From sea to exclusion: livelihood transformation of the Islanders
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Abstract. During half of the century, the livelihood of the islanders of Pari, Seribu Island rapidly changing. The external factors which drive islander to only adjust and survive namely ecological change and tenurial insecurity. The degradation of water quality shifted islanders from sea to land, in land the islander face another challenge, the absence of tenurial insecurity led them to have protracted dispute against corporation whose land entitled and state that give legal justification over the corporation claim on their private land. This study case which using rational choice theory trying to describe the pattern of change on islanders’s livelihood and analyse the factors that put the islanders in the state of anxiousness against future exclusion against them after long period of inhabiting the island. The study indicates that the absence of norms on the limited available resources and the absence of institutionalized collective actions put the islanders in jeopardy from exclusion and marginalization. To avoid further marginalization, it is urgent to formulate the contra-exclusion movement as a foundation for strong institutionalized collective action and specific affirmative policy on small island’s limited available resources.

1. Introduction

Livelihoods transformation is a common practice in a community unit along with the development of society both caused by internal conditions of society and outside influences, or a combination of both [49]; [54]. In communities that are located in relatively small geographic areas and has limited resources, changes in livelihoods can be double-edged which can be an indicator of welfare improvement or in contrary, an indication that the community just passive to adjust with the changes [15]. In the first option, livelihood transformation become a mechanism for carrying out social mobility and achieving higher socioeconomic status, but if the second indicator as the basis for change, the sustainability of livelihoods will be threatened due to the lack of alternative resources available.

The small Island of Pari’s community is one example of a community that has undergone a livelihood transformation due to changes in environmental conditions, the existence of innovations in mariculture, as well as the interaction with the tourism industry around the island. For more than fifty years since the 1950s this livelihood transformation has been in the control of society so that it is considered to be quite sustainable to sustain the lives of all its inhabitants both for the fulfillment of basic infrastructure, basic needs and secondary needs. During this period the sea and its ecosystem become the basis of livelihoods and people's lives. However, since 2010 when their livelihoods have changed on a land-based, heavier issues have arisen: land they occupy and long-managed as livelihoods is in the ownership claim by other
parties so that tenure security is not owned by the community any longer [18]. In the context this problem, the change of livelihood of small island communities turn to be unsustainable and prone to prolonged agrarian conflicts [13] and even, displacement [37].

This paper intends to present the factors that influence Pari Island community’s decision-making processes on their livelihood strategies in relation to the existence of small island resources. In addition, this paper also intends to project the possibility of changes in people's livelihoods after tenure conflicts.

2. Material and Methods

This case study took place in Pari Island, Seribu Islands in 2016-2017 where there is an agrarian conflict between the community and a tourism consortium on land ownership. In the study it was found that there were several phases in this conflict along with interrelated phases of socio-economic development between environmental, economic, political and agrarian issues [17]. For this reason, this study specifically wanted to analyze relations between community development with changes in agrarian resources that occurs. Data retrieval uses interview and observation methods with the support of secondary data. The collected data were analyzed using the rational choice theory approach to provide an explanation on the facts through multi-level analysis between micro-macro level [21] in determining the Pari community action system combined with the analysis of Sustainable Livelihood (SL) by Scoones [45] to see the determination process of the livelihood strategies.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Geographical and community’s socio-economic profile

Pari Island is a small island among the 110 islands in the Seribu Islands Regency and one of the eleven inhabited islands in the geographical area. This 41.3 hectare island is inhabited by 1280 individual or 320 families. Ethnically, the cultures mostly influenced by the Betawinese from northern Jakarta, northern Tangerang, to Muara Gembong in Bekasi. In addition, Javanese, Sundanese, Bugis, Makassar and Batak ethnic groups were also found in smaller numbers. From the side of the building unit, there are 236 residential houses, 217 houses of them also functioned as homestays and 69 stalls (various types ranging from small shops to medium scale), while public facilities on the island are 4.2 km paved path, integrated schools (kindergarten-junior high school), dock, maternal and child health center, Posyandu, mosque, small mosque, and police post.

