

7-1-2015

Culture of Control versus the Culture of Resistance in the Case of Control of Forest

Prudensius Maring
pruden_s@stisipwiduri.ac.id

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



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Business Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Maring, P. (2015). Culture of Control versus the Culture of Resistance in the Case of Control of Forest. *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, 19(1), 27-38. <https://doi.org/10.7454/mssh.v19i1.3471>

This Original Research Article is brought to you for free and open access by UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

Culture of Control versus the Culture of Resistance in the Case of Control of Forest

Prudensius Maring

Graduate Programme, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Widuri, Jakarta 12210, Indonesia

E-mail: pruden_s@stisipwiduri.ac.id; pruden_s@yahoo.com

Abstract

The implementation of rights, policy, forest official, and repressive approach by the government shows that the culture of control is applied at forest tenure. This research showed that the application of cultural control by the Government clashed with the interests of local wisdom and socio-economic communities around the forest. The local community have developed strategies and tactics to resist the Government through controlling the land, determining the types of plant, and by implementing community-based forest management system. These resistance strategies and tactics is the manifestation of the socio-economic conditions which are integrated in the community culture. Through the perspective of power (Foucault) and resistance (Scott), this research shows the urgency to put culture and behavior as the focus of an analysis particularly in the midst of a strong influential political ecology perspective. The focus on culture and behavior means that an analysis on controlling culture is not only to discuss the strategy of fulfilling the formal rights of the government, but also to discuss the arrogant, repressive and proud behavior of the government of its authority and power. Equally, the analysis of the culture of resistance does not only discuss the strategy to get the formal rights of the community, but also deliberate on the behavior of the community to implement their strategy quietly, secretly, and while avoiding the forest staff.

Budaya Kontrol versus Budaya Perlawanan pada Kasus Penguasaan Hutan

Abstrak

Penerapan hak-hak, kebijakan, aparat kehutanan, dan pendekatan represif oleh pemerintah memperlihatkan berlakunya budaya kontrol dalam penguasaan hutan. Penelitian ini memperlihatkan bahwa penerapan budaya kontrol oleh pemerintah berbenturan dengan kepentingan sosial-ekonomi dan kearifan lokal masyarakat di sekitar kawasan hutan. Masyarakat lokal membangun strategi dan taktik untuk melawan pemerintah melalui cara menguasai lahan, menentukan jenis tanaman, dan menerapkan sistem pengelolaan hutan berbasis masyarakat. Strategi dan taktik perlawanan tersebut merupakan manifestasi kondisi sosial-ekonomi yang terintegrasi dalam kultur masyarakat. Melalui perspektif kekuasaan (Foucault) dan perlawanan (Scott), penelitian ini memperlihatkan urgensi menempatkan aspek kebudayaan dan perilaku sebagai fokus analisis di tengah kuatnya pengaruh perspektif politik ekologi. Fokus pada aspek kebudayaan dan perilaku bermakna bahwa analisis budaya kontrol tidak hanya mendiskusikan strategi pemenuhan hak formal pemerintah, tetapi juga mendiskusikan aspek perilaku pemerintah yang bersifat arogan, represif, dan bangga pada otoritas. Analisis budaya perlawanan pun tidak hanya mendiskusikan strategi pemenuhan hak formal masyarakat, tetapi juga mendiskusikan perilaku masyarakat dalam menjalankan strategi secara diam-diam, sembunyi-sembunyi, dan menghindari petugas kehutanan.

Keywords: culture of control, culture of resistance; relation of power, local community, state-forest tenure

Citation:

Maring, P. (2015). Culture of control versus the culture of resistance in the case of control of forest. *Makara Hubs-Asia*, 19(1): 27-38. DOI: 10.7454/mssh.v19i1.3471

1. Introduction

This paper is intended to clarify the relationship between the culture of control used by government

against the culture of resistance conducted by the community regarding state forest tenure. The government's control over the state forest started from the territorialism process, which is a process of

regulating the community and the natural resources within the particular zones and setting up rules of operation (Vandergeest, 1996). Forest territorialism in Indonesia is seen by the way the region and forest area zonation are governed according to its function and specific management procedure. This mechanism includes the establishment of a temporary pal limit, establishing a definite pal limit and creation of a map on the delineation of the forest area including news endorsement on zonation limits (Contreras-Hermosilla & Fay, 2006). Territorialism is not a merely a technical forestry affairs because this process also organizes and controls the community. This phenomenon is like a picture of *governmentality* as an effort of setting up and directing the behavior of society, which is done in different ways by a variety of actors beyond the conservation and community development agenda in Central Sulawesi (Foucault in Li, 2007).

Peluso's study (2006) in Java shows that the government position themselves as owners, managers, and rulers in the management of the forest. Forest management policy shows that government's authority over forests must be evident, i.e. which are forested areas and which are for the community. The government claims authority over forest areas and determines the orientation of forest management systems. There is only be a singular control over the forests and this is concentrated on forestry bureaucrats. As a result, the forestry institution has forestry staff, forest field officers, foreman's and forest rangers who are tasked in enforcing rules and arresting residents who break the rules. The community may only utilize the forest when the authorities are willing to engage them. Such a picture solidifies Peluso's view about strong cultural control in forests tenure in Java.

The implications of the application of state-based forest management system are visible in the social conflict phenomenon and its resistance. An analysis of conflicts deriving from forests control in Indonesia shows that within the years 1997-2003 the conflicts are always between the community against government and business people (Wulan *et al.*, 2004). Vertical style conflict between society against the corporations and government often develops into a horizontal inter society conflict. An analysis of the relationship between local communities and companies in Sumatra shows that the presences of companies which are profit-oriented affect the changes in the behavior of the society in forest management. Exploitative behavior on local communities could be triggered by the behavior of companies that misuse large scale forest resources for economic orientation (Maring, 2013c; Maring, 2014). An analysis of the management of State forests in Java shows that the rise of resistance within a village community is a response against the controlling dominance the forest by state-owned enterprises (Santoso, 2004).

