

10-6-2018

Community Marginalization as the Effect of Public Policy in Democratic Governance Era

Didik G. Suharto

Public Administration Master Program, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta; Indonesia

Hendrikus H. Botha

Public Administration Master Program, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta; Indonesia

Rina H. Haryanti

Public Administration Master Program, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta; Indonesia

Rutiana D. Wahyunengseh

Public Administration Master Program, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta; Indonesia

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jbb>

Recommended Citation

Suharto, Didik G.; Botha, Hendrikus H.; Haryanti, Rina H.; and Wahyunengseh, Rutiana D. (2018) "Community Marginalization as the Effect of Public Policy in Democratic Governance Era," *BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi*. Vol. 25 : No. 3 , Article 3.

DOI: 10.20476/jbb.v25i3.9967

Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jbb/vol25/iss3/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty of Administrative Science at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in *BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi* by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

Community Marginalization as the Effect of Public Policy in Democratic Governance Era

Didik G. Suharto¹, Hendrikus H. Botha², Rina H. Haryanti³, Rutiana D. Wahyunengseh⁴

Public Administration Master Program, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,

Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta^{1,2,3,4}

didikgusuharto@staff.uns.ac.id¹; hendrabothe@gmail.com²; rinaherlinaharyanti@staff.uns.ac.id³;

rutianadwi@staff.uns.ac.id⁴

Abstract. Watu Ata natural reserve is a natural reserve located in Ngada of Nusa Tenggara Timur Province. Watu Ata natural reserve was established based on Ministry of Forestry's Decree Number 432/Kpts-II/92. The policy impacts negatively on community marginalization, particularly the elimination of people from their previous cultivated land. This research aimed to analyze the community marginalization occurring as a result of the policy establishing Watu Ata forest area to be conservation area functioning as natural reserve. This research was conducted in two villages namely Inelika Village and Heaweia Village. The research method employed was qualitative one with descriptive approach. The type of data used is primary and secondary data. Sampling technique employed was purposive sampling one. Techniques of collecting data used were interview, observation, and documentation. Technique of analyzing data used Miles and Huberman's data analysis technique (data reduction, data presentation, conclusion drawing and verification). The result of research showed that: 1) the form of marginalization the people felt surrounding Watu Ata natural reserve area was social exclusion from cultivated land. Social exclusion from cultivated land encountered by the people in Heaweia and Inelika Villages impacts on other exclusion forms. 2) the attempt the people had taken to deal with marginalization was to establish an organization called PERMATA (Perhimpunan Masyarakat Watu Ata or Watu Ata People Association). The objective of getting fair distribution of forest resource and property certainty has not been achieved yet until today. In democratic governance era, government policy is ideally a dialogical product, government with community.

Keywords: community marginalization, democratic governance, Watu Ata

Abstrak. Cagar alam Watu Ata merupakan kawasan suaka alam yang berada di Ngada Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Timur. Kawasan cagar alam Watu Ata ditetapkan berdasarkan Surat Keputusan Menteri Kehutanan No. 432/Kpts-II/92. Kebijakan tersebut menyebabkan dampak negatif berupa marginalisasi masyarakat, terutama tersingkirnya masyarakat dari lahan garapan mereka sebelumnya. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis marginalisasi masyarakat yang terjadi sebagai dampak dari kebijakan penetapan kawasan hutan Watu Ata sebagai kawasan konservasi dengan fungsi cagar alam. Penelitian ini dilakukan di dua desa terdampak kebijakan, yakni Desa Inelika dan Desa Heaweia. Metode penelitian yang digunakan adalah penelitian kualitatif dengan pendekatan deskriptif. Jenis data yang digunakan adalah data primer dan sekunder. Penentuan sampel dengan teknik Purposive Sampling. Teknik pengumpulan data menggunakan wawancara, observasi dan dokumentasi. Teknik analisis data menggunakan teknik analisis data Miles and Huberman (reduksi data, penyajian data, penarikan simpulan serta verifikasi). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa: 1) Bentuk marginalisasi yang dirasakan oleh masyarakat yang berada di sekitar kawasan cagar alam Watu Ata adalah marginalisasi dalam bentuk eksklusi sosial terhadap lahan garapan. Eksklusi sosial dari lahan garapan yang dialami oleh masyarakat di Desa Heaweia dan Desa Inelika membawa dampak bagi bentuk eksklusi-eksklusi lainnya. 2) Upaya yang dilakukan oleh masyarakat untuk menghadapi marginalisasi yaitu membentuk organisasi PERMATA (Perhimpunan Masyarakat Watu Ata). Tujuan mendapatkan distribusi sumberdaya hutan secara adil dan mendapatkan kepastian hak milik hingga kini belum tercapai. Pada era pemerintahan demokratis, kebijakan pemerintah idealnya merupakan produk dialogis, antara pemerintah dan masyarakat.

Kata kunci: marginalisasi masyarakat, democratic governance, Watu Ata

INTRODUCTION

There are abundant number of literature explaining that democratic governance has basic principles such as transparency, accountability, and responsiveness, contributing to a fairer comprehensive social-economic development. Democracy is valued as a factor contributing to a larger national development process (Carothers, 2009). It is in line with Mainwaring and Scully (2008) stating that Democratic governance is the democratic government's capacity of applying policy that can improve a nation's

social, economic, and political welfares. A successful democratic government needs the maintenance of high-quality democratic practice, encouraging economic growth, giving the citizen the security, and solving social problem befalling seriously (e.g. poverty, income gap, and bad social service).

