

Chapter 1

Agrarian Reform and Rural Social Movements in Indonesia: Background of the Study

Access to land is the essence of rural politics (Turner 1993: 132)

Movements may largely be born of environmental opportunities, but their fate is heavily shaped by their own actions (McAdam, McCarthy and Zald 1996: 15)

There are many ways in which people are reinventing local politics and building linkages with the political sphere (Antlöv 2003: 82)

It was Thursday the 24th of September 1998. Hundreds of people, representatives of peasant groups from many parts of Indonesia, other student and NGO activists, were gathered in a demonstration in front of National Parliament building at Jakarta. A national newspaper reported, 'the action, at midday, was carried out by young and old protesters wearing headbands with the slogan *'reforma agraria'*... amongst them were students with alma mater jackets of the University of Indonesia... others came from North Sumatra and Lampung University' (*Republika* 25 September 1998). It was clear to those in the agrarian reform movement that the protest had been coordinated by an *ad hoc* action committee composed of NGOs, student groups and peasant organizations called the Action Committee of Indonesian Peasants (KARTI,

Komite Aksi Rakyat Tani Indonesia).¹ They demanded that the government implement agrarian reform again in Indonesia. They also challenged the government to resolve agrarian conflicts which had occurred in Indonesia since the New Order period within three months; if not, according to KARTI's statement, people will occupy the lands they believed rightfully belonged to them (Komite Rakyat Tani Indonesia 1998, *Republika* 25 September 1998).

Three days before the Jakarta action, on 21 September 1998, hundreds of peasants consolidated in another *ad hoc* organization, the Fraternal Struggle of All Indonesian Peasants (PPTSI, Perjuangan Persaudaraan Tani Seluruh Indonesia), had already conducted a similar protest at the same place. They wore black headbands saying '*Petani Menggugat*' ('The Peasants Accuse') – reminding people who knew a bit of modern Indonesian history of the title of Soekarno's defence speech in the colonial court 78 years ago, "Indonesia Accuses" (*Indonesia Menggugat*). The peasants accused the government of facilitating land grabbing for 'development' and commercial projects; the peasants accused the State of using violence and repression against their families and defenders; they demanded return of their land, recognition of pluralism for indigenous land rights, revision of the Basic Agrarian Law (BAL) and formulation of legislation to protect land rights (*Kompas* 24 September 1998).

After conducting their protest on 21 September, hundreds of PPTSI peasants camped in an open field within the University of Indonesia campus at Depok, southern Jakarta, to discuss what would be launched at the next action on 24 September. Hundreds more peasants, students and NGO activists joined the camp prior the 24th of September. These protesters, imbued with the spirit of the 1998 *reformasi* movement, joined with other Indonesian social movement groups to consolidate a protest which had actually been generated

¹ Organizations who belonged to this committee were the Consortium for Agrarian Reform (KPA, Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria), the Secretariat of Bina Desa, Pasundan Peasant's Union (SPP, Serikat Petani Pasundan), Indonesian Federation of Peasant's Unions (FSPI, Federasi Serikat Petani Indonesia), Indonesian Peasant Alliance (API, Aliansi Petani Indonesia), Friends of the Earth Indonesia (WALHI, Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia) and others.

by 'urban-educated activists' (students, ex-students, and NGOs activists and other progressive middle-class people).

The 24 September 1998 is an important date for Indonesians who are pro agrarian reform and rural social movements because this date is National Peasants Day, which they commemorate with actions articulating peasant's demands through petitions, street actions, marching rallies, and other kind of protests. Before and after this day both local and national mass media cover the various claims and statements of the pro-peasant activists, politicians and intellectuals about land and agrarian problems in Indonesia. It was on this date in 1960, that the Basic Agrarian Law was promulgated as Indonesia's most important post-colonial populist law (see Gautama and Hornick 1974, Parlindungan 1991, McAuslan 1986, and Wiradi 2000). The BAL, that is still law until today, contained important mandates with respect to peasant's rights over land, and the implementation of agrarian reform.