Systems analysis of natural resource-based control state is based on two ways of view (*perspective*) to the contrary. *First*, the analysis refers to the approach of *political ecology* and *political economy* who criticized the failure of the system of State-based natural resource management. The State enforces its authority by way of ignoring the rights of the community. This approach rejects the notion that environmental damage due to the low level of public awareness, lack of education, population density, and weak community wisdom. Environmental damage could not be seen as a phenomenon is a-political (Bryant & Bailey, 1997). *Secondly*, the analysis refers to resource scarcity approach to the environment (*environmental scarcity*) that sees population growth as a factor in the causes of the degradation of renewable natural resources (Hartmann in Peluso & Watts, 2001). The implications of resource scarcity approach are the emergence of justification against the strengthening of Government control in the management of natural resources, including its control over society.

The implications of the two approaches mentioned above are seen in the analysis of conflict control of forests has a two-way (bi-polar) characteristic. The conflict is seen as a two-way contradiction in which the Government and the community are facing each other. *Environmental scarcity*-approach scientists put the community as the source of the problem. In contrast, *political ecology* researchers do not put the conflict as an open process that could put the community as the cause of environmental damage (Maring, 2010a). In the analysis of social conflict in Indonesia and the re-orientation of social sciences, Mallarangeng (2000) stated that the usual social movement activists are positioning the community as the underdog and non-problematic (*the innocence party*). In the context of control of natural resources, the attitudes and positions taken by activists and researchers are seen as a response towards the controlling power of the government over the natural resources.

The above description depicts a strong influence of the political approach in the study of ecological problems. On the other hand, study ecological problems are less steeped in cultural and behavioral aspects expressed actors in natural resource control. The cultural aspect is only placed implied and secondary in the study of ecological problems (Saif, 2007: critical views presented during the study). Study on control of natural resources that takes into account cultural aspects seen in the analysis of resistance (*resistance*) which runs farmers. Model analysis of resistance continue to experience a change of focus analysis on resistance are confrontational, toward an analysis that sees resistance as a subculture of society (Scott, 1985), and appears as a resistance that puts the analysis of strategies of power (Abu-Lughod, 1989). Although there is a change of

analytical focus on the resistance there is however still criticisms thrown at each other among the researchers in the amendment process which has given the impression that the selected approach is still partial and not mutually accommodating.

Starting from a strong *political ecology* perspective and limited cultural analysis, this paper tries to bridge these gaps by referring to these two perspectives: *firstly*, the perspective of Scott's resistance (1985) which views resistance as a cultural phenomenon that communities undergo through strategies and tactics as part of a subculture of a society. *Secondly*, the dynamic power perspective by Foucault (1980) who viewed power as a process of influencing each other mutually to achieve their purpose. These strategies and tactics can be run by different parties, from different directions, and from various levels. This view could be a framework to explain how the government, communities, and NGOs, influenced mutually and negotiate with each other to realize its objectives on their hold of the forest. Foucault's power perspective opens integrating ways in seeing the cultural control phenomena and that of cultural resistance in one unit of analysis (*Foucault: Where there is power, there is resistance*). The integration of both perspectives is intended to open a discussion about the relationship between government's behaviors through cultural control versus the behavior of the community through cultural resistance.

Based on above description, therefore the research question that was analyzed is how is the relationship between the implementation of the culture of control against the culture of resistance in terms of forest tenure? The culture of control is related to the behavior of a government and the culture of resistance is related to the behavior of the community. Based on the research question, this paper aims to: (1) analyze the strategies and tactics that are implemented by the government in controlling the forest and the community. (2) Analyze the strategies and tactics that are implemented by the society in responding to government's control. (3) Analyze the contributions and the theoretical-methodology constraints.

2. Methods

This research refers to a qualitative-inductive work flow which emphasizes the importance of an empirical fact construction to explain the inter phenomenon relationship as the foundation of the construction theory. The main method applied for data retrieval is through in-depth interview and involving participatory observations (Creswell, 2010). Both of these methods are amplified through the recording of interviews and photographs. In-depth interview methods were used to extract meanings of a variety of events and phenomena experienced by the community. Data and contextual

information were retrieved progressively (Vayda, 1983; Winarto, 2006). The interview process is carried out flexibly. Targeted questions are asked based on one aspect to another aspect and while having a view on the relationship between one aspect and the other aspects. Interviews about the strategies and tactics that are implemented by the Government are always analyzed to see the connections between theirs versus the strategies and tactics carried out by the society. For in-depth data and understanding the meaning of events that occurred within the community the triangulation methodology was applied. Triangulation was done by exploring the same data through different methods or by feeding the same data to different informants. Objects that are explored through involved observational methods are the management of the gardens/ fields, application of land technology processing, crop selection, the forestry projects proofs and pal forest area boundary.

The informants used as sources of data retrieval consisted of community leaders, indigenous leaders, and community members, officials from governmental agencies as the local/regional Forestry department, the Regional Development Planning Board, the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD), and non-governmental organizations (NGOS) activists. The process of choosing the informants was made through a rolling mechanism from the society towards other informants (snowball mechanism) which are associated with the data and information needed. The point of entry of data/information retrieval starts from the village/hamlet. Based on the results of interviews with the society, outside informants from outside of the village that has a direct relation to the event or situation were identified. Each event in the village/hamlet is always related with the roles of the outside parties such as officials from the governmental agencies, as well as NGO activists. Informants from the government interviewed included the Head of Department of Forestry, forest officials and forest rangers that were involved in the process of determining the state forest boundaries. Informants from the NGO are those that were still active and had become a member of the Parliament. The obstacle faced during the field research is the fact that the informants did not open up and were cautious in providing information, particularly from the community. This is caused by a long-lasting conflict. The solution to fix this problem is to combine a combination of application methods and by explaining the purpose of the research and provide information on the identity of the researcher.