Democratic governance is built on mutual learning and decision making process involving many actors and diverse alternative voices and minority (Parra and Moulaert, 2016). It provides protection more strongly resisting the predatory rule, ignoring public welfare straightforwardly, and

self-aggrandizing behavior of leaders. Democracy fertilizes the institutions controlling executive power arbitrarily. The more stable and transparent law regulation reinforces potential investment and exchange. Moreover, political liberalization gives civil mobilization a space, lobbies for public interest, and independent media channel that can disseminate information and ask the leader for accountability (Lewis, 2008).

Contrary to what is expected from government-society relations in democratic governance, marginalization is a process making in which certain group put on edge (peripheral) position, marginalized, or helpless. However, marginalization is more than a condition; it involves the feeling of such condition. Being marginalized is to have a feeling that an individual is excluded from and as such, an individual feels that he/she is not the member of community who is valuable, able to give valuable contribution to the community, and able to access various service and/or opened opportunities (Razer and Warshofsky, 2013). Marginalization process, according to Fakhri (2008), is as same as the impoverishing process. It is because those marginalized are not given opportunity of developing themselves. In other words, it is an action of marginalizing by a group of people and a social process making some people (community) marginal, either naturally or created, so that people have marginalized social position.

The presence of community marginalization as the effect of policy is of course in contradiction with a policy's purpose and objective. Harold and Laswell emphasized that a public policy should contain social objectives, values, and practices existing in community environment (Subarsono, 2013). Thus, a policy in contradiction with community values will be potentially resisted when they are implemented. Marginalization condition is also paradoxical with democratic governance approach. Public policy, according to Bevir (2010), should result from dialogical and participatory processes. And eventually, as suggested by Brinkerhoff (2000), effective democratic governance will affect the people's prosperity and economic advance.

Chance is big that people in a disadvantaged region would also suffer from disadvantageous situation of marginalization putting their need, demand, and interests at a stake. When this comes to a sort of different desired policy goals which are supposed to be not competing to each other, chance could become bigger. Reserving richness of natural resource utilization and protection might raise people resistance due to negative effect they suffer from. Government policy might be weak in fulfilling certain community group's interest in this situation. The existence of forest as global sub-ecosystem occupies an important position as the world's lung (Zain, 1996). It requires full attention to the existence of existing forest. On the other hand, the attempt of meeting the people's need requires the formulation of policy that is balanced, meaning that the forest's natural richness owned is protected and conserved and the attempt of meeting the people's need is considered and taken into account.

This article brings this policy dilemma to the fore with a case study of natural reserve policy of Watu Ata Forest in Ngada, Province of Nusa Tenggara Timur, Indonesia, taking into account that some of largest tropical forests in the world are located in Indonesia, which occupies the

third position following Brazil and Congo Democratic Republic (formerly Zaire) (FWI/GFW, 2001; Kementerian Kehutanan/Ministry of Forestry, 2014). A case of the established policy of Watu Ata Forest reservation as natural reserve area has shown that the established policy led to marginalization of certain people living in and relying for their live on cultivated land in natural reserve. The people are eliminated from their previous cultivated land. At the same time, the people consider that Watu Ata Natural Reserve Area established since 1992 is not managed based on a management design, as mentioned in Article 12 of Governmental Regulation Number 68 Year 1998 about Natural Reserve and Natural Conservation Areas.

The Government of Indonesia, under the Law Number 41 Year 1999 about Forestry, protects forest and its function by dividing forest area into Conservation Forest, Protected Forest, and Production Forest. Conservation forest is a forest area with typical characteristics, functioning mainly to conserve flora and fauna diversity as well as its ecosystem. Conservation forest consists of Natural Reserve Area in the form of Natural reserve (Cagar Alam) and Wildlife Reserve (Suaka Margasatwa); Natural Conservation Area in the form of National Park (Taman Nasional), Great Forest Park (Taman Hutan Raya), and Natural Tourism Park (Taman Wisata Alam); and Hunting Park (Taman Buru).

The criteria of an area to be designated and established as natural reserve area (Article 6 of RI's Governmental Regulation Number 28 Year 2011) are, among others: having plant and/or wildlife diversity affiliated in a type of ecosystem; having genuine and undisturbed natural condition, either plant and/or animal communities as well as with scarce ecosystem and/or endangered existence; having certain biota formation and/or its composing units; having adequate width and certain form that can support effective management and ensure the natural ecological process sustainability; and/or having potential characteristics and can be the sample ecosystem, the existence of which needs conservation effort.

Natural reserve is an area that should be maintained for its intactness so that Article 19 clause (1) of Law Number 5 Year 1990 about the Conservation of Living Natural Resource and Its Ecosystem mentions that any body is prohibited from doing activity that can result in the change in the intactness of natural reserve area. Furthermore, in its explanation, the change in the intactness of natural reserve means destroying the intactness of the area and its ecosystem, hunting the animals existing in the area, and including non-genuine species. Furthermore, clause (3) mentions that the change in the intactness of natural reserve as mentioned in clause (1) involves reducing, removing function and width of natural reserve area, and increasing the type of non-genuine (original) plant and animal species. In its explanation, non-genuine plant and animal species means those never existing in the area.

In relation to the management and utilization of natural resources, the 1945 Constitution of Republic of Indonesia in Article 33 confirms that the land, the waters and the natural resources within shall be under the powers of the State and shall be used to the greatest benefit of the people. The article mentioning "...the land, the waters and the natural resources within shall be used to the greatest

benefit of the people...” confirms that the position of people is substantial (prominent). It indicates that economic democracy is justified, that: “...community (people) interest is prioritized more than individual interest...” (Ruslina, 2012).