Table 1. The revenue of Pari Islanders from tourism and fisheries sector per month.

| No | Type of enterprise                  | Monthly revenue (approx) |
|----|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1  | Homestay with 2 rooms/1 house      | Rp 1.600.000-Rp 2.000.000 |
| 2  | Food stall                         | Rp 2.000.000             |
| 3  | Souvenir vendors                   | Rp 300.000               |
| 4  | Small vendors (mobile)             | Rp 500.000               |
| 5  | Mobile fish seller                 | Rp 1.500.000             |
| 6  | Swimming crab seller               | Rp 2.500.000             |
| 7  | Management of beach tour (Pasir Perawan.ed) | Rp 1.000.000-Rp 1.500.000 |
| 8  | Tour guide                         | Rp 1.000.000             |
| 9  | Snorkling gear rental              | Rp 500.000               |
| 10 | Boat rental                        | Rp 1.500.000             |
| 11 | Fishers (depends on the catches)   | Rp 1.000.000 – Rp 1.700.000 |
| 12 | Restaurant                         | Rp 1.000.000             |

Source: Kelurahan Pulau Pari¹

The main community livelihoods are entrepreneurs in the tourism sector as homestay owners, boat service providers, guide services, tool rental services, food-supplier, stall owners, and fishers (capture

¹ Kelurahan Pulau Pari (2016) (processed).
and mariculture). At least these type of works are divided into two sectors, namely the tourism sector and the fisheries sector. The following is an overview of the revenues from both sectors.

The numbers above are the average number where it can fluctuate during the tourist season or during the less-visitors. In the fisheries sector, income is also very plastic depending on the fish season. There are two types of fishery enterprise run in Pari, which area capture fisheries and mariculture. In more detail, here is an overview of income from the fisheries sector in Pari.

| No | Type of fishers | Result | Selling price by fisher/ kg | Sell to | Gear/method | Organisation |
|----|----------------|--------|-----------------------------|--------|-------------|--------------|
| 1  | Capture fishers | Rabbit fish | 20.000 | pelele local | handline | KUB Baracuda, 10 members |
|    |                | Cob     | 15-20.000                   |        | gill net    |              |
|    |                | Beltfish | 11.000                      |        | gill net    |              |
|    |                | Spanish mackerel | 40-60.000 |        | gill net    |              |
|    |                | Indian mackerel | 20-35.000 |        | gill net    |              |
|    |                | Barracuda | 12.000                     |        | handline    |              |
| 2  | Swimming crab fishers | Swimming crab | 40.000 | pelele local | trap      | KUB Bubu, 10 members |
| 3  | Seaweed mariculture fishers | wet | 7.000 | pelele local | line | 2 mariculture group members |
|    |                | dried    | 25.000                      |        | line        |              |
| 4  | Grouper mariculture fishers | humpback, leopard, giant | 35.000 | pelele local | 24 floating cage and 3 stationary lift net | 1 group: 27 members |

Source: Primary data 3

From the types of fishers above, fisher's income in Pari can be estimated as follows:

| No | Type of fishers                      | Average income/month |
|----|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1  | Trapping fishers                    | Rp 1.400.000         |
| 2  | Capture fishers                     | Rp 1.500.000 – 3.000.000 |
| 3  | Stationary lift net fishers         | Rp 1.700.000         |
| 4  | Floating lift net fishers           | Rp 1.700.000         |
| 5  | Stiff hand drift net fishers        | Rp 3.000.000         |
| 6  | Grouper floating cage fishers       | Rp 1.300.000         |

Source: Pari Government Report 3

In capture fisheries, the difference in production can be very contrast where in the fish season fishers total catch each trip per day can reach 1 ton but when it is not in fish season, the catch can be only 50 kilograms. Somewhat different from mariculture fishers who have their own marketing channels that can get a fixed income every harvest season. The main absorption of fisheries is the marine tourism sector through food-catering, only seaweed has its own marketing path because it is sold in mainland Jakarta or processed in Pari as a local food products.