The analysis has begun since the field research phase. Any data or information obtained from the in-depth interviews and observations resulted in written field notes. The process of writing the field notes is part of the analysis process. Through the process, researchers can determine whether the obtained data-information are

sufficient or need to be further explored. The data collected day-to-day are then analyzed to see their relationships and interconnectedness with each other. Through this process the researcher can then determine whether the data collected are adequate or there needs to be further action done. Data or information that has not been in depth explored is sought for clarification to the informant. A post research field analysis is done through the process of identifying data, sorting data, and preparation of data within the framework of the corresponding theme and argumentative framework analysis (Creswell, 2010)

The data source for this paper comes from the field research undertaken during 4 months in mid-2007 and field research for two months in mid-2012. The Field research took place within the Lerokloang community, in the village of Houday, Tanaloran, Flores. Data collection was conducted at the level of the village, district, and the region. The site selection research was based on limited studies that are similar outside of Java to see the forestry tenure in forest management decentralization policy setting.

3. Results and Discussion

Socio-economic background of the society. The community Lerokloang as the focus of the analysis resides in the village of Houday, one of the 22 villages in the forest of Noge. The Lerokloang community is the natives of Houday village who originally lived in the village in the forest area. Aafter the colonialization by the Dutch, the government established Noge forest as a state forest in 1932, whereby the village of Lerokloang still remains in the forest area. The Lerokloang community were forced to leave the forest area in 1960, when there is an expansion of the state forest area by the government. The Lerokloang community consists of several tribes with the largest tribe being Wodon. The role of chiefs and community leaders are still significant at the community level. During conflicts, the community agreed to establish a one-door line of communication. All public affairs related Lerokloang are put on the table and sought a consensus. In addition, a specified role or person to conduct all external related affairs. This internal agreement on one side is protecting the community while on the other hand makes it difficult of external parties to make an intervention.

The Lerokloang society around the forest system and Noge area abide by the local rules on the control of natural resources. In terms of the utilization of natural resources, there are two local concepts that are embraced by the community. *First*, the concept of *Opi dun dunan Curry* which set about areas that should not be managed or planted by the community, and must on the contrary be protected. *Secondly*, the concept of *Opi dun taden Curry* which sets areas that could be

selectively maintained (Maring, 2010a; LBH, 2004). In addition to these two main concepts, there are 12 local concepts that regulate in detail the management of natural resources (Metzner, 1982). There is a customary character called *Tana puan* (indigenous land ruler) and *Two moan watu pitu* (Indigenous Council and community leaders) that control and overview the enforcement of the rules in every area of the village. As Joint Chiefs and community leaders in the area of the village, *Tana puan* organize ceremonies and set the ground rules on the utilization of natural resources. *Two moan watu pitu* is an institution which consists of indigenous men and women who were involved in dispute resolution at the level of the village. Since early 2000, the role of indigenous people in forest tenure experienced revitalization. The revitalization was carried out by NGOS at the district level who received network support at the national level. This process is in response to the strong influence of the government's authority in forest management. The regional government responds to the revitalization efforts by carrying out identification and curbing the role of indigenous people and indigenous institutional.

Lerokloang community interactions with forest area can be seen in the socio-economic and cultural context. Culturally, the symbol of the old village and the traditional ceremony of *Watu mahe* (stone offerings or offerings to the ancestors) is in the forest area Noge. Under the socio-economic context, the Noge forest area is where the community are able to look for income. Most of the arable land is located in the community forest area with an average of 2.5 Ha per household, while the arable land area outside the average forest area is of 0.5 Ha per household.

The above socio-economic background is the underlying decisions and behavior of society Lerokloang in responding to government control in forest tenure. The dynamics of relationship behavior is control and behavior of the resistance was seen in a series of special actions or behavior of the apparatus of Government and the community. A series of actions or behavior that can be seen in these events and happenings (*trajectories*) were experienced by the community. In the context of this paper, the action or behavior is seen in Genesis and the State forest management events, namely: (1) Construction of behavior occurred in the process of determination of the boundaries of the State forest area on top of the area that had been controlled by the community through customary system. (2) Construction of behavior occurred in the process of implementation of the Government strategy as a forestry project in controlling the forest and the community. (3). in the process of applying the behavior of Construction Project of non-utilized community forestry as a weapon against government control.

Behavior control versus resistance on the process of determination of the boundaries of State forest. The implementation of state-based forest management started from the initial appointment until the nomination of the state forest area. The establishment of Noge forest area into a state forest started from the colonialization of the Dutch until the independency of Indonesia. In 1929, the community living in and around the Noge forest was approached by forestry officials. They were asked to surrender the area which was previously managed by traditional customs system so that it would be able to called state forest. This initiation did not cause any rejection from the community because this idea was according to their local wisdom. The forest area Noge was initiated into a state forest that includes the *Opi dun kare duman* area which was guarded by the community as a protected area. In addition the village area and agriculture area which were located inside the state forest was freed from the state forest area and were still owned by the community. In 1932 the initiation of Noge forest was established as a state forest area with an area of 8100 Ha (the Regional Forestry NTT, 1997; Maring, 2010a).

During the Independence era, the boundaries of Noge forest were brought up again for discussion. In the mid-1950s, the state through their forestry officials conducted an expansion of Noge forest area. The officials opened roads surrounding Noge forest. This road includes the *Opi dun kare taden* area that was regulated under the community's custom as an area that allowed cultivation activities. The community was suspicious of the forestry officials' actions because the road included the cultivation area. The community asked the reason for the road. However the forestry officials said that the road will function as control road towards the forest area. Initially, this statement was accepted by the community and they allowed the opening of the road. However, in its development, there were stakes being planted within the forest boundaries. This made the community more suspicious and they protested to the forestry officials. Finally the forestry officials stated that the boundaries 'pal' (several rocks in which their coordinates were already inputted) along the road are the new boundaries for Noge forest.

The new forest area boundary in Noge forest area implies that (1) there is no recognition from the colonial government regarding the liberation of the villages and farms with the state forest. 2) The *Opi dun kare taden* cultivation is included in the state area forest. To protect the new boundaries the forestry officials forced the community out of the forest area. The Lerokloang community as the traditional leader was also subject to this expulsion. In 1960s the Lerokloang community residents went out of the forest area. Initially their leaders were still inside, however through negotiations with the forestry officials in 1968 the leaders agreed to go out of the forest area as long as their traditional

houses were not destroyed. The community thought that under the reasoning of the traditional housing, they would have a reason to enter the state forest area. Therefore they would have the opportunity to control the traditional house and conduct their traditional ritual during *Wahe mahe* inside the state forest area.

