhile, Figure 3 shows the practice of building bridge infrastructure and road rebates in the Pangi Hamlet area. This development model will continue to be negotiated with adat to absorb the village fund budget disbursed by the central government.

In the cultural aspect, indigenous institutions have symbolically decayed. The influence of cultural leadership is not significantly able to intervene in formal government decisions at both the village scale and the district scale. The decay was shown due to the inability to restore the status of the gallarang led by the Galla. Galla is the equivalent of the formal village head. In this context, the customary institution called Gallarang which is led by Galla is concurrently with village heads in the Ammatoa Kajang region. This reality shows that the Village Law and its jargon “Village Builds” fail to answer and acknowledge the existence of indigenous communities in Indonesia.

In the social aspect, village-scale local authorities in community empowerment practices are held sewing training. The training was conducted in Balagana and Jannaya hamlets, where the participants were members of the indigenous community from Ilalang Embayya and Pantarang Embayya in Tanah Towa Village. The provision of this training is paradoxical with the tradition that has developed in the Ammatoa Kajang which makes or designs their own clothes made of natural materials. The clothes worn by members of the Ammatoa Kajang range from sarongs, shirts, and passapu (headgear) which are woven by themselves.
This failure must be answered by the indeginization of village thought and practice in communities, especially in the Ammatoa Kajang. Indigenization of thought and village development as a strategic step to implement ethnodevelopment practices to suit the recognition needs of indigenous communities. A strategic step to answer the paradox of implementing the Village Law by strengthening “the right of origin in customary communities”.

Giving recognition to indigenous communities is not just public recognition. The recognition given must elevate the pride of the indigenous community as a community entity that has a role and contribution to the Indonesian nation as a nation. Fukuyama (2019) states that the cause of identity politics amidst world inequality over the past five decades is the lack of recognition of poor and marginalized groups of people. Complaints arose because of increased feelings of humiliation and disrespect by certain groups controlling resources. Ethnodevelopment practices are used to break the gap between those who are dominated and disrespected in the public sphere, both by the state and by the social structures that dominate indigenous communities.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ETHNODEVELOPMENT STRATEGY BY THE AMMATOA KAJANG

In the last few decades Bicker, Sillitoe, and Pottier (2003) development agents realized and sympathized that “indigenous knowledge” must be included in the planning and implementation of development programs. Development agents are increasingly open (receptive) and acknowledge the failure of development projects targeting the poor. They are aware that their development strategy does not consider customary strategies in realizing development projects. Development agents must provide greater facilities and roles to the wisdom, knowledge and aspirations of local communities in developing village interventions planned for their area. Village planning interventions cover liberation, recognition, politics of development without growth (degrowth), revitalization of indigenous institutions, and increasing cultural awareness. A village development planning intervention is known as ethnodevelopment. The flow of this strategy can be seen in Figure 5.
The flow of ethnodevelopment practice strategies is different from the practices implemented by the World Bank in Latin American countries. The strategic steps taken by the World Bank reduce the failure of development and (mitigation) projects and increase human and social capital to face the market economy in the form of providing training and capacity building, and preparation for investment in indigenous community areas in Latin America (De Zaldívar 2008). Ethnodevelopment that is run by the world bank is corporatism, a development that is carried out to serve market needs and control indigenous communities through local elites and ethnic empowerment policies.

This strategy flow is also different from Silahuddin (2015) which views the village as an arena for development and the village as the subject of development. This view still has errors in seeing the village as a passive subject that still uses interventions in several development and empowerment programs. Silahuddin’s view Silahuddin (2015) is trapped in the economic
interests of growth and progress espoused by Latin American countries. This view is not much different from that of the World Bank. The paradigm used by Silahuddin (2015) is the old paradigm for developing villages, while ethnodevelopment is the new paradigm for developing villages. The different strategies and paradigms applied can be seen in table 3.