3.2. Rational choice theory

The Rational Choice theory is one approach in Sociology that base of its argument that a social phenomenon must be explained both at the micro level and macro level, or the relationship between agent and structure [31]. According to this theory, social phenomena such as social relations,
associations and social order, for example, are forms of practice at the macro level, but to explain the emergence of these forms uses a micro level analysis [52] is used. Blau argues that in a social organization there is always an exchange relationship between the individual and the collective, between the agent and the structure in which the agent seeks his action to obtain power or something that is deemed valuable to agent in the structure itself [10]. With the perspective as above, this theory is in the family of the Utilitarian Theory which is developed from economics which sees that individual actions and behaviors are always aimed at a particular benefit for themselves and as much as possible avoid the costs that must be borne [20].

So the Rational Choice theory sees that every form and socio-cultural structure that exists in society is the result and effort of individuals to maximize the benefits to themselves at the lowest possible cost and the smallest investment possible. Another implication of the application of this behavior theory in looking at social phenomena is that every organism, including humans, would prefer to learn and arrange their own behavior patterns in a structure rather than acting through a certain coercion [52].

In the context of the problem in Pari, Rational Choice will try to analyze the two main elements in this theory which have important meaning in creating community actions namely norms and resources and how the relations between them encourage the creation of collective actions taken by Pari Island people in living on the island small. In summary, the relationship between micro and macro in determining collective behavior in the perspective of Rational Choice Theory by Coleman [21]; [29] can be described as follows:

![Figure 1](image)

**Figure 1.** Flow of interaction between individual, norms, resources and collective behavior.

From the picture above, at the micro level individuals have actions aimed at resources, as well as other individuals who share an interest in resources. It is not a dyadic relation that underlies this interaction between individuals but the compatibility between one individual and another in terms of benefits. To facilitate reciprocity between individuals, norms are made containing values and preferences that place all parties to unilaterally benefit from resources. From this process, an action system is formed where there are two or more purposive actors in action that involves each others. At this level the structure is also formed with a tendency to continue dynamically without any guarantee of equilibrium [42].

### 3.3. Development of livelihoods

The development of this island that Pari Island began to be inhabited in the early 20th century. For fifty years the fishers of Pulau Panggang and Tidung Island, a small island that developed first, made this island as coconut plantation. Besides grown coconut, people also work as artisanal fishers who catch
fish around the island as a source of food, not for commercial purposes. In the 50s there were at least five families occupying twenty residences on Pari Island, they could be said as the early inhabitants. In the 1970s along with the construction of the Oceanography Institute station on the west side of the island, this institution developed seaweed cultivation because it was considered the island's waters were very good as a location for seaweed cultivation. This innovation makes Pari Island a major commercial production center for seaweed in the Thousand Islands, whose products are exported to Taiwan, Philippines and Japan in partnership with a company in Jakarta. In 1990, seaweed production from the Seribu Islands (eq Pari) was recorded at 0.11 tons/hectare of wet Eucheuma spinosum [48]. Economically for two decades (1980-1999) people's income increased rapidly, which was perceived by the community as a "prosperous" condition (primary interview 2017). But this condition changed drastically at the beginning of the millennium. In 1999, malaria outbreaks struck the entire population while health facilities were not available. This outbreak caused 49 fatalities, most of population left the island and lived along the coast of Bekasi to Tangerang. In 2000 it was recorded that only 30% of the population still lived on the island. Seaweed cultivation has not been carried out due to outbreaks or out of cash after plague.

The next period, 2000-2010 was a heavy period for Pari people because the resources for restoration of seaweed cultivation were no longer maximal. Even so, some fishers are still cultivating seaweed, but the production from Pari has gone far down. To support themselves, the community carries out three alternative livelihoods: the first, moving to the mainland coast into fishing laborers or freelance construction workers; secondly, to become a crew of commercial vessels carrying out fishing or squid between the Seribu Islands to Bangka-Belitung; and third, become an artisanal seaweed farmer and fishers in Pari Island.