Within the year 1960-1980 the relation between the forestry officials with the community took place under tense condition. The forestry officials in the field level known as the forest rangers destroyed the gardens, burnt houses, seized agricultural equipment's, and killed the cattle's that belonged to the community. The community that had a plantation in the forest area were caught and thrown into jail. The forest rangers became figures that were feared by the community. Even so, the actions were repeated and that finally drove confrontations between the community surrounding the Noge forest area who had lost their patience and the forest officials. There were two confrontation incidents that the community remembered. In 1976 a widespread news came to the community that a forest ranger became a victim of an attack conducted by the community. Even though this forest ranger was feared by the community. In 1978 there was also a rumor about a forest ranger that was beaten up by the community because of his violent actions.

In the early 1980s the forestry officials intensively watched over the new borders of Noge forest. In 1982/1983 the officials of the forest boundaries conducted a measurement of the state forest. The presence of this officer is part of the TGHK implementation program that were conducted nationally. On 12 December 1984 the road became the new boundaries of the Noge forest area with an area of 19456 Ha. Compared to the boundaries in 1932 there is an increase of ca. 11000 Ha that derived from the plantations owned by the community. After that time there were dualisms in the forest boundaries. One was the boundaries in 1932 (since colonial era) and second the one was the boundaries set in 1984 (after the independence). Since 1990 NGO activities worked together with the communities to acclaim the 1932 boundaries. Open demonstrations requested that the boundaries are returned to the 1932 boundaries were often conducted. Behind these protests the Lerokloang community conducted their resistance strategy to take control over the forest. This resistance strategy was conducted silently and by avoiding the authorities. This was done by planting multipurpose tree species on the forest fields without any permission and without prior notification to the forestry officials. The community also avoided and rejected to see directly the forestry officials when they were making the rounds in the forest area.

This repressive approach by the forestry officials was not successful to stop the community to plant in the

forest area. The limited numbers of staff were easily tricked by the community. As explained previously, even though since 1960 the Lerokloang community had been expelled from the forest area, they still continued to plan on their fields and gardens inside the forest. After they planted rice, corn, etc. the community planted annually harvested plants. These fields then are converted into gardens and also worked by the community without the knowledge of the forestry officials. The garden that were managed by the community since 1960 were found out by the authorities in 1995 when they were making evaluation in the villages through participatory rural appraisal (PRA) to prepare for the forestry project.

This empirically realistic picture depicts the control behavior vs resistance behavior on the initiation stage of the state forest area and show a dynamic control relation. The actions by the forestry officials in line with the legal and formal regulation did not occur under an empty space. Each action that was conducted by the forestry officials always triggered a response and resistance from the community. Before 1950s even though the colonial government had a wide impact such as a change of land use from the community into a state forest, this was however accepted by the community. This was because the community valued the management system of the state forest as equal to their protected area customs rules *Opi dun kare dunan* area. When the expansion of the forest became apparent, by expelling the community including destroying properties, the community went into an 'avoidance and hidden' strategy. However this repressive action by the forestry rangers took its peak when the community challenged the authorities into physical fights.

Behavior control versus resistance on the process of intervention projects in forestry. After the boundaries of the state forest the forestry projects entered the Noge forest area. The ideal aim of this project is to preserve forest areas. A forestry project is a symbol of power for the government. The government determines where the location of the project, who may be involved in the project, and how to manage the funds of the project. Through forestry projects, forestry authorities determine the pattern of the relationship with the community. Forestry- and non-forestry projects are beneficial on one side, but on the other hand brought also additional problems to the community. The perceived benefits is the community are able to work on the projects earn their income. The project also provides opportunities to strengthen land tenure claims. By planting in state forest area, it shows that the land falls under the power of the community. The community develops a good relationship with the forestry officials so that the project enters their village. However the existence of the project at Noge forest also brought in a bad influence to the society (Maring, 2010a).

In 1984 reforestation projects (reforestation of damaged forest area) came into the Woods Noge. The project is managed by the Forestry department. The field officer determined the region of Haeretea as the location of the project. This was the only information that the Lerokloang community knew of the project. After they knew the existence of the project, they wanted to work as laborer's into the projector because of the location of the project was close to their village. However, the officer ignored the wishes of the Lerokloang community. The field officers brought in outside laborers from outside of the village that had good connections with the field officers. Because of the distance, these outside laborers built temporary housing and brought in their family to live in the project site. The workers received daily salary and were cultivating plans in the project sites for 2-5 years. These laborers were planting multipurpose tree species and this thus became a problem after the reforestation project because the workers continued to live on the project sites because they needed to take care of the plants. They even established a residency that was then called Haereta village.

In 1991-1993 the ABRI Manunggal Reforestation (AMR) project entered again the same location. This AMR project strengthened the position of community living in the village Haereta (the previous project labor) because in addition to being involved in labor project, they can grow food and plant trees because of this project. The community of Lerokloang protested to the village chief and the Head of the Forestry department and requested that the project site is relocated, but this protest was not successful. This situation angered the Lerokloang community. The Lerokloang community claimed that the project location is their ancestor's and traditional grounds. They requested that the Haereta community exits the forest area because they do not have the local custom or traditional powers over those lands. In early 1990 the Forestry department ignored this agreement. Because the forestry department did not take this protest seriously, tension raised between the Lerokloang communities with the Haeretea community. In 1997 an open conflict with physical fights occurred and had to be mediated by the police.

