

Chapter 10

Conclusion: The Dynamics of Pro Agrarian Reform and Rural Social Movements in Indonesia post-1965

This conclusion will build on previous chapters to give some theoretical explanations of the emergence, development, sustainability and consequences of rural social movements from the New Order period until now. Six propositions were formulated in Chapter I (section 1.4.1) to which will be elaborated further in the following three sections, while the fourth section contains some reflections about further research that should be conducted.

The first section, trajectories of rural social movements, will address propositions number one (1)¹ and three (3)² of this study. The second section, discourse and actions on agrarian reform, will address propositions number two (2)³ and five (5)⁴; while the third section, exchange of interests between

¹ Proposition number (1): That activists generated pro peasant and agrarian reform movements from the New Order period for two inter-connected objectives: To rebuild rural mass politics in Indonesia and to build rural bases for their political interests including involvement in institutionalized politics.

² Proposition number (3): ‘Transmutation’ processes which occurred in Indonesian rural social movement trajectories were mostly determined by the creativity of the activists and scholar-activists rather than being determined by external social and political factors.

³ Proposition number (2): NGO and agrarian scholar-activists developed the discourse on agrarian reform both to manifest their commitment for radical social change in Indonesia and to support their control over peasant-based movements.

⁴ Proposition number (5): The political struggles and conflicts of interest among rural social movement’s leaders and the more open political space during the transition to liberal democracy, allowed them either to support movement organizations or to pursue their own individual interests. However this weakened the ability of rural social movements in Indonesia to push the implementation of radical agrarian reform

peasants and activists, addresses propositions number four (4)⁵ and five (5)⁶ as well.

The explanations of previous chapters indicated that creativity and leadership of the activists determined development of the movements more than external socio-political and economic conditions. Jenkins (1981) called this capability the 'entrepreneurial leadership' of sociopolitical movement activists. They acted like 'social entrepreneurs'⁷ because they generated and implement ideas and initiatives for social change. As 'entrepreneurs' they created political opportunities to develop movement bases for imagined changes to facilitate their own interests. They developed arguments, and claims related to people's grievances. They made efforts to mobilize resources of the community and/or external sources, to support their social movements. To some extent, activists manipulated the political processes of social movements for their owned personal, political and economical interests as well.

10.1 'Transmutation': Trajectories of Rural Social Movements

Although the mass killings had left more than half a million dead in the rural areas between 1965-1966, muzzled opposition groups and potential movements in rural areas, radicalism in rural Indonesia did not totally disappear. Rural protests related to land problems and evictions still occurred from the beginning of the 70s, such as the Jenggawah case in Jember, East Java and the Siria-ria case in North Sumatra.⁸ However, groups of organized peasants with broader political objectives than defending land rights, that could have generated and supported potential radicalism, were absent. On the contrary, the New Order regime organized farmers and other rural villagers,

⁵ Proposition number (4): Both participant groups of rural social movements, namely rural villagers and urban-educated activists, have joined movements with different interests.

⁶ See again note 4 above.

⁷ See also McCarthy and Zald 1973 and 1977; and Jenkins 1981.

⁸ See again Chapter IV.

namely the Harmonious Indonesian Farmers Association (HKTI) and the Association of Reliable Farmers and Fishermen (KTNA), to mobilize rural villagers in order to implement New Order developmentalism goals.⁹ Rural people were being depoliticized since that time.

From the early 70s to the mid 80s, radical social movement activists did not focus their activism in rural areas, but concentrated more on the issue of national leadership,¹⁰ while Mansour Fakih has argued that NGOs were trapped by the government's rural development projects (Fakih 1986). Spontaneous local protests and rural unrest that reappeared in many places after mid 80s, evicted people from their land and livelihoods because of development projects, triggered the emergence of rural social movements. The New Order developmentalism opened the way for activists to re-engage with rural social movements and mass politics in rural areas. Moreover, land conflicts that occurred across the country during the 1980s and early 1990s, became an appropriate medium for the revival of agrarian reform ideas and to connect protests against land expropriation with the demand for agrarian reform.