Although in normative terms in aforementioned laws and regulations both natural reserve and prioritization of people interest are equally important, this is not necessarily the case in reality. Departing from this interesting phenomenon, this research aims to analyze the community marginalization occurring as the result of policy establishing Watu Ata Forest area to be conservation with natural reserve function and the attempt the people take in dealing with marginalization.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted in Watu Ata Nature Reserve constituting a forest conservation area in East Nusa Tenggara Province, particularly in administrative region of Ngada Regency Government, in 2017. This research focused on two villages: Heaweia and Inelika. Both villages were selected because they have widest arable land: 256 Ha in Heaweia and 528 Ha in Inelika villages, with total arable land width of 1,538 Ha. The community's arable land belonging to natural reserve area leads to the community's limited access to the arable land.

The research method employed was qualitative one with descriptive approach. Data source of research was obtained from primary and secondary data. Primary data is the one collected directly from research subject including information in the form of informants' response, opinion, and assessment on cause, form, and attempt of dealing with community marginalization encountered by people surrounding Watu Ata Nature Reserve area. This data was collected using interview and observation techniques. Secondary data is information supporting the primary one. Secondary data in this study was obtained through collecting documents related to research object and documentation by studying the author's need. The data included, among others: map of nature reserve location and coverage of area assigned to be nature reserve.

Technique of collecting data used in this research included interview, observation, and documentation. Interview was conducted through face-to-face meeting between data collector and informants consisting of community (individuals whose arable land is located in nature reserve region), community leaders (individuals having strong influence on community group (mosalaki: an address for community leaders in Ngada community) and those knowing history of Watu Ata forest and community's arable land), and government (the leader of institution authorized to deal with forest and nature reserve areas or Natural Resource Conservation Center for Ngada Resort and Inelika and Heaweia Village Governments). Informants were selected based on purposive sampling method, by selecting informants considered as knowing in-depth the information and problem becoming the object of research and trustable to be a complete data source. Observation was conducted directly on the research object. Observation was conducted on the border of Watu Ala Nature Reserve area, arable land of community located

inside Watu Ata Nature Reserve, community's activity related to forest and attempts the community takes and local wisdom in managing the forest. Documentation was conducted by taking data from written documents such as: regulation, monograph, book, daily minutes, and etc.

The aspects analyzed in this study were form of marginalization (particularly social exclusion form), cause of marginalization (viewed from on social exclusion dimension) and attempt the community has taken (viewed from social exclusion dimension and its indicators). Technique of analyzing data used was Miles and Huberman's data analysis one including data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification.

Technique of validating data used in this study was source triangulation. Source triangulation technique utilizes different types of data source to explore similar data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

An effect of community development through policies applied by government is the emergence of situation in which there is some people marginalized by the effect of a policy. Harrison (1988) divides marginalization due to development into two: structurally and culturally marginalization. 1) Structurally, domestic government of a state becomes an agent to create capitalistic market through development program. In this case government (state) can use its supporting set or apparatus as well as through policies or policy implementation. In certain cases, even the government is supported with supranational power having certain interests, such as global capitalism system. It indicates that national (state) and supranational (global capitalism system) power relation will lead certain community groups to be marginalized; 2) Culturally, community has been hegemonized by materialistic development concepts by means of promising economic modernization and welfare. Olivier de Sardan (2005) see that local community's culture and values becoming the object of development are compelled to implement something not becoming their values. It is this that initiates the marginalization due to development.

It is well-established that community marginalization is a social problem often felt by community in daily life. Broadly, marginalization means the breaking of a human group's access to vital sources (soil, water, capital, occupation, education, political rights, and etc) by other groups with stronger position (Umanailo, 2016). This stronger group can be defined as a certain community group with more power than other community groups or government having power in making policy and decision affecting the wide society's life interest. Munk (2002) suggested that marginalization is a marginal position in work relation, family, or in daily life environment, health, education, political participation. If an individual is marginalized in the aspect or scope, the one will encounter social exclusion. Such the exclusion is not situation occurring from a moment to the next, but the result of a process usually starting with some forms of marginalization likely leading to social exclusion.

Concept of marginalization and the relationship between marginalization of social exclusion suggested by Munk can be seen in the life experience by the people

surrounding Watu Ata natural reserve. People constituting the farmers relying on farming and plantation product for their life feel injustice ending up with marginalization resulting from the establishment of Watu Ata forest to be natural reserve area.

The policy assigning Watu Ata Forest Area as Conservation area functioning as Nature Reserve through the Ministry of Forestry's Decree No. 432/Kpts-II/92 is government's policy governing government and community's ownership and right to the forest area.

Marginalization encountered by community as a result of a policy specified by government is an impact of top-down decision making system. It is confirmed by Soetomo (2015) stating that in fact the centralistic, top-down, and uniformity-oriented approach has marginalized community. At macro level, marginalization encountered by local people in the framework of national community leads them to lost access to decision making and resources. Furthermore, at micro level marginalization is encountered by certain community class in its structural framework and social system.

Nearly all informants representing the people interviewed say that people surrounding have encountered marginalization related to social exclusion over the land they have cultivated for tens years hereditarily and inherited from their ancestors.

