

4-11-2014

Public Participation in the Implementation of Forestry Decentralization in Indonesia

Emilianus Yakob Sese Tolo
Universitas Gadjah Mada; Indonesia

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

Recommended Citation

Tolo, Emilianus Yakob Sese (2014) "Public Participation in the Implementation of Forestry Decentralization in Indonesia," *BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi*: Vol. 20 : No. 2 , Article 8.

DOI: 10.20476/jbb.v20i2.3065

Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jbb/vol20/iss2/8>

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.

Public Participation in the Implementation of Forestry Decentralization in Indonesia

EMILIANUS YAKOB SESE TOLO

Graduate School of Public Administration, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta
emilianustolo@yahoo.com

Abstract. The implementation of decentralization in Indonesia brings two-fold effects. On the one hand, it has given more autonomy for regions to organize and manage their governmental affairs. However, on the other hand, regional autonomy causes problems in society, such as increased corruption, money politics, and environmental damage. By using descriptive-qualitative approach, the author evaluated the implementation of forestry decentralization in Indonesia with research focus in Manggarai and Central Maluku districts. This study found that the implementation of forestry decentralization ignored community involvement thus brought negative consequences such as the increasing damage to forest ecosystems and the declining public welfare. Therefore, in order to bring benefits for forest conservation and welfare of the community, forestry decentralization needs to fortify community involvement.

Keywords: forest decentralization, forest degradation, fortification of community involvement, social welfare

Abstrak. Penyelenggaraan desentralisasi di Indonesia telah membawa dampak yang mendua. Pada satu sisi, desentralisasi telah memberi otonomi yang lebih luas kepada daerah otonom untuk mengatur dan mengurus berbagai urusan pemerintahan yang dimilikinya. Namun, di pihak lain, otonomi daerah justru telah menimbulkan masalah di dalam masyarakat, seperti meningkatnya korupsi, politik uang, dan kerusakan lingkungan. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif-kualitatif, penulis mengevaluasi penyelenggaraan desentralisasi kehutanan di Indonesia dengan lokus penelitian di Indonesia Bagian Timur, khususnya kabupaten Manggarai dan Maluku Tengah. Penelitian ini menemukan bahwa penyelenggaraan desentralisasi kehutanan mengabaikan keterlibatan masyarakat sehingga membawa akibat negatif berupa meningkatnya kerusakan ekosistem hutan dan menurunnya kesejahteraan masyarakat. Oleh karena itu, agar penyelenggaraan desentralisasi kehutanan membawa manfaat bagi kelestarian hutan dan kesejahteraan masyarakat, perlu diupayakan fortifikasi peran masyarakat dalam desentralisasi kehutanan.

Kata kunci: desentralisasi kehutanan, fortifikasi peran masyarakat, kerusakan lingkungan, menurunnya kesejahteraan masyarakat

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia ranks third after Brazil and the Republic of Congo as a country that has the largest tropical forest in the world, as large as 90.1 million hectares (Brockhaus et al., 2012). Since the time of the kingdoms, Indonesia's forests have been continuously threatened by deforestation and forest degradation caused by forest fires, legal and illegal logging (Noordwijk, et al., 2008; Simon, 2008; Tolo, 2012). Deforestation and forest degradation in Indonesia is considered as a result of bad policies (implementation) in the forestry sector that tends to be centralized, ignoring the role of society, and use a purely economic approach (Yustika, 2009; Awang, 2006). As a result, the richness of forest resources seems to bring no benefit for public welfare. In economic literature, the fact is called a resource curse or Dutch disease (Yustika, 2009).

If the root causes of deforestation and forest degradation lies in the realm of policy (implementation), then a policy reform is a *conditio sine qua non*. In Indonesia, since the independence, the dynamics of centralization and decentralization of forestry policy changed to seven times

(Siswanto and Wardojo, 2006; Ekawati, 2010). When the New Order authoritarian regime collapsed, the government reformed centralized forest policy to decentralized one. However, the post-New Order decentralized policy also failed, characterized by the increasing deforestation and forest degradation. According to the author, the failure of forestry decentralization in Indonesia, besides due to misinterpretation of the meaning of decentralization, is also caused by the neglect of public participation in forest governance.

After the collapse of the New Order, the new government is committed to build democracy through political and policy reforms (Boediono, 2009). The political system is changed from centralization to decentralization with the issuance of Law no. 22/1999 on Regional Government. The goal of decentralization is to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of public services, reduce public spending of the central government, and tackle the disintegration of the nation (Kristiansen and Pratikno, 2006). In the forestry sector, decentralization has liberated autonomous regions to manage their own forest resources. However, forestry decentralization, believed to bring positive

effect on regional development, was not actualized. In contrast, forestry decentralization has led to corruption, abuse of authority, and increasing deforestation and forest degradation.