Since that event, the two sides often engage in open confrontation and demonstrations demanding a settlement to government (cq. Governors, legislators Department of Forestry). An overview of the forestry project's presence brings bad implications in public life above shows the Government's half-hearted behavior in conflict resolution. NGO activists at the district level pointed out that the government deliberately created a horizontal conflict between indigenous peoples and the new residents. The government deliberately conducted a project to divert the problem of dualism on the borders of the Noge forest area. Forestry projects deliberately were tasked to break the bonds of the history of

indigenous peoples with the forested areas of the country. Finally, the government were busy to mediate a horizontal inter society conflict and ignored the community's and NGO's activities request regarding the forest boundaries and to cancel the new boundaries and replace it with the boundaries of 1932 (LBH Nusra, 2004).

In 1996/1997 the Lerokloang community received a reforestation project. In contrast to the above cases, the project is implemented on the arable land of the Lerokloang community which is located in the state forest area. This gave rise to different strategies and tactics from the community to ensure that the project fails and to sue this project to strengthen their claim on the control over the state forest. The project has already ruled what kind of plants were to be planted such as acacia plants and eucalyptus plants. However, the community there was planting fruit trees such as mango, jackfruit, coconut and food plants such as rice and corn. They did not reject the plants that were chosen by the project but they made sure that the plants were not able to grow.

This action to trick the field officers is quite simple. Ahead of the monitoring takes performed by the field officer the head of the group would show certain resistance action. The farmers involved in the reforestation project would pull out plants they did not like, break of the roots and plant them back in the field. When the field project officer conducts their monitoring task, it would seem like the plant is growing. But during the next scheduled monitoring the field officer would found out that the plant has died. This action by the community was only found out later by the project officer. Domide, one of the project officers, stated: "The first time I went to control the reforestation site, the plant was growing and looked health. But when I came back, the acacia plant and eucalyptus plant were dying. I think this was caused by the leader of the group who was brave enough to take a different action against the forestry department. It is also hard for the field officers to give sanctions. The period and their interaction with the community made it difficult for the field forestry officers to give sanctions to the community as this would cut off their cooperation with the community. (Maring, 2010b).

Behavior Control versus resistance to the process of non-forestry project interventions. Non-forestry project even has entered Noge forest. This project was used by the Lerokloang community to realize their goal in controlling the state forest area. According to the forest regulation, non-forestry project are not allowed to be implemented inside the state forest area. Therefore, the existence of this non-forestry project inside a state forest is a contradiction in the field. The main problem was determining the project location. There are two non-forestry projects that were supposed to be located outside the forest area; however the Lerokloang community tried to influence the authorities to have the

project just within the boundaries of the state forest. The clueless non-forestry project officers were not informed specifically where the boundaries of the state forest were and therefore was easily duped. The community also tried to influence the project officer to pinpoint the project location within the state forest area. Below is one non-forestry case that was used by the community as a proof over their claim over the state forest area (Maring, 2010a).

First, the case of the estates project. In 1982, there was a rejuvenation and rehabilitation project and the expansion of plants for export commodity (PRPTE) that entered Lerokloang. The coconut plantation project promised land certificates to the community. Therefore, the project was met with great enthusiasm by the Lerokloang community. The information about this plantation project was heard by a community leader working at the administrative office in Houday. The road infrastructure became one of the prerequisites in determining the location of the plantation project. The community leader then led the community to repair the road leading to the location that was targeted as the project site. The efforts of the community succeeded, from a total of 61 projects with an area of 61 Ha at Lerokloang, 15 Ha in it was located inside the forest state area. The plantation project officer were not aware of the boundaries of the state forest were easily tricked by the community. Once the officer completed the measurement, and started to determine the boundaries and equipment to start the cultivation. After the coconut plants aged around 6 years, preparation was made for the land certification. Only at this stage was it then known by the project officer that some the project sites were inside the state forest area.

As a result, the process of land certification of the plantation stopped. The community stated that the determination of the location of project plantation in the state forested areas is due to different understanding between the community and the government. The community are basing themselves on the areas that were given by their parents. The community finds that it is the fault of the government because they are the authority which has the forest area map. After this incident, the Plantation and Garden agency coordinated with the forestry authorities to clarify the status of the sites. The project officer cancelled the certificate but the harvest was to be given to the community. The community did not regret being involved in this project because they intended to use this project as a strategy to ensure the control claim over the foist area through a legal approach which is the government's project.

Second, the case of Independent Non-governmental Resettlement Project (TSM). This project evolved from a previous activity entitled PRA in 1995. Through PRA, the Lerokloang community proposed local transmigration

projects the Provincial Forestry Department of NTT. People who still lived in the forest area were willing to be relocated as long as there was a location and also enough infrastructures to build houses outside the forest area. In 1997 this community request was answered through the TSM project. This project was used by the community to strengthen their claim over the state forest area. The Lerokloang community sees an opportunity to strengthen their control claim over the forest through the TSM project because one of the aims of the project is to conduct land certification for the TSM participants. The implementation of the project was under the Resettlement and Infrastructure regional agency (Kimpraswil) at the provincial level. When the TSM project started, the community tried again to influence the project officer so that his location of the TSM project was inside the state forest.

This unawareness was misused by the community in the process of determination of the location of the TSM project. The society influenced the project officer to choose specified locations that are inside forest area. The community at that time was successful in their endeavor because all TSM locations are inside the state forest areas. The strategy was only known by the authorities when they were about to issue the certificate. Finally the certification process of 200 Ha of land for the location of TSM had to be stopped. For the community of Lerokloang however, even though it cannot yet produce a TSM certificate, it only strengthens their claims over the control of the state forest area. Nowadays, houses within the TSM are not being questioned by the authorities. In fact, most of those houses were even renovated and built into a permanent state. The chief of the community still has his hands on a map of the project location, TSM-yards, and allocation of arable land per family participants of TSM. Throughout 2012, there was an increase of population and settlements within the forest area that more public facilities were built to meet the needs of the community.