Various actions and media statements appear around 24 September especially after Peasants Day 1994, both in Jakarta and in the regions, organized by social movement groups reaffirming agrarian reform as the common and unified claim of the peasantry. This claim was reaffirmed within a common framework of pro poor-peasant movements in Indonesia. They connected local problems of limited land access, evictions and wider agrarian policy change to implement agrarian reform. Their core demands were restructuring of land distribution, land conflict resolution and recognition of indigenous land rights.

1.1 Background of the Study

Peasant protests have existed in many forms in each historical period in Indonesia, and many perspectives having been used to account for them. They

emerged in the pre-colonial times, and often occurred in the colonial period.² Soon after Independence until the mid-1960s, peasant movements in Indonesia significantly influenced land reform policy-making processes and implementation, especially for land reform implementation (see, for instance, Mortimer 1972, Pelzer 1982: 26-27, Huizer 1980 and 1999, Kartodirdjo 1984, Lyon 1970, Kuntowijoyo 1993, and Padmo 2000). However, a dramatic political change in 1965-1966 followed by New Order rule (1966-1998) shrank peasant movements under the authoritarianism of state power, particularly for the first two decades, before they re-emerged clearly in the last decade of the Suharto regime.

Many studies have been conducted to examine the dynamics of the economic and political changes which occurred after the new regime, calling itself the 'New Order', came to power, influencing both social and production relations and creating social unrest in rural areas. Studies of rural unrest of the New Order period (1966-1998) were generally focussed on the resistance of peasants or rural villagers, as the so-called 'victims of development', to the oppression of the New Order regime.³ Other studies have focus on dynamics of the pro peasant and agrarian reform movements, their organizations and networks that emerged either in the midst of the authoritarian regime or during the *reformasi* era (Royo 2000, Aspinall 2004, Wahyudi 2005, Di Gregorio 2006, Peluso, Afiff and Rachman 2008, Safitri 2010).

Other explanations of social and pro-democracy movements during the New Order period have had little to say about these 'rural social movements'

² Many peasant struggles in the pre-colonial and colonial periods were interpreted as messianic movements or social banditry to articulate popular socio-economic grievances against feudal as well as colonial pressures. See for example the bulk of Kartodirdjo's work, such as: Kartodirdjo 1966, 1972, 1973 and 1991, also Suhartono 1993. For criticisms that there was a misleading emphasis on the religious character of rural protests in Java during the colonial period, see: Radin 1995 and 1999. Other scholars who have portrayed peasant struggles as part of continuation of the nationalist and/or social revolution for independence include Mortimer 1972, Pelzer 1982, Kurosawa 1993 and Padmo 2000.

³ See, for instance, Lucas 1992 and 1997, Bachriadi 1997a, Agustono *et al.* 1997, Maliki 1999, Firmansyah *et al.* 1999, Bachriadi and Lucas 2001, Hafid 2001, Bachriadi 2002b, Pussbik 2002, Suryaalam 2003, Situmorang 2005, and Mustain 2007.

and their significance for the democratization processes in Indonesia. Scholars such as Eldridge (1995), Uhlin (1997), Hadiwinata (2003) and Aspinall (2005), for instance, explain rural protests during the New Order period as one kind of oppositional movement to Soeharto's power, which would bring ideas of democratization in Indonesia. Even though, as part of their broader explanation, both Eldridge (1995) and Aspinall (2005) also mention branches of movements that tried to be more radical through embryonic organizing of mass-movements in rural areas based on land conflicts. Lucas (1992 and 1996) and Aspinall (2004) are few amongst these scholarly attempts that emphasise significant political impacts of land conflict campaigns and advocacy to the democratization process, particularly to delegitimize the New Order's claims on development.