It is just like what has been suggested by K.N. as follows:

"The loss of access to plantations (estates) is indeed perceived by community; although some people prefer to keep managing them, the situation slightly changes because there must be fear inside community as what they are doing now that has been basically done since tens years ago has led them to be the rule breaker. In this situation, the movement space of community will be constricted in the attempt of fulfilling their needs" (Sunday, January 15, 2017).

From government's perspective, people are considered as the rule breaker, although in reality the cultivated lands belonging to the part of Watu Ata natural reserve is the impact of inadequate community (public) participation in its policy establishing process.

The marginalization in the form of exclusion of the people residing around Watu Ata natural reserve from the land is in line with empirical conception about social exclusion suggested by Hall et al. (2011) stating that social exclusion refers to a condition indicating a situation in which a large number of persons have no access to land use.

Hall et al. (2011) argues that exclusion condition and process is composed of the interaction of four powers: regulation, force, market, and legitimation. Simply, the power of exclusion use occurs in six processes: 1) Regularization of access to land, through government's program about land registration, formalization, and reconciliation; 2) Space expansion and intensifying effort through forest conservation by means of limiting farm; 3) New boom crop in the form of monoculture plant expansion leading to massive land conversion; 4) Land conversion after the use for farming purpose; 5) Processes resulting from agrarian formation in village involving fraternity and neighbor village bond (intimate

exclusion); 6) Groups' mobilization to maintain their access to land

Social exclusion is process and product all at once. Social exclusion is defined as a process in which there is internal inhibition in institution in achieving life utilities, human development, and equal rights as citizens. It means that there are programs and activities that do not achieve the target set. Social exclusion as a product is a condition in which individual or a group of individuals cannot contribute fully to community because of social identity such as race, gender, ethnic, caste or religion, and location such as inland area, war or conflict area (Nurdin, 2015).

Considering the view suggested above by Nurdin, it can be seen that social exclusion occurring is the one as a process, in which government as an institution in living within nation and state has inhibited the community's right in the attempt of meeting their life through the policy issued.

It can be seen from the result of interview conducted with informants related to the factor causing social exclusion as suggested by Y.M:

"It is mainly caused by government assigning the forest area containing community plantations to be nature reserve area. We or farmers have cultivated the plantations first, and even there are Ringa and Menge ethnics' lands within. The ethnic land has been cultivated for tens or even likely hundreds years ago because those ethnics had occupied these villages first" (Sunday, January 15, 2017).

This statement is also confirmed by N.L suggesting:

"The causal factor lies actually on the government. Why government? Because the assignment of area was conducted without involving the community. If the community was involved at that time, these incidences would not occur certainly. We or communities do not feel guilty because before the assignment exactly in 1980s, government and community have conducted reforestation program collectively by planting ampupu in this forest area, then the existing regulation related to nature reserve area as we know has natural characteristic that has never been touched by human beings. It of course makes us confused; moreover we also included into the area, so where is the natural factor? In my opinion, the government's fault is here because the borders are made unilaterally without public participation" (Friday, January 20, 2017).

From the statements above, it can be seen that in the attempt of stipulating a policy related to the community's social life, government has ignored one of processes, socialization and public participation in policy making. Thus, the effect occurring and experienced by community is the impact of public's disengagement with a policy making.

A slightly different argument is expressed by the officials from Natural Resource Conservation Center (Indonesian: Balai Konservasi Sumberdaya Alam or BKSDA) for Ngada Resort, stating:

"This inclusion of community plantation into nature reserve area is the Government's fault that at that time did not survey precisely during determining the borders of area. However, some people who have known that the area is natural reserve keep opening plantation and cut

the trees there. Thus, not all of plantations existing in this area are inheritance; some of them are the result of path-finding, but owing to the officers' perseverance, those lands are no longer cultivated" (Wednesday, February 15, 2017).

Marginalization related to the exclusion of arable and belonging to community can be seen from geomorphologic condition of Watu Ata nature reserve representing that in the nature reserve area, there has been human intervention, as indicated with the presence of dry field and plantation in total 1,421.96 ha width (29.05%). The composition of land use in Watu Ata nature reserve area completely consists of: forest inside area (1,169.58 ha or 23.90%), bushes (30.98%), dry field (815.85 ha), and plantation (606.11 ha). The presence of dry field and plantation indicates that there has been area land cultivation for cultivation activity by community. In addition, there is historical heritage proving the existence of community inside the area. Besides, cultural heritage existing inside Watu Ata nature reserve area proves that some of nature reserve area have been touched and cultivated by community, indicating that community is not the forest pathfinder and the arable land has been existent.

Total cultivated lands in two villages (Heaweia and Inelika) that have been the part of natural reserve area thereby can no longer be cultivated by people are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Cultivated Lands That Have Been the Part of Natural Reserve Area

No.	Village	Total cultivated lands that have been the part of Watu Ata natural reserve area (Ha)
1	Heaweia	256
2	Inelika	528
	Total	784

Source: Natural Resource Conservation Center NTT Region II, 2012

In relation to social exclusion, Lawang (2014) mentioned that the negligence of people's rights lead them to fulfill economic need difficultly. This opinion can also be seen in social situation encountered by the people surrounding Watu Ata natural reserve. Marginalization (exclusion) renders the people losing their job opportunity so that some of them should seek job in other places such as Borneo Island or Malaysia. On the other hand, those still holding out find difficulty in the attempt of fulfilling their need for construction material (wood board) they can find easily formerly. Cattle breeding business formerly supporting their life need is finally abandoned due to difficulty of finding cattle feed that is actually abundant in forest area.