Construction of the culture of control versus the culture of resistance. The results of this research show that forest governance has become an arena for control culture and of cultural resistance. The application of cultural control by the government is seen during the territorialism process of the state forest area, in forestry projects, through the intervention and enforcement of rules to control the community's involvement in the development of the forest. During the initial stage of determining the state forest process, the forestry authorities accommodated the value system that was embraced by the local community. Areas designated as state forest were adjusted according to the *Opin dun dunan Curry* which in the past had been recognized by the community as an area to be protected and where there is a prohibition of agricultural cultivation activities. Such an accommodating approach resulted

positively and had the community's acceptance of the concept of state forest. The community then gave over their custom land to be designated as a part of the state forest. During the independence era, since the 1950s, the process of regulating the state forest area was based on the authority of the government as the decision maker and forest managers. The Government tried to expand the state forest area by taking over and incorporating the *Opi dun taden Curry* area that was managed the community as part of the state forest. This shows a cultural construction that is based on the government's control that is moved by the aim to control the forest and also the community. This phenomenon depicted the territorialism aim it (Vandergeest, 1996), that is relevant to Foucault's view on *governmentality* as an effort that is made by conducting briefings is done by a series of ways that have been calculated in such a way by the Government and other actors (Foucault in Li, 2007).

The application of culture controls in the mastery of the forest can be seen through the implementation of policies, programs, and projects in forestry. Through reforestation projects, the Government has manifested the state's forest land status. The government's control over the project started when the location of the project was chosen. This process became the momentum for the officer to ensure the status of the forest area of the country. With an influx of reforestation projects within the area, it means the community is aware and recognizes the status of the state forest area because reforestation projects were only conducted in state forests area. Through the reforestation project, the government showed his power in determining the types of trees to be planted in the area of reforestation projects. The community was to follow to the choice of the kind of trees that have been chosen to be planted. The reforestation project has also become a means for the Government to control the involvement of labor. In order to be selected as a laborer involved in the reforestation projects, the community must build good relations with the forestry staff at the field level. Horizontal conflict at Noge forest is a result of poor recruitment of labor projects. Forestry officers bring in labor from outside the village and the neglect of the local workforce. This strategy placed by the government is intended to sever the historical ties between the Lerokloang community and their natural resource (LBH Nusra, 2004; Maring, 2010a).

This research showed that the construction of the community culture of resistance is the result of the community's response to the application of cultural control by the government. The types of resistance shown by the community depend on the strategies and tactics that are run by the Government. The community would actively update their goal formulation based on this. After the establishment of the state forest in 1984,

the Lerokloang community changed their pattern of confrontational strategy toward a pattern of quiet and veiled resistance. The community uses the forestry projects to strengthen their claims over the forest land and plants. They would try to trick the officials into planting economically beneficial plants and to kill the project plants that would have been useful for the forest. The community would also pinpoint the project locations within the state forest area so that they could obtain a certificate over the forest land areas. This picture shows that Government-run control culture gets a response from the public through a distinctive strategy and tactics. It also showed mutual-related and mutual influences between the Government-run strategies with community-run strategy.

The important thing within the frame of the resistance by the community given as a culture is seen by the basic targeted formulation. When the communities are providing resistance and this is seen as a culture, this culture is driven by a goal to become the real rulers of the state forest area. The community will aim to fulfil that goal by planting inside the state forest lands, determining the types of crops that can be harvested – mostly fruit trees, they will come and go inside the state forest area freely to care for the plants, and by limiting the influence of the other party. This has been proven by looking at the annual harvest produced in their gardens. On the other hand, the community strengthens their identity through the revitalization and strengthening of the values of the traditional ceremony to depict how close the relationship is between society and the natural environment. A combination of initiatives, provision of evidence of their work, and the integration of traditional values within the society show that the selection of the strategies and tactics are used to try to make the other party to obey them. Such strategies and tactics can be run by different parties, from different directions, and from various levels. This view could be a framework to explain how the government, communities, and NGOs, mutually influence each other and negotiate to realize its objectives in the control of the forest. On the other hand, the dynamic power perspective also viewed that the relationship of power, conflict, resistance (Foucault, 1980), and collaboration (Maring, 2010a) is a phenomenon that cannot be separated from each other. This view could be a framework to conduct further analysis on integrated cultural control practices against the government and the cultural resistance that are run by the society. The reason is because the events and phenomenon that occur are taking place at the same place with the same people when it comes to fighting over the control of the forest.

4. Conclusions

The results of this research show that the control of forest areas is a relation of power involving the government,

the community, and NGOs who gave birth to the control culture and cultures of resistance. These issues include possessing the knowledge on the territorialism process of forest area of the region, the implementation of forest management policies, the implementation of forestry projects, cultural practices and control over society. The process is not just merely technical forestry matters because in reality this has caught the interests of many parties such as local communities, immigrant communities, labor projects, forestry officials at field level, local government, central government, and NGO activists. Those processes that used to be seen merely as technical forestry affairs, has given rise to a lot of social problems such as conflicts and resistance which involves many parties interested in forest control.

The government put themselves as the ruler of the forest. The government sets its rights in the form of rights to land, the right to control trees, the rights to control laborers, and the rights to apply a system of forest management. For the realization of their rights, the Government implements the policy, runs the project, and deploys the forestry authorities to enforce repressive rules. Such things reveal the cultural controls that are run by the Government. The application of a control culture clash with the interests of local wisdom and socio-economic integrated in the culture of communities around the forest. Active community will then construct a cultural resistance in response to the government's application of control culture. The community will build resistance strategies and tactics by means of controlling the land, determining the types of plants, controlling community-based forest management, and by revitalizing indigenous values that they adhered to. Such things reveal the culture of resistance that is run by the community.

The perspective of power and resistance opens up the inspiration to explain the empirical reality on the control over the forest. The theoretical implication of this paper is to contribute to the analysis of the forest through in-depth understanding of the problem and emphasizing discussion based on the cultural- and behavioral aspects of the actors involved in the control of the forest. Analysis on the control culture of Government over the forests does not only look at the strategies and tactics in fulfilling the formal rights and authorities of the government, but also to look at the arrogant and repressive behaviors of the authorities that occur in the process. Likewise, the analysis of the culture of resistance should not just look at the response in its effort to demand that the formal rights of the community are observed, but also to see the changes in the behavior of the community in carrying out strategies and tactics secretly, in a hidden manner, by misleading officers, and by avoiding the forest authorities.