In the midst of these livelihood difficulties, in 2010 there were ideas and initiatives from inhabitants to make the natural potential of Pari Island into commercial product like the previously developed Tidung Island. The mainstay of its iconic location is the Pasir Perawan Beach which has a sloping character, calm water, shallow water, has sandbanks, and has mangrove and seagrass areas as their coastal barrier and fish spawning area. Meanwhile on the land, Pari Island has white sand sloping sand and has a fresh water source, the coastal vegetation is dominated by sea pandanus, cattapa and hibiscus which make this beach shady. This idea was followed up by the community collectively without government assistance to became the main tourist icon of Pari Island. Institutionally, the Pasir Perawan beach management institution was formed consisting of ten people to conduct beach operations and maintenance. In terms of distribution of utilization, managers have an obligation to share with the community in the form of social funds, facilitate stalls on the beach location, as well as the provision of bathrooms and musholla.

The presence of this tourist destination makes the community-based tourism run because it triggers the community to invest in the form of homestays, tourist facilities (boats, snorkles, fin, etc.), stalls and tourism services (guides, diving, transportation). The average number of visitors in 2016 was 3200 people for one year. Though it is built and managed by the community, the circulation of money in this industry is very large. Three years since it began, the total money circulating from the tourism industry reached Rp. 12 billion/year, which means an average of Rp. 1 billion per month [51]. This has not calculated income from other sectors, namely fisheries, both catch and cultivation (seaweed and grouper) which are still run by some fishers. Most fisheries absorbed by tourism industry through food-catering, while seaweed is sold to Jakarta. Until 2016, the environmental carrying capacity as a support for the tourism industry was relatively adequate despite indicating the decline on quality [36].

The success phase of this community-based tourism industry has been under intense pressure since 2015 when agrarian conflicts regarding resource claims occurred. The pressure referred to is the claim of the private sector over the residential land and the coastal area. This private claim has a legality basis because it has a land ownership certificate. This claim received a response from residents who claim to be inhabitants of the island for generations. Although the people legitimately have strong reasons, the ownership of legality is the court's preference to provide recognition of ownership of the land and control of the beach by the private sector. In 2016, the management of the Pasir Perawan beach was revoked by the power of judicial law which stated that community management was an illegal practice. The local
government also voiced the same opinion with the court, stating that land and beaches are the right of private companies, not in the hands of the people.

At present the tourism industry is still running, fisheries are also still running, as are the stalls and other micro businesses but losing their local economic prime-movers, namely the management of the Pasir Perawan beach. On the other hand, the pressure from the company on the residents is even higher with the use of apparatus to suppress the aspirations of residents on their land. The threat of exclusion is evident because community lose access to benefit from the resources they have [41] and are in the shadow of being limited by others who have the power of exclusion. This has become a new chapter in the social change of society when people's livelihoods have been in a situation of tenure insecurity that brings people to a very marginal position politically. This shows that there is a very close relationship between economics and politics in the control and management of limited resources of small islands and will directly impact the livelihoods of small island communities.

3.4. Livelihood analysis of sustainable and choice rational actors

According to the World Commission on Environmental and Development (WCED), sustainable livelihood is a condition where cash and food needs both consumption and reserves are able to meet the basic needs. Security refers to securing ownership from or access to resources and activities that generate income including reserves to deal with risks, withstand crises, and deal with emergency conditions. Meanwhile, sustainable refers to the maintenance or ability to increase long-term resource productivity [1].

The analysis of sustainable livelihoods does not only see at actions in order to increase income (income generating) including in doing various livelihoods/diversity of livelihoods [24]. Sustainable livelihood also looks at its human aspects, its capabilities and how they live, including in meeting food, income and asset needs in a sustainable manner [14]. The definition formulated by Chambers and Conway for livelihood is an interconnection between three words, namely "sustainable", "rural", and "livelihoods" which are based on the study of human-oriented development making the rural poverty reality a starting point for study of livelihood [25].

Scoones develops an approach that not only departs from planned actions by actors to seek many ways to live because according to him a new livelihood will be sustainable if it is able to overcome and bring actors to rise from pressure or crisis [34]. According to Scoones, "livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, while not undermining the natural resource base [45].

