Dramaturgy of agrarian reform in forestry sector in java Indonesia
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Abstract
Deagrarianization represent the situation in which the village as the basis of agrarian life and its peasants deal with the pressure of destroying its existence as an agrarian community. Deagrarianization poses a real threat to peasant communities in developing countries. This study aimed to determine the efforts of peasants who still exist to maintain their agriculture and able to survive from the process of deagrarianization, and the forms of autonomy that grow in it. The research used a single case study approach. Data were obtained through participant observation and in-depth interviews on 28 peasants. The results showed that ideological autonomy could support the existence of peasant communities to survive the deagrarianization process. The peasant community could withstand the deagrarianization process because it has strong ideological autonomy. This ideological autonomy was manifested in strong and sustained subsistence farming ties in communal farming practices and kinship ties within the internal community. Through ideological autonomy, the peasant community was resistant to interventions from outside the community that are considered inconsistent with the community values. This resistant attitude was consistently undertaken by applying livelihood only on agricultural activity and identifying themselves firmly as peasants who continue to practice subsistence agriculture.

1. Introduction
The highest populated Java island in Indonesia (1,109 person per Km square) has only 2.6 million hectares of the state forest land managed by the State Forestry Enterprise (Perum Perhutani). In managing the forest, Perum Perhutani meets continually and increasingly social problems. The population living surrounding the forest are poor, some of them have encroached the forest areas illegally. Meanwhile, the forest areas have not been sufficient for protection of the Java island from flood and dryness every year [2]. In some places the forests cover are still less than 10%.

Since 1970s Perum Perhutani has implemented social approach in the forest management for handling social problems. Social approach (called as prosperity approach) programs have been done and improved continuously namely taungya system (agroforestry) and intensified taungya system in 1972, forest village community development (PMDH) in 1983, social forestry (PS) in 1986, and integrated forest village community development (PMDHT) in 1994, and since 2001 Perum Perhutani develop collaborative forest management (PHBM). Social life dynamic in Jawa influences to social
pressure to the forests. The programs was successful respectively according with degree of social problems [7][5][9][4][1][6][8].

In June of 2017 the ministry of environment and forestry (MoEF) introduced social forestry program to be implemented in Java on the state forest land under Perum Perhutani, it is called IPHPS based upon MoEF decree No. 39/2017. The program aims to revitalize and reform the previous PHBM program with special attention in forest areas with trees cover less than 10 % and/ or the forest land mostly occupied by non local people. The IPHPS has been designed to give local people rights to the state forest areas. Supposedly local people would be getting rights and benefit much more bigger from the IPHPS than from the previous PHBM program.

In the implementation of IPHPS, MoEF has been supported by national Bank (BRI, BNI, Mandiri) who provided financial credit with low bank interest and subsidy of agricultural production inputs. The IPHPS, however met resistance from villagers or groups of forest farmers who have gotten benefits so far from the forest and they felt having role in managing the forest sustainably in collaboration with Perum Perhutani. The introduction of IPHPS program showed an interesting phenomenon in national level and local level as well. It showed a dramaturgy of forest related-agrarian reform.

This article is about contest of policy implementation of social forestry. The objectives of this paper are to (1) describe controversy or debate among stakeholders, movement and mobilization of participants; (2) describe their position, interests, and power; and (3) explain factors influencing decision making in government (MoEF) policy.

2. Method
The contesting groups expressed opinion, arguments, and demonstration. They showed a particular symbolic significance as well. This case showed a dramaturgy of forest related-agrarian reform [3]. According to [3], interaction may be roughly defined as the reciprocal influence of individuals upon one another actions when in one another immediate physical presence. There are the term “front region” and “back region” or “back stage”. The front region refers to the place where part of the individual performance regularly functions in a general and fixed fashion to define the situation for those who observe the performance. In the front region there are “setting” involving expressive equipment: furniture, physical layout, and other background items; and “personal front” refers to the other items of expressive equipment: clothing, sex, bodily gesture, speech patterns, and the like. The personal front could be divided into “appearance” and “manner”. Appearance refers to those stimuli which function at the time to tell us of the performer’s social statuses. Manner refers to those stimuli which function at the time to warn us of the interaction role the performer will expect to play in the oncoming situation. The back region or back stage may be defined as a place where the impression fostered by the performer is knowingly contradicted as a matter of course. In the back stage, grades of ceremonial equipment, such as different types of clothes, can be hidden so that audience will not be able to see the treatment accorded them in comparison with the treatment that could have been accorded them.

In this research context, individuals did interact in immediate physical presence i.e discussion forum, and on virtual discussion by using WhatsApp groups (WAGs). Nevertheless, the term “front region” vs “back region”, “appearance” and “manner could still be used. This research was conducted by following and observing attentively discussion in WhatsApp groups (WAGs) and discussion in direct meeting. Other data and information were collected through interviewing some informants and other sources. Discussions have been going since the decree of MoEF No. 39/2017 was socialized and implemented in the fields. Statements and arguments from each participant was observed, noted, codified and categorized.