The policy to give license to cooperatives to manage the 100-hectare forests without the supervision of the department of forestry allegedly resulted on the increasing deforestation. Another cause was the increasing logging activity on the former territory of forest concessions (HPH) and forest conversion for transmigration areas, illegal logging, agricultural land clearing, smallholders, private estates, forest fires and land disputes between logging companies and indigenous people (Awang, 2006). As a result, in the post-New Order, the rate of forest degradation that previously only reached 800,000-900,000 per year in 1997 to 1.8 million hectares in 2001 and reached 3.8 million hectares per year in 2003-2004 (Siahaan, 2007). The facts of increasing deforestation and forest degradation after the implementation of Law no. 22 of 1999 indicates that the change in the political system and the forestry decentralization have brought new problems for forest management in Indonesia.

To rectify the shortcomings of Law No. 22 of 1999, the Law No. 32 of 2004 on Regional Government was formed. Based on Law No. 32 of 2004 and Law No. 41 of 1999 on Forestry, the governance of forest sector becomes the responsibility of local governments within the framework of the unitary state. Both regulations provide a strong juridical basis for local governments to manage their forest resources for the preservation and enhancement of regional development while keeping its accountability to the public and accounting for the central government. However, the presence of Law No. 32 of 2004 and Law No. 41 of 1999 did not make forest governance in Indonesia better. The problem of deforestation and forest degradation still occurs despite the slight decline. The rate of deforestation of 1.7 million hectares per year in 2004-2006 declined to 0.5 million hectares per year in 2009-2011 (Tolo, 2012).

Based on previous studies (Yustika, 2009; Larson, 2006; Siswanto and Wardojo, 2006), the failure of the decentralization policy in Indonesia is due to the following three factors: First, local governments use purely economic approach to forest governance (Yustika, 2009; Larson, 2006). Second, the failure of forestry decentralization is also caused by a faulty interpretation of the concept of decentralization. Larson (2006) refers to this phenomenon as the “contradictory political interpretation” since the local governments interpret decentralization as a self-authority, apart from the central government. Third, forestry decentralization in Indonesia is characterized by a weak central government control (Larson, 2006). Control in this case means that the central government should oversee the implementation of the decentralization of forestry to conform to the established juridical corridor. For example, local government gave non-procedural license of forestry concessions and tax in order to reap high economic profits. In some autonomous regions in Indonesia, authorities seized and sold public land to entrepreneurs for economic benefits (Siswanto dan Wardojo, 2006; Tolo, 2014).

Essentially, decentralization is often defined as the transfer of authority or power sharing from the central to local governments (Dwiyanto et al, 2003), it is commonly born as a result of a national crisis, initiatives at both central and local elites, and pressure from international donors (Larson, 2006; Agrawal and Ostrom, 2008). Whatever the background that gave it birth, decentralization is considered important, because from political science perspective, decentralization is believed to facilitate the development of democracy. Meanwhile, from the perspective of public administration, decentralization makes the bureaucrats closer to society and more efficient and effective in providing public services (Kristiansen and Pratikno, 2006). Thus, decentralization is believed to ‘encourage development by improving efficiency, equality and democracy’ (Larson, 2006).

Due to the positive promise of decentralization, many countries in the world in the 1960s and 1970s, having had their forests managed centrally, temptingly shifted to forestry decentralization since the late 1980s. In the early 21st century, about 80 percent of countries in the world have chosen a decentralized government system. Consequently, forest resource managements are also decentralized (Agrawal and Ostrom, 2008; Shivakoti and Ostrom, 2008; Moeliono et al, 2009). In the past 20 years, about 200 million hectares of forest managements are decentralized, involving communities in almost 60 countries in the world (Chhatre and Agrawal, 2009). Forestry decentralization has brought a positive effect on forest conservation and community welfare.