Some studies about land conflicts in Indonesia have connected rural radicalism with potential for policy changes (Bachriadi and Lucas 2002; Lucas and Warren 2003; Afiff 2005; Peluso, Afiff and Rachman 2008), but these studies do not mention the significant roles of activists in leading the process of transformation from spontaneous local radicalism into more sustainable social movements.

As explored in chapters IV-IX, various mechanisms, methods, and claims were created and modified by the activists to generate movements against the State regimes during the New Order period until now. Table 10.1 shows how urban-based social movements responded to spontaneous protests conducted by victims of land expropriation, then moved on to the revitalization of rural

⁹ About the New Order's developmentalism, HKTI and KTNA, see again Chapter II.

¹⁰ See again Chapter IV.

mass politics, with agrarian reform as a common theme of movement alliances, and the involvement of local peasant's organizations in post 1998 electoral politics.

Table 10.1 Dynamics of Changes in Pro Agrarian Reform and Rural Social Movements in Indonesia, 1980s-2000s

Period	Base	Dominant Organizing Forms	Main Issues and Claims	Main Action Strategies	Leadership
1970s to the mid of 1980s	Rural areas	Spontaneous local protest groups that emerged 'naturally' because of repression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against land evictions • Recognition of land rights 	Protest of single case to local authorities and assemblies	Local leaders, <i>tokoh petani</i> ¹¹
	Urban areas	NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural development • Promoting land reform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-based development projects • Seminars on land rights and land reform 	NGO and scholar-activists
Mid of the 1980s to the beginning of 1990s	Rural areas	Spontaneous local protest groups that emerged 'naturally' because of repression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against land evictions • Recognition of the land rights • Fair compensation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protests of single cases to the local authorities and assemblies • Direct land claims actions 	Local leaders, <i>tokoh petani</i>
	Urban areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student solidarity groups • Student committees for actions in collaboration with NGOs • NGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solidarity actions for victims of land expropriations • Against the New Order's developmentalism and political repressions • Land rights as human rights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct protests both to local and national authorities and assemblies • Legal and paralegal aid, campaigns and advocacy • Mobilization of the victims of land expropriations of multi-cases for protests to district, provincial or national authorities and assemblies 	Student and NGO activists
Beginning to mid 1990s	Rural areas	Local peasants' organizations (village and inter-village levels)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against land conflicts • Recognition of land rights • Freedom for people organizing in the rural areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protests of single case and/or multi-cases to the local authorities and assemblies • Direct land claims actions 	Combination of local leaders (politically trained ' <i>tokoh petani</i> ' new cadres), ex-student and/or ex-NGO activists

¹¹ About '*tokoh petani*' or 'prominent peasant leaders' see again Chapter V.

	Urban areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student committees for action in collaboration with NGOs • Advocacy NGOs for land rights and agrarian reform • Peasants' organizations at district, inter-districts and/or provincial levels) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solidarity actions to victims of land expropriations • Against the New Order's developmentalism and political repression • Land rights and access to natural resources for livelihood as a human right • National agrarian policy changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct protests both to local and national authorities and parliaments • Legal and paralegal campaigns and advocacy • Mobilization of victims of land expropriations in multi-cases; protests to the district, provincial or national authorities and assemblies • Campaigns and advocacy 	Student, ex-student and NGO activists, scholar-activists
Mid 1990s to 1998	Rural areas	Local peasants' organizations (village and/or inter-villages levels)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against land conflicts • Recognition of land rights • Freedom for people organizing in rural areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protests of single case and/or multi-cases to local authorities and assemblies • Direct land claim actions 	Combination of politically trained local leaders and cadres, ex-student and/or ex-NGO activists
	Urban areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy NGOs for land rights and agrarian reform • Peasants' organization at District, inter-districts and/or provincial levels) • National coalition for agrarian reform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against the New Order's agrarian policies and political repressions • Against global neoliberal land policies • Land rights and access to natural resources for livelihood as human right • Agrarian conflicts resolution • National agrarian policy changes • Agrarian reform as the way to resolve agrarian problems in Indonesia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct protests both to local and national authorities and assemblies • Legal and paralegal aid campaign and advocacy • Mobilization of the victims of land expropriations of multi-cases for protests to the district, provincial or national authorities and assemblies • Campaign and advocacy at national and international levels • Influencing public and academic discourses 	Student, ex-student and NGO activists, and scholar-activists
Post 1998	Rural areas	Local peasant's organizations village and/or inter-villages levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against land conflicts • Recognition of land rights • Improving rural infrastructure and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protests of single cases and/or multi-cases to the local authorities and assemblies • Direct land claims actions 	Combination of politically trained local leaders and cadres, ex-student and/or ex-NGO