The process of research and analysis show that integrating the concept of power and resistance to

explain the empirical facts are dynamic and vary should be dealt with in a more coherent manner, both at the concept level and during the design method of field research. At the level of concepts, Foucault's view of cultural integration opens up opportunities to integrate controls and a culture of resistance in a single-entity analysis. However, to realize such integration requires translation and simplification in the field of research methods that are effective and practical. On the level of implementation, the obstacles encountered in field research is that the attitudes of the informants be it from the society, government, and NGO activists, as a result of a long-lasting conflict. To fix the issue would require a carefully prepared method, flexibility in applying the methods, and understanding the socio-economic issues by researchers.

The results of this research has not used in-depth behavioral perspective, hence in the future necessary analysis that specifically uses the perspective of behavior to explain the relationship between culture and cultural control of resistance as well as the implications that arise are recommended

Acknowledgement

Thanks to Prof. Dr. Achmad Fedyani Saif, Dr. Iwan Tjitradjaja, Dr. Suraya a. Afiff who advise reinforcement theory, methods, and analysis of this research. Thanks to the *anonymous reviewers* who have given advice through a process of *peer-review* this article.

References

- Abu-Lughod, L. (1990). The romance of resistance: Tracing transformations of power through Bedouin women. *Princeton University. American Ethnologist*, 7(1), 41-55.
- Barbalet, J.M. (1985). Power and resistance. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 36(4), 531-548. Accessed on August 20, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/590330>.
- Bryant, R.L. (1993). Forest problem in colonial Burma: Historical variations on contemporary themes. *Global Ecology and Biogeography Letters*, 3(4/6), 122-137.
- The political ecology of Southeast Asian forest: Transdisciplinary discourses (Jul-Sept-Nov, 1993)*, Accessed on August 20, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2997765>.
- Bryant, R.L., & Bailey, S. (1997). *Third world political ecology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chaudhuri, B. (1991). Forest, forest development and community participation. *Indian Anthropologist*, 21(1), 9-16. Accessed on August 20, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41919634>.
- Chrysantini, P. (2010). Di balik panggung reforma agraria: Perjuangan tersembunyi Perempuan Tani. *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia*, 31(3), 185-199.
- Contreras-Hermosilla, A., & Fay, C. (2006). *Memperkokoh pengelolaan hutan Indonesia melalui pembaharuan penguasaan tanah: Permasalahan dan tindakan*. Bogor: World Agroforestry Center.
- Creswell, J.W. (2010). *Research design: Pendekatan kualitatif, kuantitatif, dan mixed*. Edisi Indonesia. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Dewa, R. (1993). Perubahan pranata pengelolaan lahan pada komunitas peladang di Nusa Tenggara Timur: Kasus Lio dan Iwanggete di Flores. *Jurnal Ekologi Manusia Indonesia*. 1(1), 37-57.
- Dimiyati, I.S. (2004). Jeprut: perlawanan terhadap hegemoni kekuasaan. *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia*, 28(75), 79-100.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (2003). *The essential Foucault: Selections from essential works of Foucault 1954-1984*. Edited by Paul Robison and Nicolas Rose. New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *Pengetahuan dan metode: Karya-karya penting Foucault*. Yogyakarta: Adipura.
- Given, M. (2002). Maps, fields, and boundary cairns: Demarcation and resistance in colonial Cyprus. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 6(1), 1-22. Accessed on August 20, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20852985>.
- Grieshaber, S. (1997). Mealtime rituals: Power and resistance in the construction of mealtime rules. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 48(4), 649-666. Accessed on August 20, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/591601>.
- Hartmann, J. (2003). Power and resistance in the Later Foucault. *Presented at the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Foucault Circle. John Carroll University, Cleveland, OH, February 28th – March 2nd, 2003*. http://mypage.siu.edu/harmanjr/pdf/jh_fouccir_03/pdf. Accessed: 09-04-2015.
- Kipnis, A. (2003). The anthropology of power and Maoism. *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 105, No. 2 (Jun, 2003), pp. 278-288). Published by: Wiley. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3567502>. Accessed: 20-08-2014 07:46 UTC.
- Koning, R.D., et al. (2008). *Forest-related conflict: Impact, links, and measures to mitigate*. Washington DC: Rights and Resources Initiative.