According to previous studies (Ostrom, 1990; Larson, 2006; Agrawal and Ostrom, 2008; Yonariza and Shivakoti, 2008; Chhatre and Agrawal, 2009), decentralization has brought a positive effect on forest conservation and community welfare. Ostrom (1990) proved that a decentralized forest governance (the commons) through local institution empowerment will enhance collective action to keep and maintain forests. According to Larson (2006), a decentralization that allows local participation has a positive effect on forest conservation and community welfare. Yonariza and Shivakoti (2008), prove that the involvement of local communities and institutions in decentralized forest governance, especially in terms of guarding and regulating in the province of West Sumatra, had positive implications for the economic improvement of the population in the surrounding forests and the preservation of forest sustainability. By conducting researches in India, Bhutan, Nepal, Thailand, Indonesia, and Vietnam, Agrawal and Ostrom (2008) explains that decentralization will be successful if accompanied by the development of community-based forestry, governed by a lucid forest tenure, capable of encouraging joint action to preserve and protect the forest. Meanwhile, the research by Chhatre and Agrawal (2009)—in 80 forests in 10 countries: 22 in East Africa, 13 in Latin America, and 45 in South Asia—found that the higher the local autonomy for forest governance, the higher the sustainability of forest and welfare of the community.

The success of forestry decentralization is also determined by the public participation in forest governance. P. Francis and R. James, as cited by Kristiansen and

Pratikno (2006: 119), asserts that “democracy and accountability of true autonomous regions is found only in changes of values and consciousness as well as the growth of an active civil society.” An active community enables a more accountable and democratic forest governance. In addition to be actively engaged in monitoring, conservation and utilization of forest resources, people must be active in controlling government’s role in forest governance. The active involvement of the community will have a positive implication on economic welfare. The economic welfare becomes the common interest for community to participate in the joint actions of maintenance and protection of forests (Ostorn, 1990).

Society can only be active in forest governance and enjoy its economic prosperity, provided that decentralization works for a lucid forest ownership. The clarity of the ownership allows communities to engage in forest governance in three areas: management, ownership and utilization (Agrawal and Ostorn, 2008). Based on the research by Larson (2006), if the right of ownership and authority over forests is obscure, forest conditions tend to be negative. This is due to public suspicion against the government who tends to exploit the forest without positively and economically contribute to the social life. In addition, local governments feel that their forests are threatened by the presence of the central government who tends to excessively exploit without taking into account sustainability aspects.

Public participation will be more effective and efficient, and affect forest sustainability provided that local wisdom in society is accommodated in the regulation of the forestry sector (Johnstone, 2010). In West Sumatra, the local wisdom of Nagari, accommodated in local regulations on forestry, has contributed positively to forest preservation and economic improvement of the local people (Yonariza and Shivakoti, 2008). However, the local wisdom must be critically installed in various forest policies through rational political considerations, since local wisdom is the result of a power struggle between different actors in society. If this is not anticipated seriously, in its implementation, local wisdom can be used as an instrument of elite capture (Dutta, 2009).

Elite capture is a latent danger, continuously threatening the implementation of decentralization (forestry decentralization). Dutta (2009) asserts that “one of the negative impacts of decentralization is the emergence of the phenomenon of elite capture, especially in developing countries.” In Indonesia, according to previous studies (Hadiz 2005, Chowdhury and Yamauchi, 2010), decentralization has given rise to elite capture by the emergence of small kings in the autonomous regions, acting authoritatively and prone to corruption, collusion, and nepotism (KKN). Therefore, in order to make forestry decentralization effective and efficient, the central government needs to do controlling, coordination and evaluation of the local governments, to make sure they are not caught up in elite capture because of its power (Larson, 2006). However, the controlling of the central government is ‘only’ to make sure local governments perform the duties and obligations in accordance with the mandate of the applicable laws. This is important to

prevent forestry decentralization from getting trapped into ‘centralized decentralization’ (Shivakoti and Ostorn, 2008) which was no different from the centralized forestry, as happened in the government of Mali and Nicaragua, where forestry decentralization actually increased the state control over forest resources management (Larson, 2006). Once the state control over forest resources is very high, it is vulnerable to land grabbing, commonly occurring in developing countries, such as Indonesia (Tolo, 2014), both by the state and by the capitalists allied with the state (Boras dan Franco, 2011).

RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses qualitative research methodology. Even though more time is required for field research, qualitative methodology is capable of revealing the facts on the field more thoroughly by conducting a literary study, observation and in-depth interviews in order to understand a concept, definition, characteristics, metaphors, symbols and descriptions about something in research location (Berg, 1989). To be more focused, this qualitative-descriptive study uses a case study, since it enables the researcher to explore the differences between two or more cases. By comparing cases of different research locations, the researcher is capable to infer a more comprehensive conclusion (Yin, 2003).