			agricultural facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Controlling the local government at village level Involvement in local elections (village and district level) 	activists
	Urban areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocacy NGOs for land rights and agrarian reform National coalitions for agrarian reform Peasants' organizations at district, inter-districts, provincial levels) National coalitions of peasant movements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against global neoliberal land and agricultural policies Land rights and access to natural resources for livelihood as human rights Agrarian conflicts resolution National agrarian policy changes Agrarian reform as the way to resolve agrarian problems in Indonesia Food sovereignty Right of peasants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct protests both to local and national authorities and assemblies Legal and paralegal aid, campaigns and advocacy Mobilization of peasants to pressures policy changes at district, provincial, national or global levels Campaign and advocacy at national and international levels Influencing public and academic discourses Involvement in local elections (district, provincial and national level) 	Student, ex-student and NGO activists, and scholar-activists

Dynamics of changes in pro agrarian reform rural social movements in Indonesia, as shown in Table 10.1 above, reflect a process of 'transmutation', which means changes in the qualities of organizing, issues and claims and actions strategies, while the substance of these changes remains the same. In organizing activities and forms of action, the important substance that remains are rural-urban alliances dominated by urban-educated activists. In issues and claims, the important substance that remains is people's land rights, policy changes toward the pro-poor agrarian policies, and recognition of political rights of rural people. While in actions strategies the important substance that remains is advocacy, collective land claims actions and political action.

There are two factors that influenced transmutation. Firstly, the entrepreneurial leadership of the activists to discover and modified their tactics, methods and strategies to deal with regime changes followed by different treatments of the social movement groups. Secondly, the existence of durable relationships between urban-based social movement activists with peasants and other rural villagers that want to improve their livelihood, and who need political support and protection. While social movement activists perceived these rural villagers' aspirations as an opportunity to achieve their political and ideological interests.

10.2 Agrarian Reform: Between Discourse and Action

It should be kept in mind that term 'agrarian reform' and 'land reform' was frequently used interchangeably.¹² In its narrow meaning, land reform referred to processes of changing land holding structures in which land redistribution was the main elements, while agrarian reform covered and wider aspects of land holding structural change. In this sense agrarian reform means a series of integrated activities related to land tenure reform, of both

¹² See also Wiradi 1984 about this topic.

individual land holdings and land controlled by corporations for their investment and natural resource exploitation for commercial purposes; redistribution both private land and State Land to small and landless peasants plus providing facilities to support agricultural productivity after having received redistributed land, changes to agrarian policies and laws, and agrarian conflicts resolution.¹³ To this end agrarian reform is a political development program to change the structure of power related to land holding and access to the natural resources, which in its operation will cover economic, legal, and social aspects. Putzel (1996) concluded that agrarian reform is a multidimensional rural development program.