Jary and Jary (2005) revealed that social exclusion separates individual or group from social institution and wide society, having implication to the limitation of their rights and obligation in many aspects of life. Those excluded socially are formally members of community, but they cannot use their rights and responsibility duly as citizens according to their own profession. This social limitedness is a factor contributing to preserving poverty

and bequeathing it to their children (Abercrombie, Hill, and Turner, 2010: 517-518 in Kusnadi, 2013).

Social exclusion from cultivated land encountered by the people in Heaweia and Inelika Villages impacts on other exclusion forms. Land exclusion encountered impacts on the loss of job opportunity. It is closely related to the form of exclusion from job market in which exclusion from job market is explained as a situation in which people lose their access to job opportunity resulting in unemployment and limited need fulfillment. Exclusion from job market is also encountered by the people surrounding natural reserve area as the further effect of land exclusion that can be seen from situation in which there is a job with good condition and giving good security (guaranty) but difficult to access. Farming is a good job and giving the security of need fulfillment for Heaweia and Inelika villagers, recalling that about 90% of these villagers rely on farming for their livelihood.

Another form of exclusion also resulting from land exclusion is the exclusion from the feeling of secure. Security has many dimensions, one of which is the livelihood-related security. Livelihood insecurity is closely related to the exclusion from land and job market aforementioned, focusing more on risk, the risk of losing land and job, and the difficulty of finding other income sources (Syahra, 2010). The risk the Heaweia and Inelika villagers should receive when they lose access to cultivated land and this job of course impacts on the situation leading to discomfort.

Discomfort situation related to livelihood can be seen from V.D. statement:

"... people are inhibited in their attempt of fulfilling their needs, particularly the need for food and shelter, because they rely on those plantations for their living. The stipulation including the community's plantation into the part of nature reserve area has reduced their access to the attempt of fulfilling their needs" (Friday, January 13, 2017).

In the same vein, N.L stated that:

"The most significant effect, in my opinion, is that the community begins to be afraid of cultivating plantations that have been included into nature reserve area. This will certainly affect their income, because most villagers are largely farmers and fulfill their life and children education needs by means of plantations" (Friday, January 20, 2017).

Both statements have described the discomfort situation encountered by community as the result of land exclusion (marginalization).

Community marginalization around nature reserve location has been created through a long historical process. The marginalization process began to be perceived gradually by community during the determination of borders that has never involved the community (public), so that there has been no process of transferring it from the community. In addition, several policies and program launched by government concerning Watu Ata forest area can be considered as the original cause of marginalization, in which there are policies and program giving the community the opportunity of cultivating the area in one period but withdrawing all of cultivation rights belonging to the community in the next period. The long journey

has begun during Regent Yan Yos Botha's reign in 1969 launching *casiavera* program by means of planting cinnamon in people plantation (garden) using intercropping system with corn and bean plants. Village government, based on Regent's instruction, distributed land to the people; in this case the status of land was cultivation right rather than property.

In 1978/1980, during Regent Jhon Bei's reign, reforestation program was implemented by means of planting *ampupu*. Government paid the people participating in the program. In addition, people also obtained *ampupu* seed to be planted on the farmers' land inside the nature reserve area. In 1982, Ngada Wolo Merah Riung (RTK 142) forest group of Flores Island (former closed forest) is stipulated to be closed forest functioning as protected forest with the Ministry of Forestry's decree No. 89/Kpts-II/1982 dated on December 2, 1983. Ten years later, this area was assigned to be nature reserve area during Joachim Reo's reign as Ngada Regent through the Ministry of Forestry's Decree No. 432/Kpts-II/92. It is this that initiated the change of area status from protected forest to nature reserve.

The people living around the forest can actually be the pillar to create everlasting forest management. People's positive behavior in interacting with forest will lead to the creation of an everlasting forest condition. Meanwhile, the negative one will lead to the exploitation and utilization of forest irresponsibly resulting in forest destruction that in turn will affect their life adversely (Suprayitno, 2008). It means that the existence of people around forest area will be important in determining forest sustainability.

The helplessness situation of people living around forest area is due to the enactment of certain policies related to forest protection ignoring the people's rights requiring them to do something to fight for their rights. The sufficiently long struggle has been done by people around Watu Ata natural reserve area to retrieve their right in Watu Ata natural reserve area.

Originally, people's struggle has not been organized well because there has been no organization accommodating their aspiration. However, since the establishment of Forum Masyarakat Peduli Lingkungan Watu Ata (FORMATA or People's Forum Concerned with Watu Ata Environment), people begins to do some activities giving them a new hope.

It is in line with K.N, stating:

"PERMATA organization established to raise the community's power around the nature reserve area becomes a good bridge for the people to express their complaints. Thus, PERMATA has ever performed peaceful action followed by thousands people and Large Discussion (Indonesian: *Musyawahar Besar*) attended by government and people essentially discussing the fate of people surrounding nature reserve. The struggle has given the community a little hope so far, because some years ago, there had been community's messengers along with government and NGO delivering the public complaints to central ministry. People just need to wait for the answer from the central ministry". (Friday, January 15, 2017).

The establishment of FORMATA organization then

renamed with PERMATA can be seen as a type of social capital. PERMATA is the real form of bonding social capital developing in community life surrounding Watu Ata natural reserve area. This community organization's inception and establishment are due to the presence of spirit to relieve themselves from social situation that Putnam calls sacred society. Through this organization, the forms of community's struggle become more organized and directed. The existence of PERMATA organization creates bridging social capital. Through PERMATA, the community tries to build interaction with other groups (LAPMAS and Government). Many activities initiated by PERMATA always involve other groups.