This qualitative-descriptive research, through a case study, was conducted in the period of 2007-2010 in two different districts in eastern Indonesia, the Manggarai and Central Maluku districts. The reasons the author chose Manggarai and Central Maluku districts are: (1) the two districts have the primary forest potential, threatened by deforestation, both legal and illegal. (2) the Forests in these two small islands (Flores and Seram) have the primary forest potential, whose existence is threatened. So far, researches on forestry tend to focus on the larger islands such as Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi and Papua. In fact, small islands in Indonesia also have a good potential of the primary forest, which should be preserved and maintained for the development of the nation and public welfare.

The research in Manggarai was conducted with two field trips for a month in 2007 and a week in 2008. The research in Central Maluku was conducted in 2008, 2009 and 2010. In the first two years (2008 and 2010), the author was on the field for a week. In 2010, the author conducted data collection in the field for a month. Data collection, both in Manggarai and Central Maluku districts, was conducted through in-depth interviews and observations. The in-depth interviews were conducted for 1-2 hours in average, with about 60 respondents. The respondents were employees at public institutions (such as Bappeda, Office of Forestry, Laboratory of Manusela National Parks and Ruteng Nature Recreation Park), community leaders, NGO activists, academicians, religious leaders, farmers, fishermen, timber companies, illegal loggers.

Considering that the research location is foreign for the author, the snow bowling method was used to get informants. The method asks recommendations from informants who had been interviewed in order to get a

new respondent. This method is very helpful for the researcher, but may at the same time reduce the plurality of perspectives on the reality under study, because the informants asked tended to recommend his acquaintance with similar and consistent way of thinking. The author also performed data triangulation by asking the same questions over and over again to different informants to obtain data validity. This data triangulation is only one out of four types of triangulation as suggested by Denzin (1978), i.e. the data triangulation, investigator triangulation, theory triangulation, and methodological triangulation.

In addition to conducting literary studies—reading relevant sources of books, journals, newspapers, internet, data and reports from government agencies—and in-depth interviews, the author also conducted involved-observation by staying with the local community for some time. In Manggarai, in 2007, the author lived for a week with Colol community. In Central Maluku, the author lived about a month with the community of Sawai, following their life-routines in terms of their relationship with the forests, especially Manusela National Park, located about half a kilometer from their settlements. The author also briefly followed the operation of arresting illegal loggers with the forestry police the Manusela National Park.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The forest area in Manggarai is 121,192.05 ha (see table 1). However, its existence is threatened by illegal and legal logging. As a result, in 2005 the area of forest was degraded by 14. 218.50 ha. Illegal logging is normally done by the community for domestic needs such as building the house, yet merely on a small scale. However, there are some groups of people who sell illegal timber.

Factors affecting illegal logging are: (1) unclear forest boundaries between customary forests, called Lingko, and state forests, (2) the increase of population, and (3) the road access passing through the forest area.

Communities in Manggarai still referred to the forest boundary made by the Dutch. In the 1970s, local governments set on a new boundary. However, this attempt got a negative reaction from the communities, since the government did not engage the communities and traditional leaders (tua golo and tua teno) in setting the new forest boundary. Increasing population also has implications on the expansion of agricultural land area. The area of forest (2008) occupied for burial, residences (villages) and plantations is as large as 9,004.50 ha. The road access to the forestry area also results in rampant practices of illegal logging. Illegally logged timbers are exported to Java through ports in Borong and Reo.

The legal logging was conducted by mining companies. The mining exploration by PT Surya in Galak Rego-Reo forest, for example, has led to massive deforestation that have an impact on the damage of other ecosystems such as the sea and river and the loss of some springs. In 2008, of 22 mining permits, approximately 5 explorations have been executed, all mining locations of which are in the forest area. The local government is very supportive to

Table 1. the Area and Types of Forests in Manggarai District.

No.	Forest Area	Area (ha)	Type of forest
1.	Gapong	952.36	Conservation
2.	Meler-Kuwus	3,040	Conservation
3.	Todo	10,089.20	Conservation
4.	Manus Mbengan	3,688.28	Production
5.	Rana	253.81	Production
6.	Riwo	1,011.47	Production
7.	Ngada Wolo Mera	4,898.80	Conservation
8.	Puntu	15,567.40	Conservation
9.	Pota	16,715.07	Conservation
10.	Nggalak Rego	14,690.30	Conservation
11.	Ndeki Komba	5,281.70	Conservation
12.	Ramut	2,400	Conservation
13.	Wae Laku	5,705	Production
14.	Sawe Sange	4,650	Conservation
15.	TWA Ruteng	32,248.60	Conservation

Source: Manggarai Office of Forestry 2008

mining explorations. In fact, economically, in the last three years (2005-2007), the revenues from mining sector for Locally Generated Revenue (PAD) was only 321 million rupiahs.