Agrarian policy that allows or even creates inequality brings about socio-political instability, because it becomes the root cause of exploitation and ignorance of political rights as well as a threat to basic needs provision for marginalized rural populations; and is also the cause of social and political instability (Russett 1964; Muller and Seligson 1987; Prosterman, Temple and Hanstad 1990; Brockett 1990; Moyo and Yeros 2005; and Currie 2009: 57-72). The New Order regime, as elaborated in Chapter II, suspended this potential for socio-political instability through more repression in rural areas. But it could not stop people protests and spontaneous rural radicalism where land expropriation and eviction occurred, separating many people from their livelihood sources. Moreover small and landless peasants, both individually or in groups, tried to resolve their need for land through occupation actions on State Land including the state forest as elaborated in Chapter VII and VIII.

While the current generation of pro-peasant and scholar-activists have their own direct experience of agrarian movements, through studying the 1960-66 period and from oral histories; they know this period is recognized as 'the years of great opportunity', for they were the years when a strong

¹³ References relating to this meaning of agrarian reform include Tuma 1965; Food and Agriculture Organization 1981; Barraclough 1982; White and Wiradi 1984; Prosterman, Temple and Hanstad 1990; Christodoulou 1990; Wiradi 2000; Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria 1995b: 428-435, 1998a and 2002a; Kelompok Studi Pembaruan Agraria 2001; and Borrás Jr. 2007.

foundation for post-independence rural and national development should have been laid (interview with Gunawan Wiradi, Bogor 7 August 2008 [No.: A-06]; see also, Setiawan 1997, Fauzi 1999; Wiradi 2000; Bachriadi and Wiradi *forthcoming*; and Bachriadi 1999b and 2002b). During these years the Basic Agrarian Law 1960 (BAL) was promulgated, followed by implementation of a land reform program with full participation of the peasantry. That opportunity was lost when a power shift occurred in 1966, followed by a systematic reduction and subsequent dismantling of the land reform program's implementation. By the 1970s it was replaced by other rural development programs such as the green revolution, transmigration and nucleus-estate and smallholders programs. Academic and public discourse on agrarian reform became a 'luxurious but dangerous' discourse.

Although NGO and scholar-activists tirelessly attempted to bring the agrarian reform idea back onto successive governments' agenda, the results were not so successful. As shown in Chapter II, since 1965 no administrations in Indonesia have put this structural change program back into their development programs. Social movement activists made various efforts to achieve this objective: from encouraging academic and public discourses to push agrarian policy change (see Chapter III), to generate social movements for both objectives, namely to change policies and to implement land reform (Chapters IV-VI), and to claim land through direct actions (Chapters VII-IX). The main constraint experienced by scholars in the '70s and 80s to develop public discourses on agrarian reform and policy changes (as discussed in Chapter III and V), was caused by the absence of political instruments that had enough power to constantly contend with the authorities, on the one hand, and had enough heat to melt the politically frozen society to become involved in public discourses on the importance of agrarian reform for Indonesian development, on the other.

Indeed many cases of forced land expropriation in the '80-90s did light fires under the frozen rural society to challenge the New Order regime through

their spontaneous protests and radicalism. These land expropriation cases and local protests provided a political opportunity, which was perceived by urban-based social movement activists as strengthening their challenge to the power of Soeharto's New Order authoritarian regime. But activists involved in defending local people's rights to land, especially in land conflict cases, were not just 'morally concerned' about evicted people. Some were activists who had ideological and political interests to revive rural mass politics in Indonesia (see Chapter IV), including using the rural masses for their political interests namely the struggle for political power (see Chapter VIII and IX).