Ironically, such the struggle has not been fruitful yet. This attempt is still covered with limited authority, bureaucracy, and long and elaborate administrative systems. That is, something that if maintained will increase a forestry bureaucrat's prestige but will torment the people who expect certain and immediate answer (Maring, 2013). Similarly, the people surrounding Watu Ata Natural reserve feel long and elaborated struggle that has been passed through but has not been fruitful, returning their rights to those like before the enactment of policy establishing natural reserve area.

In this context, World Bank's view on the forestry policy is relevant to discuss. World Bank (2006) suggested that forest, to Indonesia, is a national asset, global community commodity, and main living source for about 36 millions Indonesian people who live in poverty. Forestry governance touches the basic issue of asset management and democratic preference in nearly all regency/city areas in Indonesia, occupying about 70% of Indonesian land. The forestry policy reforming process raises the issue really important to rural economy and poor people, to build participation and accountability voice and to confront government and community in building a good governance practice collectively.

This World Bank's view is possible when the status of Watu Ata forest area formerly as conservation area functioning as nature reserve is changed into the forest area that can also be used by community as the place for fulfilling their life needs, recalling so many people relying on the forest area for their life. On the other hand, participative paradigm emphasizes on the importance of public participation in development. It is relevant to democratic governance approach.

Democratic governance is an attempt of institutionalizing the space for expressing the people's voice in which these institutions of voice do not have capacity to ensure the implementation of such decision. Democratic governance occurs in the case of democratic voice is not bound to agency. The form of democratic governance is the attempt of participating in policy making by means of representing the people's voice (Ron, 2012). Civil Society can contribute to democratic governance, and civil society and state can create synergy in democratic governance (Kim, 2009).

The exclusion of arable land encountered by community surrounding Watu Alam reserve nature is the impact of non-participative but top-down policy stipulation. The ancestor heritage of cultural sites existing in Watu Alam Nature Reserve area proves that actually some of Watu

Ala nature reserve areas are the land that has been cultivated by community. Historical record stipulating Watu Ata forest to be nature reserve also suggests that community has ever been involved by government in utilizing and managing Watu Ata forest. The informants' comment on the socialization of policy is that there has been no socialization related to the plan of assigning Watu Ata to be nature reserve area. One of comments given by G.T, stating that:

"... there has been no socialization before the assignment until the determination of border was conducted unilaterally by government that actually does not know the details and history of forest and community's plantations" (Thursday, February 9, 2017).

The process of assigning Watu Ata forest area to be Nature Reserve area tending not to involve the community leads to the top-down policy making. Sabatier in Pissourios (2014) criticized the top-down model firstly as creating decision maker's centralized perspective by ignoring other actors. Secondly, they criticize this model as the one used difficultly in a situation in which there is a dominant policy (law) or agent, so that the policy made will be largely a direction. Thirdly, this top-down model was criticized as it tends to ignore or at least underestimate the strategy taken by lower-level bureaucrat (local government) and targeted group to understand the policy and/or to transfer it to its own purpose.

These critiques delivered by Sabatier lead to the understanding on the weakness of this top-down model. As cited in Subarsono (2013), Sabatier suggested two weaknesses of top-down approach. Firstly, a policy formulated sustainably, despite clear formulation, makes the government revealing difficultly the new problem developing within society. This weakness is manifested into the policy of assigning Watu Ata forest area to be natural reserve conservation area, in which the Ministry of Forestry as the governmental institutions that makes and issues the policy seems to continue the preexisting previous policy only. Considering the historical assignment of Watu Ata nature reserve, in 1983 Government through the Ministry of Forestry issued decree No. 89/Kpts-II/1983 dated December 2, 1983 mentioning the assignment of Watu Ata forest to be closed forest functioning as the protected forest. There has been no socialization and survey conducted by government leading the Watu Ata nature reserve area includes the arable land of communities living surrounding the area. The border of Watu Ata nature reserve area only followed the preexisting border of protected forest constituting the former border of closed forest during Dutch colonialism period. Although the border has been changed further, it has proven the weakness of this model. Secondly, this model tends to bring about non-democratic public policy process, and even it will very likely bring about authoritarian political regime. The communities have complained this weakness in which there is no public participation in the policy making, thereby harming them. The loss of access to arable land that has been the part of nature reserve area is the impact of the absence of public participation.

Marginalization in the form of social exclusion encountered by people surrounding Watu Ata natural

reserve area essentially originates from the policy not accommodating people's interest. Public participation very likely encounters some problems in formulation and implementing policy.

Overall, social exclusion represents a condition in which individual cannot participate fully in economic, social, political, and cultural lives, and process leading to and maintaining such condition. Participation may be inhibited when people do not have access to material resource, including income, job, land and housing, or services such as education and healthcare. Social exclusion includes not only material deprivation but also inadequate agent or control over important decision and the feeling of being alienated and inferiority (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2016; Todman in Syahra, 2010).

Policy, planning, and social service activities should be conducted in order to contribute to dealing with and promoting social exclusion, to support the family to live better (Nuridin, 2015).

In the states holding on democratic system, the marginalization of community as the effect of a policy may not occur. The improvement of community participation is the basic pillar of democracy. Democracy cannot be achieved without citizen participation (Bayeh, 2016). In democratic governance, Bevir (2010) argued that the best hope for democratic reform lies on more interpretative style of skill, dialogical form of policy making, and more varying way of public participation.