There is relatively less attention given to the strategic changes developed by pro-peasant activists and agrarian reform movements to the challenges of the different regimes. What were the contentious issues and debates about strategy and leadership among the activists that caused splits, the breakup of organizations, and the emergence of new movement organizations that could be involved in politics? This dissertation will look into these issues. It about dynamics, change and continuation, as well as consequences of, 'pro-rural' movements, also called 'rural social movements' or just 'rural movements', as Woods (2003) has pointed out.

What is meant by the 'change and continuation' of such movements is the extent to which those emerging in the mid-80's have kept going until now, even though they have performed differently in different periods, with changing forms of organization as well as struggle agendas. The pro-rural movements, which are mostly based in urban areas in this period (the '80s) are very important, since the New Order banned all kinds of leftist political and people-organizing activities and consolidated all forms of social organizations, both in urban and rural areas, into umbrella groups they could control. Through land conflict cases, these pro-rural movements tried to dissolve the frozen mass

politics caused by the state-corporatism of the New Order (Lucas 1992 and 1996, Fidro and Fauzi 1995, Fauzi 1997, and Aspinall 2004). In rural areas, roots of earlier mass-based social movements were mostly destroyed since the New Order took power in 1966 (Bachriadi 1996, Fauzi 1999, Aspinall 2004 and 2005, Boudreau 2004, Farid 2005, Heryanto 2006, and Fauzi and Bachriadi 2006).

From scholarly references and previous 'small studies' which were conducted by activists (Fidro and Fauzi 1995, Lucas and Warren 2000 and 2003, Bachriadi 2001c and 2005a, Bachriadi and Fauzi 2001, Aspinall 2004 and 2005, Fauzi and Bachriadi 2006), one gets the impression that there was a continuous relation between 'peasant and rural protest movements' and 'urban-based pro-democracy movements' in the New Order period, reflected in the emergence of national coalitions for agrarian reform and peasant organizations, at both local and national levels. This, in return, reflected the role of these movements in the formation of a 'new rural politics' in Indonesia. This is shown by the importance of the actors involved, whose leadership of recent peasant organizations is crucial in current rural social movements, their developing networks and selected struggle agendas, as well as methods and tactics used for political development in post Soeharto Indonesia.

The past 10 years have seen significant changes and developments in rural social movements in Indonesia. If the early 1980's agrarian protest was about land expropriations and evictions, since the end of the 90s a new wave of movements relied on widespread land occupation actions (see for instance Bachriadi and Lucas 2002, Fauzi and Bachriadi 2006, Safitri 2010). This important strategic change taken by current rural social movements underscored their serious demands for land (Bachriadi and Fauzi 2001, Bachriadi 2005a, Fauzi and Bachriadi 2006). On the one hand, through land occupation actions, groups of poor peasants tried to regain their economic and

political rights that had been lost or denied for a long time.⁴ On the other hand, land occupation actions have been improving the political bargaining power of these groups,⁵ and have already affected agrarian politics at both local and national level.⁶

There are several conditions under which rural families in Indonesia have expressed their political aspirations through land occupation actions. Firstly, where the need to control or own agricultural land for livelihood and survival is high. In fact, unequal land holdings and landlessness is a feature of life in rural areas (Bachriadi and Wiradi forthcoming), but a genuine land reform program, as an instrument to redress this unequal land distribution, has never been implemented seriously after the political change in 1966.⁷

Secondly, since the beginning of the 90's, various peasant organizations were emerging as a consequence of consolidation work and radicalism in rural areas, mainly manifested as demonstrations and protest actions in reaction to land expropriations in the years before. These organisations were becoming an effective instrument in actions for land occupation (see for instance Bachriadi

⁴ For a similar explanation of occurrences in some Latin American countries, see Huizer 1972 and 1973, Fernandes 2001, Wright and Wolford 2003, Branford and Rocha 2002. In case of India, see for examples Sharma 1989; and Ramagundam 2001 for a specific attempt to explain how the *adivasi* (tribal) people tried to claim land rights. See also Franco 2006 for a discussion on land rights in the perspective of human rights.