Table 3. Differences in Village Development Paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Old Paradigm</th>
<th>New Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Mandating through the right of origin</td>
<td>Giving mandate and restoring the right of origin of indigenous communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Arrangement</td>
<td>Formation of traditional villages</td>
<td>Restoring and revitalizing the roles and functions of institutions, according to their origins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Redistribution or delegation of authority</td>
<td>Redistribution and restoration of rights of origin authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Facilitation in the implementation of development.</td>
<td>Facilitating and mainstreaming the needs of indigenous communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emancipation Spirit</td>
<td>Providing freedom in planning based on the absorption of village funds</td>
<td>Providing autonomy for indigenous communities in planning and determining their needs based on their traditions and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a village</td>
<td>Village as development contestation and budget absorption arena</td>
<td>Local knowledge and wisdom and cultural strengthening as the basis for building villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Degrowth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors

Table 3 describes the different paradigms and strategies in the practice of building villages. The most fundamental difference between
the two paradigms is the mainstreaming of local knowledge and wisdom of indigenous communities in developing villages. The principles of recognition and emancipation are embedded in culture and needs based on the initiative of indigenous communities. This basic problem from the old paradigm of developing villages can be found from the results of the interview presented by Mr. SH that:

“Village laws are very relevant to be implemented in Tanah Towa village and restore the system of government that took place in the past using the gallarang system. But, on the other hand, the current government system that is currently underway is very difficult to implement and implement. By law regarding the village, it recognizes the existence of a village with a different name from the current formal village government system. Changing a Tanah Tōwa village from an ordinary village status to a traditional village requires study and volunteering to apply village laws. In the aspect of the development needs expected by indigenous peoples, for example by inserting stones from the river which are used to compact and flatten the roads traversed by the community on a daily basis, and the construction of bridges with wood, irrigation improvements funded by village funds.” (SH’s interview as a member of the Ammatoa Kajang, 27 February 2019).

The excerpt from this interview is to confirm that the implementation of village laws through development programs is not only limited to good intentions to improve. Development that is carried out by the communities in Tanah Towa Village must be carried out through a change in the development paradigm that is oriented towards land development and the achievement of statistical figures. Development practices running in the Ammatoa Kajang must be based on meeting basic needs.

CONCLUSION

The results of the implementation of the Village Law in the Ammatoa Kajang through development programs and practices reinforce the paradox of recognition in the Ammatoa Kajang. The paradox of recognition is shown through the neglect of the wisdom values of the Ammatoa Kajang in implementing development practices. Practices try to ignore various pasang of values in various aspects including
political aspects, namely the arrangement of the village government system with a modern bureaucratic system that ignores the system of customary wisdom; cultural aspects of neglecting cultural decay through Ammatoa symbolic decay in decision making and territorial constriction; social aspects and increasing social capital, members of indigenous communities are encouraged to master modern sewing skills.

The recognition paradox occurs because government and development actors are unable to translate recognition into values-based development practices and the needs of indigenous communities. In Tanah Towa Village, there is a paradox of recognition because the programs that will be carried out in the Ammatoa Kajang do not correspond to pasang values that are used as life guidelines for the indigenous community in carrying out their daily lives. The recognition paradox that occurs in the Ammatoa Kajang can be overcome through the ethnodevelopment paradigm in running development programs in there. The implementation process begins with the revitalization or reconstruction of the actors’ knowledge of recognition and subsidiarity in the Village Law.

The strategy for implementing the ethnodevelopment paradigm in the development of indigenous communities is based on the Village Law. Conceptually, Ethnodevelopment is inclusive because it mainstreams local knowledge, local wisdom, and the needs inherent in indigenous communities. The Ethnodevelopment strategy begins with recognition, emancipation, reconstruction of local knowledge and wisdom to design village development, as well as revitalizing indigenous and cultural institutions to realize rural development without growth. The results of this strategy provide a new way for the village to build by using the principles of values and traditions of the indigenous community that exist in its community.

The results of the case study of the Ammatoa Kajang in Tanah Towa found that the ethnodevelopment paradigm is different from the ethnodevelopment practice carried out by the World Bank in the Andes mainland, Ecuador and other Latin America. This is because in the Ammatoa Kajang development programs and practices are initiated by indigenous communities for indigenous communities, a development program planned based on the guidelines and rules desired by the state and the market economy. Thus, this article emphasizes that the new paradigm of Ethnodevelopment is a process of identifying village
thought and development that mainstreams traditions, local knowledge, local wisdom, and community needs.
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