Scoones’s analysis of sustainable livelihood places the process of institutionalization and organizational structure will determine the ability of access to livelihood resources, namely natural capital, financial capital, human capital, and social capital [45]. In the Pari case, because this resource is related to land politics, the legal-political aspect of the land also determines their survival strategy. At this level of analysis, the sustainability of livelihoods is not only determined by the capacity of households to diversify but rather on the institutional capacity aspect of a society to be able to create collective action to tackle crisis access to resources [45].

Within the framework of rational action theory, it is in the arena of institutionalization and organization every social actor articulates a number of assessments of their environment and turn it into the norms used to manage their resources. Interrelations between actors, norms and resources are referred to as action systems. The output of this action system at the macro level is the collective behavior that results from the unilateral process of transfer of control from the collective actions of individuals into a common norm that regulates the behavior of each individual within his social unit. The relation between micro-macro graph [19] forms the social outcome action system when Pari people when making choices change their livelihoods [30].

---
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In the framework of Sustainable Livelihood above, the political, historical, policy and demographic contexts help determine the types of livelihoods and assets managed by the community. But the type of strategy when a crisis occurs will be mediated by institutions and organizations. This analysis will also find out why poverty and vulnerability in a society last long using key questions that have been developed by Bernstein [9] namely who get what? who does what? and what they do with that?  

3.5. Driving factors to livelihood transformation

From the studies in the field, there were several trends and indications of factors causing changes in Pari Island’s livelihoods. Changes made can be divided into two, namely the desired change/planned and the other is the unplanned changes. The phase of changes mentioned above can be summarized in the following figure [45]:

Planned and desired changes by the community take place in the initial phase of occupancy where there are technological innovations and information about seaweed cultivation. This contact is considered to provide benefits in the form of more planned income than artisanal capture fisheries which are only to provide family food sources. The risk in Pari artisanal waters is relatively safe as well as the risk of mariculture is considered low. The quality of the waters was considered very good and suitable as a medium for seaweed cultivation. Viewed from the structure of its own resources, this area is an open access area that can be used collectively without having to exclude others. Based on this new knowledge, the community runs seaweed cultivation as the main livelihood and capture fisheries as a secondary activity. The social action taken by the community is a rational action based on the calculation of certain values and maximizing benefits, and the choice of action is taken by each individual even though it is carried out simultaneously [23]; [38].

---

[6] Batterbury (2015).
In the period of the 1980s to 1999 seaweed cultivation experienced success and even managed to export, all households did work related to seaweed. This reason also makes Pari residents reject illegal relocation offered by the company to Tidung Island in 1992 [17]. However, during this period there were other factors that influenced the sustainability of seaweed cultivation, namely the decreasing quality of water. As an island located on the south side not far from the mainland of Java Island, especially Jakarta Bay, Pari Island has several typical conditions that position it as an area that is sensitive to ecological pressure [50]; [7]. Overnutrition, ship oil contamination, increase in Pb element is a form of pressure from within the island itself [26]; [43]; [2].

Ecological threats that occur in Pari Island are damaged marine biota habitats, water pollution, and a decline in fisheries resources occur both due to the influence of decreasing water quality in the Jakarta Bay and from within the island itself [4]; [33]; [8]. The quality of water in the location of seaweed cultivation on the north side is of poor quality, while in the west it is better but it still occurs due to temperature, current and dissolved oxygen. As a result, the carrageenan of seaweed decreases and ice-ice disease extends so that during poor water quality, seaweed cultivation is stopped [3]; [53]. Until 2016, water turbidity increased so it was less supportive for seaweed cultivation except in the western part of Pari Island [36]. This condition eventually forced islanders to build their livelihoods on land as a new community-based marine tourism area [17].

Since year 2010, urbanization of the small island of Pari in the form of tourism industrialization has become a turning point towards insecurity [16]. The shift of livelihoods of islanders who were originally in waters in the form of capture and aquaculture began to shift to land-based tourism industries and environmental services. But on the other hand this on-land activity collides with tenure problems where there is a double claim for land ownership. This prolonged conflict shows that precisely on land the biggest risk to small island communities is found in the absence of legal protection of land ownership. This tenure insecurity makes the base of industrialization in Pari an imbalance in land tenure, where in formal legal terms, land ownership certificates are in the hands of outsiders, namely private tourism industry companies [5].