⁵ For works relating to this argument see Huizer 1971, 1972 and 1973; Mortimer 1972; Hobsbawm 1974; Kartodirdjo 1984; Kuntowijoyo 1993, and Borras Jr. 2007. See also Petras 1998, Fernandes 2001, Brandford and Rocha 2002, Wright and Wolford 2003, and Wolford 2003 for a contemporary and significant collective land occupation action in Brazil. Kowalchuk 2005 showed how the land invasion method is used to improve the political bargaining power of the peasant organization in El Salvador, while Sharma (1989) showed that strategic changes in the methods of the Indian peasant movement in Bihar, which shifted from conventional actions to land occupation, increased significantly the political power of this movement. A relatively similar case of using collective land occupation in India as a method to increase the power of the *adivasi* and 'untouchable' peoples was also mentioned in Ramagundam 2001. For cases of land occupation in contemporary Philippines, see Rodriguez 1987. For a comparative inter-country study of cases across continents, see Moyo and Yeros 2005.

⁶ For a short but good example see Lucas and Warren 2003.

⁷ Reminders of agrarian inequality as a cause of peasant rebellion and revolution were Prosterman's work on the Index of Rural Instability (IRI) (Prosterman 1972, Prosterman and Riedinger 1987) and Seligson's work on land tenure in El Salvador (Seligson 1995 and 1996).

and Lucas 2002, Fauzi and Bachriadi 2006).⁸ Many of these conflicts continued for years, even for decades after the 70s. This unrest and protest actions reflected peasant distrust of state authority, particularly of its political practices and development programs.

Huizer (1971, 1972 and 1973), basing his observations on peasant rebellions in Latin American and some Asian countries, including Indonesia, in the 60's and early 70's, mentioned peasant distrust as a potential factor for social change, if used by revolutionary groups. Skocpol (1979 and 1994), through her study of peasant-based social revolutions, concluded that organizing for revolutionary movements would be more effective when peasant unrest and protest already existed. Despite Skocpol's explanation being related to national revolutionary movements, her argument appeared relevant in the formation of radical peasant movements and organizations in Indonesia during the late 90's. Based on this argument, it is assumed here that land conflicts and rural protests against land expropriation made the consolidation of radical peasant organizations⁹ much easier. In other words, these definitive rural protests could become a base for the formation of radical peasant organizations.

Thirdly, Indonesian political change after 1998, particularly the transition from an authoritarian state to democracy, was gradually weakening the power of the state's repressive and coercive actions. Fourthly, reviving the agrarian and land reform theme in Indonesia led by NGOs, advocacy groups and other

⁸ The two tables in Appendix 4. show the figures for prolonged land conflict cases in Indonesia from 1970 until 2001.

⁹ Fitzgerald and Rodgers (2000) make a distinction between 'moderate social movement organizations' and 'radical social movement organizations' based on internal structure, ideology, tactics, and mode of communication and assessment of success. The ideal type of 'radical social movement organization' is characterized by: non-hierarchical leadership, participatory democratic organization, egalitarian, membership based on involvement, and support of indigenous leadership (internal structure); radical agendas, emphasis on structural changes, flexible ideology, radical networks, global consciousness and connections, an anti militaristic stance (ideology); nonviolent direct action, mass actions, and innovative tactics (tactics); being ignored/misrepresented by media, reliance on alternative forms of communications (modes of communication); limited resources, being purposefully short-lived, substantive rationality, contributing to a larger radical agenda, and subject to intense opposition and government surveillance or 'assessment of success'.

networks, was affirming actions by poor rural families to use land occupations as a kind of political expression (see for instance Lucas and Warren 2003, Aspinall 2004, Boras 2004a, Bachriadi 2005a, Moyo and Yeros 2005, and Fauzi and Bachriadi 2006).