The forest area in Central Maluku district is 746,471 ha. Its existence is threatened by illegal and legal logging. Illegal logging is done by the public and government officials (police and military). However, illegal logging is conducted by the public only in small quantities, for domestic purposes such as to manufacture boats and houses. However, government officials do illegal logging in considerably large quantities.

Factors influencing illegal logging are (1) economic pressures and the demand of timber from the outside, (2) unclear forest boundaries, (3) increasing number of inhabitants and transmigration, and (4) indecisive, corrupt and easily bribed officials.

Due to the economic pressures, illegal logging is done to get money. The demand for timber from the timber

Table 2. The Area and Types of Forest in Central Maluku District

District	Central Maluku
Conservation Forest	137,584
Limited Production Forest	180,789
Production Forest	33,331
Conversion Forest	130,250
Manusela National Park	189,000
Nature Preservation	14,234
Other Land Uses	61,283
Total	746,471

Source: Central Maluku Office of Forestry (2008)

barons in Masohi, Ambon and Sulawesi with high prices (IDR 700,000 to IDR1.500.000/cubic) encourages local people to do illegal logging. The migrants, amounting to 1,000 people each year in the last 30 years (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2009) also has implications on the illegal logging. Some of the migrants are involved in illegal logging. The boundary of customary forests, called *pertuanan*, and state forests is also obscure. Moreover, people referred more to Dutch-made forest boundary. The boundary set by the local government is considered unfair and annexed their *pertuanan*. In Sawai, the state forest boundary of Manusela National Park is just 500 meters from the residential areas. In addition, the officials are not strict in handling cases of illegal logging. Some of them even become illegal loggers. For example, a soldier named 'Labiru' rented 14 sensor operators to cut down a tree every day in Manusela National Park around the village of Saka.

The legal logging was conducted by companies owning a concession rights from the government. In 1970-1980, forest concessions were granted to Jayanti Group company, in the late 1980s Brata Jaya company also obtained concession rights, and in the 2000s, PT Nusa Ina got concessions of oil palm plantations in the area of primary forest. The land clearing for transmigration area had also damaged the forests.

Decentralization in the forestry sector in the two districts showed the remaining strong dominance of the center toward the autonomous region. All forestry decisions and policies are produced in Jakarta. For example, in terms of determining the type and boundaries, the Head of Manggarai Office of Forestry said that: "We do not have the authority, except waiting for the decision of the Department of Forestry. We were given guidelines for the determination of forest areas. Then, we give a proposal to the Department of Forestry in Jakarta. Department of Forestry itself ultimately decides the boundaries of the forests under the Law No. 41 of 1999."

In addition, with regard to the granting of license and forest concessions, only the Department of Forestry and related departments are entitled to issue them. Local governments have no authority whatsoever. Therefore, should a conflict occurs vertically in the field, as was the case in Manggarai, the local government becomes the victim of public anger, yet cannot do many things since the concession is the authority of the central government. In Manggarai, mining permits are granted by the central government upon the recommendation of the local government. The same thing happened in Central Maluku district where forest and plantation concessions are given by the central government. Economically, the granting of forest concession is more beneficial for the central government. Therefore, the Head of Central Maluku Office of Forestry said that "the existence of forest concessions benefits central government more than local government because the ecological damage of forests in the autonomous regions is not balanced by economic benefits."

The forest governance in the two districts shows that people are 'objectified'. The Government considers that the public does not have any capability in forest

governance. In fact, people are criminalized as the culprit of deforestation. Therefore, some customary land (*lingko* and *pertuanan*) were seized by the government (land grabbing) with the arguments for maintaining and preserving the forest. Yet, in reality, the government, through the concession rights and policies, has led to massive deforestation.

In Manggarai District in the 1970s, the villagers in Gapong must allow their 11 *lingko* to be grabbed by the local government with the purpose of conservation. However, in 1982-1985, the local government granted certain companies the forest concessions of the *lingko* area previously grabbed from the people of Gapong village. In 2005, after the forest was cleared away, five villagers from Gapong dag in the ex-forest concessions area to excavate rock. However, they were captured and imprisoned. Similar thing happened in Galak Rego area. In 1962, the government claimed people's *lingko* as protected forests. However, in early 2000s, the government handed over the forest for mining exploration to PT Surya. Moreover, the people of Colol must allow their forests and plantations to be claimed as the state forest area by the government in 2002. In 2004, people of Colol who rejected to be imprisoned and some farmers were shot dead by the police forces.