Figure 3. Livelihood transformation trend and sequence to possible exclusion.
The development of this prolonged conflict puts power relations between society and corporations into unbalanced, conflictual and has implications for threats to the environment. From the perspective of political ecology, in developing countries there is a tendency that injustice will have an impact on both the local population and the environment [39]; [11]. The loss of power over agrarian sources and corporate domination in high-potential environmental management revokes the local social and environmental determination of the value of its agrarian sources [12]. This directly threatens the livelihoods of local people fundamentally [28]. This loss of livelihood is mainly due to the loss of access to communities where the local population loses its power to take advantage of all material objects, existing populations and social systems, value and institutional symbols of all agrarian sources on their small island.

3.6. Institutional management of resources

According to Scoones [45] the institution of a society to be able to create collective action to overcome the crisis of access to resources greatly determines the sustainability of livelihoods. At this point there is a crisis in the agrarian conflict problem in Pari. Institutional practice of agrarian sources only receives attention when there are claims by companies that are normatively legal supported by the state and quasi-bureaucracy.

Using the definition from Davies and Hossain [22] institutional is the social bond that connects each stakeholder to access to capital and determines the direction of livelihood adaptation, whether positive or negative. In the perspective of Rational Action, institutions are driven by motives for conformity for the sake of personal safety [56]. Institutional in other words is a set of rules that are patterned and used by many parties on a regular basis. The rules of this game can be in the form of formal or non-formal, but what determines whether or not effective institutions are power relations in them where each actor will work together as well as contesting. Therefore institutions are always dynamic and change over time involving social relations and political processes [44].

At least, in the institutional analysis of the transformation of the livelihoods of Pari people there are three conditions which then influence people's choices to transform from the marine resource base to the service sector. First, there are obstacles to tenure security. Small island communities do not develop a legal administrative system about their agrarian sources both on land and in waters. Even traditional norms such as customary laws are not developed, so that the process of socio-economic-culture did not bound in a solid system to limit or manage all resources sustainably including protection from ecological damage and expansion of other actors.

Second, the social relations within the Pari Island community unit are relatively loose where the process of contestation, negotiation, or exchange goes without the dominant power dynamics. The absence of interventions in strengthening formal livelihoods causes social processes to run naturally. Third, both formal and non-formal organizations that should carry out the rules of the game do not exist effectively both at the community unit level, family level or individual level to provide a security guarantee for actions taken. These three institutional factors place sustainability on livelihoods relatively weak especially when dealing with external factors such as degradation of water quality or expansion of capital actors or countries (political actors) in managing their agrarian resources [32]; [46].

In the end, the small island community of Pari experienced a rural transformation in which the lives of its people followed the changes that occurred due to external factors that were beyond the ability of the community itself to control it. Ideally, a rural transformation must be mediated by local social structures and institutional frameworks prepared by the people themselves for local and unique preferences regarding existing potentials and constraints [6]. This condition is absent in the small island community Pari. Although economically there is an increase in income but in general, this change is fragile because the structures of resource use and aspects of tenure protection are not in the hands of the community institutions. The presence of capital strength and state bureaucracy in the future then precisely presents the threat of exclusion in Pari island communities due to changes in the structure of utilization and control of the island. Meanwhile institutional revitalization must face the challenges of
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power relations that are not balanced, the differentiation of actors within the community itself, and the absence of political justification to contest in political spaces in order to aggregate their power.

3.7. Threat of exclusion
Social changes in Pari today can be seen from the perspective of political economy where there is a shift in the meaning of rural or small islands from the area of agricultural production into a commodified area and a multi-functional other than agriculture [35]. The industrialization of the tourism sector that present in Pari shows that tenure legality and building dominant power relations over the bureaucracy became the main factor to change the small island rural space into a new space for production.