"Good" or "democratic" governance has dominated global political agenda since early 1990s. Its fulcrum lies on two basic premises, 1) that democracy should be "the only game in town"; 2) that a democratic government is the precondition to accelerate national development (Hyden, 2016). Ron (2012) suggests that there are four forms of democratic governance, viewed from the form of cohabitation with government. They are, 1) Voice as supplement: speaking directly to the formal authority; 2) Voice as corrective: illegitimacy of the formal institutions of voice, directed to both formal authority and other performers in governmental game; 3) Voice as transformative: usually in contradiction with formal institution. It is a laboratory for discussing idea and policy beyond the conventional discourse border; 4) Voice as participation: it aims to provide a model that can be applied to democratic policy making that can be taken and adopted by other participants in governance process (government, business, and civil society).

Cheema (n.d.) defines democratic governance as a series of processes in which people reach consensus and apply regulation, human rights, law, policy, and social structure – in pursuing justice, welfare, and environment protection. Policy and law are implemented by many institutions: legislatives, judicial, executives, political parties, private sector and civil society. In this definition, democratic governance leads to a question about how the people govern themselves to ensure equality (of opportunity) and justice (social and economic justice) for all citizens. Key dimension of a democratic government includes election process and general election management boards' role, access to justice and human right norms and local government's enforcement, decentralization and capacity, transparency and anticorruption

strategy, legislative process and relationship with constituent, role of civil society and media, and effect of global power including external partner's role.

The principles of democratic governance can be used to examine governance system (structure, process) and the relationship of stakeholders (Parent, 2016). Democratic governance is one key to development. Now it is recognized that political process, regulation, and institution play a principal role in economic growth and human development (Michiels (ed.), n.d.). Effective democratic governance affects people's prosperity and economic advance. In many developing and post-socialist states, action and effect of democratic governance occurs through sectoral reformation. Otherwise, sectoral policy reformation and program intervention can serve to promote and to improve democratic governance (Brinkerhoff, 2000).

Qian (n.d.) argued that improving democratic governance can be a holistic measure not only to prevent the system led by executives from going down to authoritarian rule, but also to improve the construction of legal system, to put a strong foundation for law enforcement.

As suggested by Kapur and Naím (2005), democratic governance means a clear responsibility line, running from policy maker to those affected.

Democratic governance is flexible and can learn from policy fault. The democratic government's ability of learning enables it to keep experimenting and adapting to the challenge they face (Stehr, 2016). In such understanding, the policy of assigning Watu Ata Nature Reserve leading to the marginalization (social exclusion) of some people surrounding it should be reviewed.

Strategic lobbying approach can support democratic governance. Lobby, according to Irimieş (2017) is a main structural element of democratic governance and sustainable development very important to accomplish administration and decision process that is competitive and efficient in local government. The successful stipulation of regulation and lobbying technique is very important to every public system, in which social participation in decision making process can contribute considerably to social, political and economic/financial efficiency.

CONCLUSION

Community marginalization surrounding Watu Ata natural reserve in the form of social exclusion from cultivated land evidently exerts negative effect on the people (community) particularly in the term of lost job opportunity, inhibited attempt of fulfilling cloth and shelter needs. The attempt the people have taken to get out of marginalized situation is among others to establish PERMATA organization as the one fighting for the people interest despite less optimal result. The top-down policy establishing Watu Ata as natural reserve due to no public participation in the formulation of policy should be reviewed. In democratic governance era, government policy is ideally a dialogical product that can accommodate many parties' interests. Moreover, there is local wisdom (called Ri'i) in the area in the process of conserving and utilizing forest resource. The forestry policy

reform, particularly the involvement of public (community) into Watu Ata nature reserve policy is considered as important.

REFERENCES

- Bayeh, Endalcachew. 2016. Role of Civics and Ethical Education for The Development of Democratic Governance in Ethiopia: Achievements and Challenges. *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 2, pp. 31-36
- Bevir, Mark. 2010. *Democratic Governance*. Princeton University Press.
- Brinkerhoff, Derick W. 2000. Democratic Governance and Sectoral Policy Reform: Tracing Linkages and Exploring Synergies. *World Development*. Vol. 28, No 4, pp. 601-615. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(99\)00147-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(99)00147-3).
- Carothers, Thomas. 2009. Democracy Assistance: Political Vs. Developmental?. *Journal of Democracy: Baltimore*. Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 5-19.
- Cheema, G. Shabbir. n.d. *Democratic Governance: Theory and Practice in Developing Countries*, http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/politics/grad/syllabi/G53.1731_cheema_f05.pdf
- Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 2016. *Leaving No One Behind: The Imperative of Inclusive Development, Report on the World Social Situation 2016*. New York: United Nations Publication.
- Fakih, Mansour. 2008. *Analisis Gender Transformasi Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Insist
- FWI/GFW. 2001. *Keadaan Hutan Indonesia*. Bogor, Indonesia: Forest Watch Indonesia, and Washington D.C.: Global Forest Watch
- Hall, Derek, Philip Hirsch and Tania Murray Li. 2011. *Powers of Exclusion: Land dilemmas in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Harrison, D. 1988. *The Sociology of Modernization and Development*. London: Routledge
- Hyden, Goran. 2016. Beyond the Liberal Democracy Paradigm: A Fresh Look at Power and Institutions. *African Studies Review: Piscataway*. Vol. 59, No. 3, pp. 169-18.
- Irimieş, Laura Maria. 2017. Lobbying and Social Participation – Key Features for An Effective Public Administration in Romania. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*. Special Issue 2017, pp. 57-73.
- Jary, David and Jary, Julia. 2005. *Dictionary of Sociology*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- Kapur, Devesh and Naím, Moisés. 2005. The IMF and Democratic Governance. *Journal of Democracy: Baltimore*. Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 89-102.
- Kementerian Kehutanan. 2014. *Statistik Kawasan Hutan 2013*. Jakarta.
- Kim, Euiyoung. 2009. The Limits of NGO-Government Relations in South Korea. *Asian Survey: Berkeley*. Vol. 49, No.5, pp. 873-894.
- Kusnadi. 2013. Kemiskinan Nelayan dalam Perspektif Eksklusi Sosial. *Jurnal Masyarakat dan Budaya (LIPI)*. Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 1-21.
- Lawang, Robert M. Z. 2014. Beberapa Hipotesis