The formation of KPA in 1994 was an important stage in the trajectory of pro-agrarian reform rural social movements in post 1965 Indonesia. KPA became a vehicle of struggle, both to revive the discourse on agrarian reform as the foundation of social development, and to keep challenging the ruling power to implement it. Following Weddon (1987) and Irwan (2005), the formation of KPA fulfilled a requirement to change policy and especially people's attitudes towards radical ideas, namely the existence of an institution that was in part a machine to institutionalize these ideas and discourses. If Weddon (1987) saw the importance of institutionalizing radical ideas through formal public education, and Irwan (2005) showed the importance of institutionalizing the idea of changes within government policy-making agencies, the formation of KPA was an effort by pro-agrarian reform activists to institutionalize the idea of structural reform, both in public and policy discourses, using social movement methods. In this thesis it has been shown that rural social movements did not emerge outside the 'normal life' of society and policy-making processes. As a political process, these movements were part of the dynamics of society itself even though ways to change social life carried out by social movement groups were frequently treated as unconventional politics.¹⁴

¹⁴ See also Gamson 1990, Meyer and Tarrow 1998, and Tilly 2004 for broad theoretical arguments on this subject.

Indeed, as shown in previous chapters, it is not an easy task for activists to build an institution to take on the role as an advocate of institutionalized agrarian reform, either within policy making processes or within the broader aspects of Indonesian social life. There are two important elements which influencing this dynamics. The first was the contentious debates amongst activists themselves to formulate integrated ideas of reform and agree on appropriate strategies to implement that reform; and the second element was the competition for amongst the activists for control of the movements' leadership.

The first element is important because activists and scholar-activists needed to reformulate the idea of integrated agrarian reform implementation as a response to contemporary land problems, which became more complicated and harder to provide advocacy for, as the anti reform Suharto regime and successive ruling regimes had no radical perspective with which to resolve poverty and social inequality problems. When the 1960s land reform program was halted and the discourse on radical perspectives of rural development was slowly submerged within the anti-communist political stigmatization, as discussed on Chapter III, the new generation of activists and scholar-activists of the 80s and 90s tried to revive these reform discourses along with explanations and arguments about how to resolve land conflict cases which occurred in those years (1980s-1990s).

As a consequence, activists were trapped in debates and contending arguments about technical policies and legal bases of agrarian reform implementation. These debates about the technical and legal bases for agrarian reform led to disintegration and splits in agrarian social movements (see chapters V and VI). While the government had little room in their policy agendas to implement reform, the debates and contending agendas reduced social movement power to push governments to radically change their orientation on development. Things only got worse when the activists fell more deeply into internal contention when neoliberal policy agendas with their pro-

poor rhetoric dominated policy-making processes, particularly in the *reformasi* era.

10.3 'Exchange of Interests' Between Peasants and Activists

Land claim actions, especially land occupation actions, and the emergence of peasants' organizations during and after the New Order period, reflect a revival of rural mass politics in Indonesia, although the government and mass media considered these actions as 'land looting' (*'penjarahan tanah'*), i.e. illegal actions against State Land. While the pre and post Soeharto regimes tried to use legal language to create suspicion that land claims were criminal actions, at the same time the public media, even though containing sympathetic reports of peasant grievances, frequently obsessively followed (*'latah'*) this government-driven discourse on land claim actions by using the term 'looting' in their reports (see, for instance, *Kompas* 27 September 1998, *Tempo Interaktif* 25 July 1998 and 19 January 1999, *Sinar Harapan* 22 November 2001, *Koran Tempo* 20 January 2002, *Bisnis Indonesia* 29 January 2002, and *Pikiran Rakyat* 30 June and 1 July 2008).

Media coverage on land actions tended to '...use the term 'illegitimate' to describe peasants as looters... [peasant actions] was constructed more in terms of civil violence and anarchism, not in terms of them attempting to get back their rights as citizens' (Sudibyo 2001: 190). So 'public opinion on looting was constructed by stimulation and images in the media' (Sudibyo 2001: 191). Meanwhile, along with legal aid to defend peasants victimized for 'breaking the law' by the courts, activists and pro-peasant scholars had made efforts to develop a counter discourse to support people-oriented land claim actions using legal critiques (*hukum kritis*), human rights, social and agrarian justice

perspectives (see for instance Parlindungan 1998, Bachriadi 1998c, Sudibyo 2001, Fauzi 2002, and Widjardjo and Perdana 2001).¹⁵