The power to do exclusion consists of four things, namely regulation, market, coercion and legitimacy. “Regulation” is a set of rules that make limits on how a land/land can be accessed and utilized by whom. By granting land transfer to private, state politically changing the pattern of land access from a social identity to “market” commodity, the state determines what for the land is and who has the right to manage the land. Classical agrarian political economy has emphasized that the agrarian struggle marked by the struggle of the peasants to survive must fight the great power in the form of high land prices which often force them out of agriculture, especially when social solidarity ties also weaken because many parties consider that if they do not participate the market then they will not get benefits to survive. The third factor is “coercion”, explicitly the use of coercion in the exclusion of citizens is to use legal power, namely the state’s security apparatus. The fourth factor is “legitimacy”, namely the victory at the level of discourse about right and wrong based on common historical knowledge. Pari islanders as heirs to the people who open land and tourism in Pari Island consider that it is their right as citizens to protect their rights to the land they have been cultivating for generations.

Because the conflict is a structural conflict in which there is an imbalance in the power contestation over land as an agrarian source, there are two possible endings of this conflict, namely the sharing of joint management or “the winner takes all” where the power holder is the winner of this contest and the community must get away or be expelled from the land they originally occupied. If “the winner takes all” happens, the Pari people are forced to become landless citizen who have to rent land from the private and give up their energy to work in the tourism industry sector. The next phase if the social structure of society changes after tourism industrialization, namely the free labor phase as a livelihood strategy. The choice of agriculture intensification, livelihood diversification and (forced) migration needs to be reviewed as a choice of sustainable livelihood strategies because without agrarian political security whatever livelihood options they choose, small island community will not be sustainable.

![Figure 4](image-url)

**Figure 4.** Relation between reason for action and pressure in livelihood transformation.

---
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The following chart is a synthesis of changes in the livelihoods of the Pari people, the reasons for taking action and the pressure from the ecological-socio-economic-political situation that is twisted in influencing community action. The critical point of the threat of exclusion after agrarian conflict occurs when there is a drastic change in the actor in which the change of livelihood factors is no longer from environmental factors but because the power relations of dominant actors by private sector and state. But exclusion drive to what is called counter-exclusion, namely an effort to mobilize collective resources to fight exclusion of their land or land by relying on their own strength against exclusion that is actually carried out by the state. This counter-exclusion process can take the form of massive and frontal struggles to everyday forms of resistance [47]. It is a historical reality in the Third World’s rurals where that when the peasant groups opposes the new powers that oppress them it is a relatively long struggle will be occurs, even some violently [55]; [40]; [27]. The disruptive and continuous challenges were originally a collective response to the deterioration of living conditions due to the use and abuse of power by the holders of economic and political powers.

4. Conclusion
Changes in livelihoods in Pari communities in the past fifty years are closely related to the existence of four types of resources to fulfill their livelihoods, namely natural capital, financial capital, social capital and human capital. But in the management of these four capitals requires the existence of two other resources to be sustainable, namely political capital and strong institutional capital to manage its agrarian resources. The rational action of each actor at the micro level does not necessarily indicate the output of a collective behavior on resources. This means that the process of institutionalization is an important phase in the framework of sustainable livelihoods to make choices on the types of strategies, both intensification of production, diversification of livelihoods and migration. Without a phase of institutionalization there is no room to build the same norms between actors, there are no rules of the game that are designed to limit, protect and utilize resources.

In situations where agrarian sources are in current legal claims, fishers and Pari people face an unplanned phase of change, namely the choice is to be excluded from the structure of industrial tourism relations then forcibly migrate, or choose to enter into a new structure to become free workers, landless fishers and without mean of production. As a counter to the threat of exclusion or forced migration, social movements in communities grows in Pari Island communities to reclaim legitimacy of their land and water based on solid institutions to reclaim community tenure security over agrarian resources. This counter-exclusion movement moves between grassroots and network resource mobilization and demands to get formal administrative recognition of the land and the area of community management. The socially counter-exclusionary movements of marginalized communities require affirmation from the state that Pari island communities have the right, history and opportunity to be able to manage their agrarian resources.
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