- tentang Eksklusi Sosial di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Mamangan*. Vol. 1, No. 2.
- Lewis, Peter. 2008. Growth Without Prosperity in Africa. *Journal of Democracy: Baltimore*. Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 95-109.
- Mainwaring, Scott and Scully, Timothy R. 2008. Latin America: Eight Lessons for Governance. *Journal of Democracy: Baltimore*. Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 113-127.
- Maring, Prudensius. 2013. Kekuasaan dan Konflik Sosial: Kasus Penguasaan Hutan Noge di Tanaloran Flores. *Jurnal Insani*. Vol. 15, No. 2.
- Michiels, Carl (ed.). n.d. *Democratic Governance - The Key to Development*. Brussels: Belgian Cooperation Technical, https://www.enabel.be/sites/default/files/democratic_governance_the_key_to_development.pdf.
- Munk, Martin D. 2002. Gender, Marginalisation and Social Exclusion. *Background paper for a conference*. 26-27 Sept. Social for skinings instituttet, The Danish National Institute of Social Research.
- Nurdin, M. Fadhil. 2015. Eksklusi Sosial dan Pembangunan: Makna, Fokus dan Dimensi untuk Kajian Sosiologis. *Kongres II Asosiasi Program Studi Sosiologi Indonesia dan Konferensi Nasional Sosiologi Indonesia IV*. Manado, May 20-23.
- Olivier de Sardan, Jean-Pierre. 2005. *Anthropology and Development: Understanding Contemporary Social Change*. London: Zed Books.
- Parent, Milena M. 2016. Stakeholder Perceptions on The Democratic Governance of Major Sports Events. *Sport Management Review*. Vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 402-416. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2015.11.003> Get rights and content.
- Parra, Constanza and Moulaert, Frank. 2016. The Governance of the Nature-Culture Nexus: Lessons Learned from the San Pedro de Atacama Case Study. *Nature and Culture: New York*. Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 239-258. DOI:10.3167/nc.2016.110302.
- Pissourios, Ioannis A. 2014. Top-Down and Bottom-Up Urban and Regional Planning: Towards A Framework For the Use of Planning Standards. *European Spatial Research And Policy*. Vol 21, No. 1.
- Qian, Liu. n.d. From Democratic Theory to Democratic Governance Theory: Implications to the Political Development of the Macao SAR. *Academic Journal of "One Country, Two Systems"*. Vol. 2, No. 2. http://www.ipm.edu.mo/cntfiles/upload/docs/common/1country_2systems/issue2/18.pdf
- Razer, M., Friedman, V. J., & Warshofsky, B. 2013. Schools as agents of social exclusion and inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. Vol. 17, No. 11.
- Ron, Amit. 2012. *Modes of Democratic Governance*. The Oxford Handbook of Governance. edited by David Levi-Faur. OUP Oxford.
- Ruslina, Elli. 2012. Makna Pasal 33 Undang-Undang Dasar 1945 dalam Pembangunan Hukum Ekonomi Indonesia. *Jurnal Konstitusi*. Vol. 9, No. 1.
- Soetomo. 2015. *Pemberdayaan masyarakat mungkin munculkan antitesisny*, pustaka pelajar. Yogyakarta.
- Stehr, Nico. 2016. Exceptional Circumstances: Does Climate Change Trump Democracy?. *Issues in Science and Technology: Washington*. Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 30-39.
- Subarsono, AG. 2013. *Analisa Kebijakan Publik, Konsep, Teori dan Aplikasi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Suprayitno, Adi Riyanto. 2008. Pelibatan Masyarakat Lokal: Upaya Memberdayakan Masyarakat menuju Hutan Lestari. *Jurnal Penyuluhan*. Vol. 4, No. 2.
- Syahra, Rusydi. 2010. Eksklusi Sosial: Perspektif Baru untuk Memahami Deprivasi dan Kemiskinan. *Jurnal Masyarakat & Budaya*, Edisi Khusus.
- Umanailo, Chairul Basrun. 2016. Marginalisasi Sosial Ekonomi Buruh Tani Akibat Alih Fungsi Lahan di Desa Ngringo, Kec. Jaten, Kab. Karanganyar. *Master's Thesis*, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta.
- World Bank. 2006. *Sustaining Indonesia's Forest: Strategy for the World Bank, 2006-2009*. The Washington, D.C: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, The World Bank
- Zain, AS. 1996. *Hukum Lingkungan Konservasi Hutan*. Jakarta: Penerbit Rineka Cipta.