In some ways the political transition to democracy accompanied by a process of decentralization and implementation of regional autonomy politics, was perceived as providing political opportunities for civil society entities including peasant's organizations, NGOs and supporting institutions, to intervene in the process of policy making (Bachriadi 2001c, Fauzi and Zakaria 2002, Antlöv 2003). This new development at the district level – particularly after 1999 when decentralization and regional autonomy policies were being implemented, became a significant factor influencing people to organize in many areas. Peasant organizations could now react directly to local political change, as new leadership, new local government and new policies were seen as an opportunity as well as a threat to rural and peasant livelihoods.

During the immediate post-Suharto period, the re-emergence of social movements currently led by peasant organizations, both at local and national level, reflected a 'transmutation' – a change in qualities while the substance remains the same – in rural social movements and peasant politics in Indonesia. This 'transmutation' is reflected in at least three ways:

- (1) Changes in the appearance of movement organizations, from rural protest groups to institutionalized peasant organizations. During the 80's and 90's many protests against land expropriations emerged both in urban and rural areas. In rural areas, protests groups mostly involved rural cultivators or land owners against 'development' programs that had evicted them from their sources of livelihood. In many cases, urban-based youth, students, and NGO organizer-activists mobilized these protests. In the late 90's many peasant organizations were formed to continue these activities.

- (2) Changes in the main theme of movement repertoires: from 'return local people's land rights' to 'demands for agrarian reform'. During the protest movements in the 80's and 90's, the main demand was to stop 'development' projects that were evicting local people and returning land already taken from local people. The protests aimed to change land allocation policies and achieve a just resolution of land disputes. In the early 90's, the issue of policy changes and conflict resolution was included in the theme of agrarian reform, which put the demand for redistribution of land through a land reform program as part of this reform. The issue of landlessness as one of the main causes of rural poverty was put back into the main theme of policy changes.¹⁰ The subject of these changes covered both the people who had lost their land and the landless people who needed land for their livelihood.
- (3) Changes in the movements' strategies and tactics: from litigation and non-litigation advocacy only¹¹, to a combination of advocacy, collective land occupation actions and political action, to gain power in local politics. During the 80's and the 90's, advocacy work was mostly conducted in term of policy changes in certain land cases. Since peasant organizations formed in particular areas, community organizers were introduced to support new strategies to improve mass-based power at the local level. Collective land occupation strategies and particular strategies to become involved in local politics were used mainly to build the local power of rural villagers for

¹⁰, The theme of landlessness and its relation to rural poverty was the main issue both in academic and policy discourses during the 70' to the 80's. This theme slowly disappeared when the New Order was implementing the massive green revolution program through its agriculture intensification and expansion programs. The intensification program involved the introduction new technology, new hybrid seeds, new technique on agricultural extension, and the development of rural production units as well as rural cooperatives and new models of agricultural production through contract farming. Agricultural expansion involved opening new areas in each sector such as foodstuffs, plantations, animal husbandry and others. For a good discussion on this topic, see Kasryno 1984. For the critics of the green revolution implementation in Indonesia see, for instances, Franke 1972; Hansen 1978; Arief 1979; Billah, Widjajanto and Kristyanto 1984; Manning 1988; White and Wiradi 1989; and Wiradi 1996. Extensive discussion and critics of contract farming implementation in Indonesia see White 1990 and 1997, Wiradi 1991, and Bachriadi 1995.

¹¹ In these advocacy strategies, such techniques as campaigns, mobilization and demonstration, lobbying, and petitioning were included, as well as popular education to make local people consciousness of their problems.

policy change advocacy as well as to conduct so-called ‘peasant-led land reform’ (Petras 1998, Wright and Wolford 2003, and Wolford 2003).¹²

In this context, there are two interrelated explanations for the changes. The first explanation looks at the mobilization of movement resources (followers, networks, information, knowledge, funds, and so on) and movement leadership. In other words, it is important to explain the identity of the main actors in these movements and their social and political networks, as well as their relationship with past movements. How have actors and groups developed their bases, power, networks, and political influence? How have they developed their movement’s identity, ideology and struggle agendas, and selected strategies for collective actions? To analyse the dynamics of interaction among the movement’s actors is important, in addition to seeing their political influence at all levels: from village to global level.