In spite of negative public opinion about land struggles (Sudibyo 2001), land claim actions and especially land occupation actions continued during and after the New Order period, and were significant in building strategies for the development of rural social movement bases, as discussed in Chapter VII-IX.¹⁶ In this context, there were also qualitative changes in the strategy of collective land occupation actions. From the 80s until the mid 90s, most were carried out by groups of people to get recognition over land they controlled, but had been evicted from for various 'development projects' (see Chapter IV). From the mid 90s until now, these actions were expanded to include peasant groups who had not actually been victims of land expropriations. They were groups of landless peasants or even landholders who wanted to extent their control over land (see Chapter VII and VIII). But when their actions faced counter-measures from existing landowners or the authorities, these groups looked for support and protection from NGO, especially from local peasant organizations that had already emerged from the early 90s, which in return enlarged the mass bases of existing rural movement organizations.

Based on landholdings among people who were involved in land claim actions, we can make a typology as shown in table 10.2 below. This table expands typologies made by Tilly (1978) and Aditjondro (2002) that pointed out two different aspects, namely the mode of actions (Tilly) and the orientation of actions (Aditjondro). Data from Chapters VII and VIII shows another aspect to enrich our understanding about the phenomena of land claim actions, namely their expected outcomes.

¹⁵ See also the poster produced by KPA in 1996 stated that "To Defend Land Rights ≠ Looting".

¹⁶ See also Huizer 1972, Hobsbawm 1974, Tilly 1978, Petras 1998, Fernandez 2001, Ramagundam 2001, Aditjondro 2002, Brandford and Rocha 2002, Wright and Wolford 2003, and Wolford 2003 for theoretical discussions about land occupations as strategies for peasant rebellion and the development of rural social movements.

Table 10.2 Typology of Land Claims Actions

Aspect	Groups of Evicted People	Groups of Non-Evicted People
Mode of actions (Tilly 1978)	Reactive	Proactive
Orientation of actions (Aditjondro 2002)	Restorative	Transformative
Expected outcomes of actions	Recognition	Redistribution

The importance of this typology of aspects and expected outcomes in analyzing land claim actions relates to the reality that, within the framework of rural social movements, a process of ‘exchange of interests’ (Migdal 1974 and Skocpol 1994) is laid out between the actors and the participants. This ‘exchange of interests’, will determine the achievement of land claim actions as part of the objectives of a rural social movement. For instance, within the framework of rural social movements Aditjondro (2002) asserts that land claim actions conducted by groups of non-evicted people are oriented to transformative change. But if we take into consideration that the interest of peasant groups to be involved in social movements is really only to hold land, ‘transformative change within society’ as a movement objective depends on the capacity of the activists to manage this material interest of the peasants to accumulate movement power. Based on an exploration of the dynamics of rural social movements in Indonesia since the 70s, (as explored in previous chapters of this dissertation), the interests of activists who dominated these movements were not merely to accumulate movement power for transformative change, but also to control the movements and to be engage in institutionalized politics. The peasants followed the activists’ directions to the movements as long as their interests were articulated, but enthusiasm to be involved declined once they got what they struggled for, namely land.

As explained in previous chapters (especially Chapters VII-IX), peasant groups involved in land claim actions needed support from outsiders, particularly when facing repression or counter-measures from landowners

and/or the authorities. During the New Order period peasant groups were unable to get constant support, either from established political institutions¹⁷, or the government-controlled farmers' organization the HKTI.¹⁸ For that support they had to approach the urban-based social movement groups such as students, NGOs (explored in Chapter IV), or autonomous local peasants' organizations that had already formed in some places since the mid 1990s (explored in Chapter V-VIII). What the peasants asked for was political and legal support and protection. In fact peasants not only got support and protection from social movement activists groups, but also from political parties, religious institutions, and others. However in violent land conflicts, frequently experienced by the peasantry, it was activist groups, which also had political interests in these conflicts, who provided continuous support, because they were embedded in these conflicts and dedicated their political life to these land struggles.