The arguments from participants were focused on policy ends, means used for achieving the ends, and their understanding of social realities or problems needed to be solved. According to his/her statements and arguments, participant was mapped and grouped into two groups, namely participants who were opponent of the IPHPS and who were against the IPHPS. Their arguments were also analyzed to get picture of conformity between ends of policy and means used for achieving the ends; and conformity between ends of policy and social reality.
Furthermore, both opponent and proponent were respectively classified based upon his/her position, interest, and power. Both opponent and proponent were also observed their action in social movement and mobilization regarding the IPHPS. The actions were analyzed how their impact on the government policy of the IPHPS.

3. Research result and discussion

Stakeholders of state forest lands in Java could be classified into six groups, namely (1) high official of Perum Perhutani representing the organization of Perum Perhutani; (2) pensioners of Perum Perhutani who were loyal and giving attention to the existence of Perum Perhutani and forests in Java; (3) high official of MoEF; (4) Civil Society Organization activists and academicians; (5) forest village groups members (LMDH); dan (6) leaders of LMDH association. Those stakeholder groups members could be separated into two groups respectively, except the second group, namely who were proponent of the IPHPS and who were against the IPHPS. Some opponent and proponent of the IPHPS expressed straight out their position as opponent or proponent, but some of them were sneaky.

The first group’s interest was the existence of Perum Perhutani as business institution that should take account of balance between profit for Perum Perhutani and public interests such as environment and social. The second group’s interest was as same as the first group, but in term of company profit they concerned directly more to their own interest i.e. pension allowance continuity. The third group’s interest was target achievement of social forestry program in Java. The fourth group’s interest was the ends achievement of social forestry program i.e. forest community well being and forest sustainability, and forestland tenure equitability as well. The fourth group has actively involved in formulation and implementation of social forestry policies. The fifth group’s interest was job opportunities related to forest management particularly on forestland activities to ensure their household income with keeping forest sustainability. The sixth group’s interest was to get benefits from forest management activities through participating in particularly off-forest activities.

The IPHPS policy faced individual and/or groups who against the policy. The contesting groups expressed their opinion and arguments in the WhatsApp groups (WAGs) and room discussions, pointed out to parliament, and even did demonstrative movement. They argued, firstly that the MoEF decree No. 39/2017 would definitely be in contradiction to government regulation No. 72/2010 on Perum Perhutani. Secondly, the IPHPS program would potentially raise conflict among local community groups as the target groups of the IPHPS program were different from the participants of the existing program (PHBM) in the same location (forest areas). Thirdly, the IPHPS program would potentially cause forest degradation because of those social conflicts.

The proponent groups of the IPHPS responded contrary to the opponent. Their arguments were as follow: (1) the MoEF decree No. 39/2017 would definitely not be in contradiction to government regulation No. 72/2010 as the MoEF has authority to give permit of forest utilization to individual or group even in the Perum Perhutani’s forest areas, particularly in urgent condition; (2) The urgency of the IPHPS was that among other things Perum Perhutani did not manage the forest well indicated by forest cover less than 5 % and local people did not get benefit from surrounding forest, conversely the forest areas have been occupied by outsiders or migrants.

The proponent groups gave political support toward the policy implementation. They argued that means of the IPHPS policy implementation was concomitant with its ends. The ends of the IPHPS policy was concomitant with social reality as well. On the other hand, the opponent argued that there blurred between means and ends of the IPHPS policy. According to the opponent, the ends and the means of the social forestry policy should be to strengthen national and local institutions. Strengthening the board of directors and the board of controller of Perum Perhutani for formulating and implementing programs which were not a business as usual, but the programs that improved immediately the forests conditions and communities well being in Java. The ends of the IPHPS policy was also not concomitant with social reality. At the local level, the programs should strengthen forest farmer groups and forest village institutes, so the programs would support benefits sharing equity among member of forest villages.
There was no consensus yet between the opponent and the proponent groups. The opponent also submitted a judicial review of the policy to Supreme Court. The Supreme Court gave a flat refusal for the submitted judicial review. The contesting opinion and arguments is still going on at present in both the national and local level. Currently, socialization process of the IPHPS policy and working groups at national and regional level are still going on, and the IPHPS program have been implemented in some places.

4. Conclusion
A new policy would raise negative and positive responses, proponent and opponent groups, particularly when the policy implication influence multi stakeholders interests. The groups from both side would express their position and power. Some of them were sneaky, however in term of their interests.

The proponent groups argued that means of the IPHPS policy implementation was concomitant with its ends, and the ends of the policy was concomitant with social reality as well. They viewed that the empirical facts including biophysical and social realities (forest cover, people-forest interaction, and people-people interaction) taken into consideration for policy formulation. Hence, they gave political support toward the policy implementation.

The proponent groups are different to the opponent groups in assessing or measuring concomitant between ends and means of the policy. They are different in seeing concomitant between ends and social realities.

After running for a year, there was no consensus yet between the opponent and the proponent groups. In the local level, the enduring conflict may take place in the future if without facilitating actions to reach a consensus among groups.
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