In Central Maluku district, the government recognizes the existence of customary forests (*pertuanan*). In the data from the Office of Forestry, *pertuanan* is included in the category of "other land uses" with the area of 61,283 ha. However, in determining the forest boundaries, people were not involved. Therefore, the boundary set by the local government tended to harm the public. The government one-sidedly annexed people's *pertuanan* area. The Head of Central Maluku Office of Forestry revealed that the government recognized the existence of customary forest, yet based on Law no. 41 of 1999 on Forestry, the people only owned the right to use, not owned the customary forest.

Once the forestry decentralization was implemented, both vertical and horizontal conflicts related to natural resources and forests in Manggarai and Central Maluku districts notably increased. In Manggarai, vertical conflicts often occurred. For example, the conflict between the Colol community and police force that killed 6 people and wounded about a dozen farmers. In addition, in Satar Teuk Reo, people who disagreed with the presence of the mining company blocked the road. However, the government and the company used the military services to quell the masses. Therefore, there was a conflict between officers and citizens. Horizontal conflict also occurred among members of the communities, caused by obscure land boundaries. The horizontal conflict was referred to as *perang tanding* (a duel). *Perang tanding* between Ngkor village and Lao village, for example, has caused material lost and many lives.

In Central Maluku District, the conflict between the authorities and indigenous people often occurred after the forest decentralization was implemented, since land and forests ownership became increasingly obscure. People who retained ownership of their *pertuanan* remained clearing their land and doing forest logging. As a result,

they were frequently involved in conflicts with authorities in the field. In addition, horizontal conflicts also occurred. For example, there were two occurrences of conflict between people of Soleman and Saka. These conflicts were due to the program of planting golden teak by the Office of Forestry. The Office gave the golden teak to people of Soleman to be planted in the pertuanan of Saka people, considered to be the state forest area by the local government. The first conflict broke out on July 10, 2006 and the second conflict occurred on May 2, 2008. As a result of this conflict, 80 houses were burned, hundreds of commodity crops were destroyed and there were victims who got injured.

Decentralization has brought problems related to forest governance in the two districts (Manggarai and Central Maluku). However, as written by Hadiz (2005), decentralization has been hijacked by the local elites for their own interests (elite capture). In Manggarai, the district head and officials had "affairs" with mining companies for economic gain, whereas many of their people are disenfranchised from their land and forests. Both horizontal and vertical conflicts added burden of their lives. Meanwhile, in Central Maluku, the Regent had an affair with the entrepreneurs to facilitate the clearance of forestry concessions. In addition, the military and the police had the freedom to do illegal logging and worked with timber brokers to smuggle illegal timber to Ambon, Masohi and even abroad.

Forestry Decentralization has a negative impact on the development, social welfare and environmental sustainability in Manggarai and Central Maluku districts. Does this mean that Indonesia should re-implement a centralized forestry? Of course not, because forestry decentralization is a democratic step that must be maintained. When retracted, Indonesia will tarnish the democratic progress that has been achieved through the post-New Order reform. Forestry decentralization is supposed to bring a positive implication, should it be implemented earnestly, by involving more public participation in the forest governance of the regions.

The findings in Manggarai and Central Maluku districts showed that community involvement in forest governance is still very minimal. In fact, the essence of forestry decentralization is to give more space to the community to be involved in forest governance. As a result, decentralization becomes the site of a power struggle and economic rents among the elite groups (elite capture and land grabbing). As a result, the public becomes the most tragic casualties of decentralization.

However, the space for public participation will be more effective and actual if the central government gives broader rights and authority to local governments to set their own forests by determining a lucid and firm authority between central and local governments. In holding authority, local governments must make room for the incorporation of local wisdom in forest governance. Therefore, the culture of 'barong wae' in Manggarai district (valuing a forest as a mother who deserves to be honored) and the culture of 'kewang' and 'sasi', that enable the forest to be sustainably maintained, must be incorporated to the forestry policies in the region. Moreover, both in

Manggarai and Central Maluku districts, people are more adherent to 'customary law' than to the government law. Given this reality, then synergizing customary law and national law in forest governance, that enables increased public participation, is urgent and needs to be done by the local government through lucid and firm public policies.

Nevertheless, although local governments are given a wide space of autonomy, the central government needs to keep doing surveillance so that local governments carry out its duties in accordance with the given authority to support national development. However, the facts on the field, to date, indicate that the central government still holds a very strong control on forest governance in the regions. On that basis, a journalist in Masohi, Central Maluku district, asserted that "the Regional Office of Forestry functions like a 'trash can' for the policies of the Department of Forestry in Jakarta. The Regional Office of Forestry must not be too passive and just wait for the program from the Department of Forestry."