In fact during the 1980s and 1990s, social movement activists that challenged the New Order regime were proactive in beginning community organizing around land conflicts, with or without requests from the victims of land evictions. This reflected the political and/or ideological interests that existed behind activists' proactive attitudes, expressed through these land conflicts. They found land conflicts that occurred provided opportunities to expand their movement bases at the rural grassroots level in order to challenge the ruling regime, and to rebuild mass-politics in rural areas.

When movement bases became rooted in rural areas and could be developed into autonomous local peasants' organizations and national coalitions of peasant movements and/or for agrarian reform, as mentioned

¹⁷ See Chapter VIII, especially the case of Sukaraja, about the unsuccessful effort of local leaders to get support from Golkar.

¹⁸ See also the explanation of a peasant leader of Badega who failed to get support from HKTI, even though he was a sub-district leader of this government-driven farmers organization, in 'Berjuang untuk Tanah' 2003: *tape no. 5*.

earlier (section 10.1),¹⁹ this reflected the 'exchange of interests' that occurred between the peasant groups and the activists. Both parties could maintain this exchange continuously so that changes in movement organization and strategies also occurred. Without this 'exchange of interests', these rural-urban coalitions could not have been established.

By placing 'exchange of interests' as the backbone of the performance of social movements, we can see that the emergence and development of the movements reflected the political dynamics of struggle interests of the parties that were involved. Indeed external factors such as regime change, macro politics transformation and economic development, will influence the dynamics development of social movements, as mentioned in 'political opportunity structure' theory (see for instance Tilly 1978, McAdam 1982, Tarrow 1983, Kriesi 1989, Kitschelt 1986, Koopmans 1992, Duyvendak 1992, Meyer and Minkoff 2004, and Goldstone 2004). But from explanations given in previous chapters, we can see that the dynamics of 'exchange of interests', including contention and conflict among the actors of the movements, determined the direction, form and changes of social movement organizations more than external factors.

As already explored in previous chapters, substantially different forms of movement organizations that occurred during and after the New Order period, reflected activists' efforts to maintain the exchange of their political and ideological interests with rural villagers' interests for better livelihoods, especially peasant groups who had struggled for land. But at the same time, these activists felt they needed to increase their influence on institutionalized politics without losing their political ties to the rural villagers that were their mass bases. This dynamics of exchange of interests between the activists and the peasants and/or other rural villagers gives us a greater understanding of the 'up and down' phenomena in the consolidation of movement organizations,

¹⁹ Details were explained in Chapter V-IX.

especially when one party considers that their interests have been achieved but the organization cannot fulfill the interests of other parties.

Experiences of SPP, STaB and its movement networks that provided strong political and legal support to their members to gain and/or defend control of land, but had relatively less success in providing economic support and/or building new economic institutions to back up their members' production activities, led to the reality that some of their bases had been 'stepping down gradually' from the movement, because they felt secure enough to control their land on their own.

This dynamics of 'exchange of interest' between activists and peasants also explains why some rural movement organizations survived but others did not, as experienced by both SPP and STaB. When the macro political structures and regimes changed, as was the case in the transition to democracy that followed the change from the authoritarian New Order regime to the liberal democratic regime, the SPP has survived until now. This is because there are some member groups that still depend on the activists and the organization for political and legal support and protection, because the land they have struggled for has not yet been legally recognized. Although some members have already got legal recognition of occupied land, others considered they already had security to cultivate the land, even though their legal position was still uncertain. Yet they have been able to 'step down' gradually from this movement organization, but later became involved again in the organization and the movement when new repression occurred. The activists' capacity to maintain peasants' interests continuously to be involved in the organization and to consider that they (the peasants) need the organization, has been a crucial factor in the continuation of SPP consolidation.