- Lan, T.J. (2009). Teori dan praktek dalam studi konflik di Indonesia. *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia*, 1, 28-40.
- LBH Nusra (2004). *Gambaran umum tentang penyelesaian konflik hutan melalui pendekatan multipihak di Kabupaten Sikka. Sebuah laporan program kerjasama LBH Nusra dengan DFID-MFP*. Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Nusa Tenggara.
- Lemke, T. (2000). Foucault, governmentality, and critique. *Paper presented at the Rethinking Marxism Conference, University of Amherst (MA)*, September 21-24 2000. Accessed on April 9, 2015 from <http://www.thomaslemkeweb.de/publication>. Accessed: 09-04-2015.
- Li, T.M. (2007). *The will to improve: Governmentality, development, and the practice of politics*. United States: Duke University Press.
- Li, T.M. (2001). Masyarakat adat, difference, and the limits of recognition in Indonesia's zone. *Modern Asia Studies*, 35, 645-676. Accessed on April 9, 2015 from <https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/>.
- Li, T. (2001). Relational histories and the production of difference on Sulawesi's upland frontier. *Journal of Asian Studies* 60(1), 41-66. Accessed on April 9, 2015 from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/2659504>.
- Lohmann, L. (1993). Land, power and forest colonization in Thailand. *Global Ecology and Biogeography Letters*, 3(4/6), 138-157. Accessed on August 20, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2997768>.
- Lubis, Z.B. (2005). Menumbuhkan (kembali) kearifan lokal dalam pengelolaan sumberdaya alam di Tapanuli Selatan. *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia*, 29(3), 239-254.
- Manki, M.A. (2003). Power, subjectivity and strategies of resistance: The case of the Acme School. *Tamara Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science*, 2(4), 52-74.
- Maring, P. (2010a). *Bagaimana kekuasaan bekerja di balik konflik, perlawanan, dan kolaborasi? sebuah sudut pandang antropologi tentang perebutan sumberdaya ekologi*. Jakarta: Lembaga Pengkajian Antropologi Kekuasaan Indonesia.
- Maring, P. (2010b). Strategi perlawanan berkedok kolaborasi: Sebuah tinjauan antropologi kasus penguasaan hutan. *Buletin PARTNER, Kupang*, ISSN:0852-6877.
- Maring, P. (2013a). Transformasi konflik menuju kolaborasi: kasus resolusi konflik penguasaan hutan. *Jurnal Ilmiah INSANI*, 14(1), 50-59.
- Maring, P. (2013b). Kekuasaan dan konflik sosial: kasus penguasaan hutan Noge di Tanaloran Flores. *Jurnal INSANI, ISSN: 0216-0552*, 15(2), 2-11.
- Maring, P. (2013c). Kekuasaan yang bekerja melalui perlawanan: Kasus penguasaan hutan oleh masyarakat dan perusahaan. *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia (Indonesian Journal of Social and Cultural Anthropology)*, 34(2), 164-175.
- Maring, P. (2014). *Konstruksi tata kelola sumberdaya ekologi berbasis nilai sosiokultural masyarakat lokal dan perusahaan swasta*. Dipresentasikan dalam Seminar Nasional Universitas Trilogi, Jakarta, 11-12 Maret 2014.
- Metzner, J.K. (1982). *Agriculture and population pressure in Sikka, Isle of Flores: A contribution to the study of the stability of agricultural systems in the wet and dry tropics*. Canberra: The Australian National University, Australia.
- Munggoro, D.W. (2002). Konflik tak kunjung padam di Sikka. *Jurnal Komuniti Forestri. Seri 6 Tahun V Desember 2002*. Bogor: LATIN Innovation Center (LATININC).
- Peluso, N.L. (1993). Traditions of forest control in java: implication for social forestry and sustainability. *Global Ecology and Biogeography Letters*, 3(4/6), 138-157. Accessed on August 20, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2997766>.
- Peluso, N.L. (1992). *Rich forest, poor people: Resource control and resistance in Java*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Peluso, N.L., & Watts, M. (Eds) (2001). *Violent environments*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Peluso, N.L., & Vandergeest, P. (2001). Genealogies of the political forest and customary right in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand. *Journal of Asian Studies* 60, 761-812. Accessed on April 9, 2015 from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/2700109>.
- Pemerintah Kabupaten Sikka, (2007). *Agenda pembangunan ekonomi Kabupaten Sikka*. Kerjasama Pemda Kabupaten Sikka/SWISSCONTACT/LED-NTT: 24 April 2007.
- Persoon, G.A., Diny M.E van Est, & Minter, T. (2005). Decentralisation on natural resource management: Some themes and unresolved issues. *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia*, 29(3), 225-238.
- Purnomo, E.P., & Anand, P.B. (2014). The Conflict of forest tenure and the emergence of community based

- forest management in Indonesia. *Journal of Government and Politics*, 5(1), 20-31.
- Purwanto, S.A. (2005). Taman Nasional, hak-hak masyarakat setempat dan pembangunan regional. *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia*, 29(3), 269-288.
- Rutherford, S. (2007). Green governmentality: Insight and opportunities in the study of Nature's rule. *Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada*. Accessed on April 9, 2015 from http://cstpr.colorado.edu/students/envs_5720/rutherford_2007.pdf. Accessed: 09-04-2015.
- Saifuddin, A.F. (2010). *Outside in, inside out: Suatu catatan reflektif tentang kekuasaan. dalam buku bagaimana kekuasaan bekerja di balik konflik, perlawanan, dan kolaborasi? Sebuah sudut pandang antropologi tentang perebutan sumberdaya ekologi*. Jakarta: Lembaga Pengkajian Antropologi Kekuasaan Indonesia.
- Santoso, H. (2004). *Perlawanan di persimpangan jalan: Kontes harian di desa-desa sekitar hutan di Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan Damar.
- Scott, J.C. (1993). *Perlawanan kaum tani*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Scott, J.C. (1994). *Moral ekonomi petani: Pergolakan dan subsistensi di Asia Tenggara*. Jakarta: Lembaga Penelitian, Pendidikan dan Penerangan Ekonomi dan Sosial (LP3ES).
- Sudhiastiningsih, N.N.S.N. (2014). Program penyeragaman yang direspons beragam oleh Individu petani. *Makara Hubs-Asia*, 18(1), 15-24. DOI: 10.7454/mssh.v18i.3458.
- Tjitradjaja, I. (1993). Differential access to resources and conflict resolution in a forest concession in Irian Jaya. *Jurnal Ekologi Manusia Indonesia*, 1(1), 58-69.
- Vandergeest, P. (1996). Mapping nature: Territorialization of forest right in Thailand. *Society and Natural Resources: An International Journal*, 9(2), 159-175. DOI: 10.1080/08941929609380962.
- Wayda, A.P. (1983). Progressive contextualization: Methods for research in human ecology. *Human Ecology*, 11(3), 265-281.
- Wijanarko, Sarwoprasodjo, S., & Rangkuti, P.A. (2014). Komunikasi penyadaran kritis gerakan petani. *Makara Hubs-Asia*, 18(1), 1-14. DOI: 10.7454/mssh.v18i.3457.
- Winarto, Y.T. (2006). Pendekatan prosesus: Menjawab tantangan dalam mengkaji dinamika budaya. *Antropologi Indonesia*, 30(2), 174-184.
- Wulan, Y.C., et al. (2004). *Analisis konflik sektor kehutanan di Indonesia 1997-2003*. Laporan Penelitian. Bogor: CIFOR dan FWI.
- Yasmi, Y., Kelley, L., & Enters, T. (2012). Forest conflict in Asia and the role of collective action in its management. *CAPRI Working Paper No.102. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute*. Accessed on April 9, 2015 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2499/CAPRIWP102>.