Looking at the aforementioned facts, there are some fundamental reasons for the public involvements in forest governance in Indonesia in general and particularly in Manggarai and Central Maluku districts as the locus of this study. First, re-mapping of forest boundaries must involve the communities and custom leaders (tua golo and tua teno in Manggarai and Saniri in Central Maluku). The government needs to equalize the perception of forest boundary that remains obscure and overlapping. Clarity of forest boundaries implicates clarity of rights and access to forests. The one-sided delimitation of forests by the government makes people both in Manggarai and Central Maluku districts tend to reject the determined forest boundary and prefer the artificial boundary made by the Netherlands. A custom leader in Colol, Manggarai district, recognized this and asserted that "society followed more the artificial boundary of Netherlands (Dutch Indies) than the forest boundary made by the local government in the 1970s that did not involve the communities here."

Second, Manggarai Office of Forestry and Central Maluku Office of Forestry are equally suffering from the lack of operational equipment and personnel. In 2008, officials in Manggarai Office of Forestry was 60 people, 42 of whom worked in the office and the rest of the field. Around 60% had a background of forestry education and 30% have a background of social sciences, economics, law and government science. Only about 10% of officers had bachelor degree. In Central Maluku, in 2010, the number of officers in the Office of Forestry was 85 people, 55 of whom worked in the office and 30 people in the field, spread in 10 Sub-districts. In general, the Office of Forestry in these two districts had limited operational equipment and personnel. Therefore, public involvement in forest governance, particularly in the supervision and protection of the forest, has a positive impact for forest sustainability.

Third, public involvement in forest governance can have a positive implication for public welfare. Public involvement can be done by developing community forest. Therefore, pertuanan and lingko can be made as community forests. The local government may make local regulations guaranteeing the existence and legal

clarity of the community forests. As community forests, *pertuanan* and *lingko* are managed by the communities in regards to the preservation, protection and utilization. However, the local government must guarantee a lucid forest boundaries so that communities' rights over forests are secured.

CONCLUSION

Forestry decentralization in Indonesia was considered a failure by the findings of the author in Manggarai and Central Maluku districts. The failure was mainly due to the remaining strong dominance of the central government and the abandonment of the public participation in forest governance by the local government. Nonetheless, the failure of forestry decentralization is not an excuse for the government to return to a centralized system such as in the New Order. Instead, the government should keep and improve the forestry decentralization since it is a positive implications of democracy after the collapse of the New Order.