In contrast, the Bengkulu activists' clique that was pivotal for STaB movement consolidation in Bengkulu was shattered as a consequence of their concerted attempts to get formal political positions and through being involved in electoral politics. Ironically, without their being aware of it, these efforts led

them to neglect the material interests of rural villagers involved in the STaB movement, who were left behind.

This was clearly reflected in the process of change in pro-rural social movement groups, which occurred since the 80s, namely that rural social movements were not merely the accumulation of rural grievances. These movements were vehicles created to achieve certain political and material objectives, which were of course triggered by rural grievances. Activists with entrepreneurial leadership capacity played an important role to manage and escalate rural demands for change, and rural villagers including peasants also used the opportunity to fulfill their demands.

The pro-agrarian reform movement in Indonesia, meaning the movement to demand the implementation of an integrated nation-wide program to change unequal land distribution structures and unequal access to natural resources, was dominated by groups of activists and/or scholar-activists. This pro-agrarian reform movement did not emerge naturally from peasant struggles to be free from their grievances.

The Indonesian pro-agrarian reform movement emerged instead as a result of the formulation of ideas and strategies to explain these rural grievances and social injustice, which to some extent was mixed up with the ideas of class struggle, human rights and democratization, formulated by the activists and scholar-activists. Some of them can be categorized as intellectuals (scholar-activists as defined in Chapter I section 1.3.2), persons that used their intellectual capabilities to influence social change through social movements. But these activists and scholar-activists were also involved in political processes of both the movements and of institutionalized politics, like any other politicians they wanted to gain political power and defend their positions.

The minds of many pro-agrarian reform activists were not set on ideological considerations concerning class struggle. It was easy to find ideas and claims of anti-capitalism and anti-colonialism as part of the activists'

political rhetoric, which then became planted in organizations' slogans and rhetoric on paper or during mass actions (see again Chapters V-VIII). But it was quite difficult to find real implementation of those anti-capitalism and anti-colonial ideas on the ground, practiced by communities that became their struggle bases. On one hand this reflected the nature of movement bases that were composed of people from different social classes (as described in Chapter VII-IX), in which it was only possible to consolidate the movement as long as their different interests were exchange; it was not possible to consolidate the movement based along certain ideological interests and objectives. On the other hand, peasants involved in movement organizations (peasant's organizations) basically said their objective was to gain and/or to defend their material interests, while their enthusiasm for being involved in the movement declined as their objectives were achieved. This was especially if the struggle moved forward to more radical social change, such as implementation of collectivization of landholdings and/or agricultural production that might reduce what they had already achieved individually.

10.4 Endnote for Further Research

This dissertation has pinpointed three factors important in understanding the emergence, development and change of pro-agrarian reform and rural social movements in Indonesia post 1965. Based on these three factors some new questions can be followed up through further research. What are the dynamics of changes in landholding structures within peasant communities that have been involved in collective land occupation actions, and what are the implications for the so-called 're-peasantization' processes?²⁰ How have the recent neoliberal land policies affected this process and how have the policies

²⁰ In context of organized land occupation actions, Fernandez (2001) and Wolford (2003) showed from Brazilian cases that these movement actions have a clear meaning as part of the process of (re)creation of the peasantry (Fernandez 2001) and formation of new rural communities (Wolford 2003), along with the struggle to form alternative modes of production to the capitalist agricultural mode of production.

influenced the agrarian movement consolidation at the grassroots level? Both questions should be followed up with the micro village level studies that bring in comparative case studies. How have external factors, such as policy and economic changes, influenced achievement of movement demands for implementation of agrarian reform? Since it reemerged 15 years ago, why hasn't the pro agrarian reform movement pushed the government or political parties to implement this agrarian structural change program? This dissertation had tried to explain these questions from the perspective of the internal dynamics within agrarian social movement groups. It is also important to understand the dynamics of policy changes and the broader political constellation of government and politics in Indonesia that has affected this phenomenon, but these issues are outside the scope of this dissertation.