The steps that need to be taken by the government to tackle this problem is by implementing forestry decentralization intelligently and comprehensively by giving greater authority to autonomous regions and communities to manage their own forest resources. Communities need to be involved in forest governance in terms of surveillance, maintenance, and utilization. Therefore, the lucid segmentation of the rights and responsibilities between the central government and local government as well as between local government and communities is urgent.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, H. R. 2005. *Pelaksanaan Otonomi Luas dengan Pemilihan Kepala Daerah secara Langsung*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Agrawal, Arun and Ostrom, Elinor. 2008. "Decentralization and Community-Based Forestry: Learning from Experience." In Edward L. Webb & Ganesh P. Shivakoti (Ed). *Decentralization, Forests and Rural Communities: Policy Outcomes in South and Southeast Asia*. India: Sage Publication India.
- Awang, S. A. 2005. *Sejarah Pemikiran Pengelolaan Hutan Indonesia*, Wacana. 20th edition. Yogyakarta: Insist Press.
- Awang, S.A. 2006. *Sosiologi Pengetahuan Deforestasi: Konstruksi Sosial dan Perlawanan*. Yogyakarta: Debut Press.
- Berg, B. L. 1989. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Science*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boediono. 2010. *Ekonomi Indonesia Mau ke Mana?: Kumpulan Esai Ekonomi*. Jakarta: KPG.
- Borras, Saturnino M & Franco, Jennifer C. 2011. *Political Dynamics of Land-Grabbing in Southeast Asia: Understanding Europe's Role*. A report published by Transnational Institute in the context of the Just Trade Project, Netherland.
- Borras, S. M. Franco, Jennifer C. G, Sergio. Cristobal, K & Spoor, M. 2012. "Land Grabbing in Latin America and the Caribbean." *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol.39, No. 3-4 (May).
- Brockhaus, M. et al. 2012. "An Overview of Forest and Land Allocation Policies in Indonesia: Is the Current Framework Sufficient to Meet the Needs of REDD." *Forest Policy and Economics*, Vol.18.
- Chhatre, Ashwini and Agrawal, Arun. 2009. "Trade-offs and Synergies Between Carbon Storage and Livelihood Benefits from Forest Commons." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* Vol. 106, No.42 (October)
- Chowdhury, Shyamal and Yamauchi, Fatoshi. 2010. "Has Decentralization in Indonesia Led to Elite Capture or Reflection of Majority Preference". JICA-RI Working Paper.
- Denzin, N. 1978. *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dutta, D. 2009. "Elite Capture and Corruption: Concepts and Definitions." *National Council of Applied Economic Research*.
- Dwiyanto, A et.al. 2003. *Reformasi Tata Pemerintahan dan Otonomi Daerah*. Yogyakarta: Pusat Studi Kependudukan dan Kebijakan Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Hadiz, V. R. 2005. *Dinamika Kekuasaan: Ekonomi Politik Indonesia Pasca-Soeharto*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Johnstone, Naomi. 2010. "Indonesia in the 'REDD': Climate Change, Indigenous Peoples and Global Legal Pluralism". *Asian-Pacific Law & Policy Journal*, Vol. 12.
- Kadjatmiko. 2008. "Implementing Decentralization: Lessons from Experiences in Indonesia". In Carol J. Pierce Colfer, Ganga Ram Dahal & Doris Capistrano (Eds.) *Lessons from Forest Decentralization: Money, Justice and the Quest for Good Governance in Asia-Pacific*, London: Earthscan.
- Kristiansen, S and Pratikno. 2006. "Decentralising Education in Indonesia". *International Journal of Educational Development*, Vol. 26, No.5 (September).
- Larson, A. M. 2006. "Desentralisasi Demokratis dalam Sektor Kehutanan: Pelajaran dari Afrika, Asia dan Amerika Latin". In Carol J. Pierce Colfer & Doris Capistrano (Ed). *Politik Desentralisasi Hutan, Kekuasaan dan Rakyat: Pengalaman di Berbagai Negara*. Bogor: Center for International Forestry Research.
- Moeliono et al. 2009. *The Decentralization of Forest Governance: Politics, Economics and The Fight for Control of Forest in Indonesia Borneo*. UK: Earthscan.
- Noordwijk et al. 2008. "Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Indonesia: Options and Challenges for Fair and Efficient Payment Distribution Mechanisms". Working Paper. CIFOR: Bogor, Indonesia.
- Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Purwanto, E. A and Sulistyastuti, D.R. 2012. *Implementasi Kebijakan Publik: Konsep dan Aplikasinya di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Gava Media.

- Santoso, I. 2008. "Perjalanan Desentralisasi Pengurusan Sumberdaya Hutan Indonesia". A paper presented in the International Seminar under the theme of Ten Years Along: Decentralization, Land, and Natural Resources in Indonesia on July 15-16, 2008 Universitas Atma Jaya Jakarta.
- Shivakoti, G. P. and Ostrom, E. 2008. "Facilitating Decentralized Policies for Sustainable Governance and Management of Forest Resources in Asia". In Edward L. Webb and Ganesh P. Shivakoti (Ed). Decentralization, Forests and Rural Communities: Policy Outcomes in South and Southeast Asia. India: Sage Publication India.
- Siahaan, N. H. T. 2007. Hutan, Lingkungan dan Paradigma Pembangunan. Jakarta: Pancuran Alam.
- Siswanto, W and Wardoyo, W. 2006. "Desentralisasi Sektor Kehutanan: Pengalaman Indonesia". In Carol J. Pierce Colfer & Doris and Capistrano (eds.) Politik Desentralisasi Hutan, Kekuasaan dan Rakyat: Pengalaman di Berbagai Negara. Bogor: Center for International Forestry Research.
- Simon, H. 2008. Pengelolaan Hutan Bersama Rakyat: Cooperative Forest Management. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Tolo, E. Y. S. 2012. Signifikansi Desentralisasi Kehutanan Bagi Implementasi REDD+ di Kabupaten Maluku Tengah, Jurnal Sosial dan Politik UGM, Vol. 12.
- Tolo, E. Y. S. 2014. Land Grabbing dan Reforma Agraria Indonesia, in Basis magazine, No.01-02, 63th year, Yogyakarta.
- Yin, R. K. 2003. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yonariza and Shivakoti, Ganesh P. 2008. "Decentralization Policy and Revitalization of Local Institutions for Protected Area Co-management in West Sumatra, Indonesia". In Edward L. Webb and Ganesh P. Shivakoti (Ed). Decentralization, Forests and Rural Communities: Policy Outcomes in South and Southeast Asia. India: Sage Publication India.
- Yustika, E. A. 2009. Ekonomi Politik: Kajian dan Analisis Empiris, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.