The second explanation looks at particular changes in state-society relations in developing capitalist countries that provide spaces for social movements to emerge, strengthen, and either succeed or fail. Political changes that happened in Indonesia, since the New Order took power in 1966 until its collapse in 1998, created different kinds of protest actions and resistance among the opposition and local people. How have these actions been related to current rural social movements? The transition to democracy that began in 1998 also created different political opportunities for these movements and their influence in local politics. Goldstone (2003 and 2004), through a series of studies in several countries, concluded that social movements would not decline even in democratic society, but would constitute ‘normal’ institutional politics. A similar argument had come earlier from Alvarez, Dagnino and Escobar (1998) when they concluded that the rise in democratization in Latin America had not diminished the significance of social movements. Also, a decade previously, Fox (1990) had showed that the current transition to

¹² Following Borras Jr., Kay and Lodhi (2006: 13-22) there are four approaches to land reform including the peasant-led approach. Three others are ‘state-instigated’ (Palmer 2000, Moyo 2000, Worby 2001), ‘state/society-driven’ (Borras Jr. 2001, Franco 2005) and ‘market-led’ approaches (Deininger 1999).

democracy that was occurring in several developing countries in Latin America and Asia, was creating different kinds of involvement of peasant movement organizations in rural democratization.

1.2 Research Questions

With the above background, this research aims to develop a comprehensive explanation as well as a theoretical understanding of five main questions: (1) How has agrarian reform returned to be a main issue used by activists involved in politics through social movements? (2) What are external (economic and political changes) and internal (organizational consolidation and coalition building) factors that are making rural social movements emerge, 'transmute', and strengthen or weaken in Indonesia? (3) How have rural issues including land rights been used? What have been strategies to mobilize peasants to increase the political power and bargaining of rural villagers and the social movements' activists? (4) What are the synergies or tensions occurring among the actors in current rural social movements who have different social backgrounds in urban and rural social life? (5) What are the interests of the activists to generate rural social movements in Indonesia?

To achieve these aims, this research will explore and analyse: (1) the dynamics of discourses on land and agrarian reform in Indonesia post 1965; (2) the emergence and dynamics of 'transmutation' of rural social movements in Indonesia from the 80's until now, during and after a long period when social movements were frozen in rural areas after Suharto's New Order took power in 1966; and (3) the dynamics of relations among social movement actors in groups that were institutionalized as local peasant's unions in order to achieve their objectives.

1.3 Theoretical Standpoints

1.3.1 Social Movements as Politics

In this dissertation, following Tilly (2004), social movements are portrayed as politics.¹³ Of course there are relations between a social movement and politics, particularly its effects on political life within society. To portray 'social movements as politics' means that the social movement is selected by its actors consciously as a way to express their political aspirations and interests. A social movement, in this sense, is not visible as a collective action that flows from a breakdown in social life, which some scholars believe occurs, when mechanisms of social control lose their restraining power,¹⁴ but from groups vying for political position. According to Gamson, rebellions, protests, and other forms of collective actions, are 'simply politics by other means' (Gamson 1975: 139).

A perspective of 'social movement as politics' seeks conflict in the political behaviour of groups of people to express their interests and claims for social changes, by mobilizing their social potential systematically. It consists of actions in order to perceive particular political opportunities and threats; to mobilize available 'internal' or 'external' resources; to frame their ideas and knowledge of social reconstruction, as well as to deal interactively with other parties' reactions – from the state, authorities, counter-movement groups, as

¹³ Tilly (2004: 12-14) identifies the following characteristics of 'social movements as politics': (1) Social movements proceed not as solo performance, but as interactive campaigns; (2) Social movements combine three kinds of claims: program, identity, and standing; (3) Program, identity, and standing claims vary significantly among social movements, among claimants within movements, and among phases of movements; (4) Democratization promotes the formation of social movements; (5) Social movements assert popular sovereignty; (6) As compared with locally grounded forms of popular politics, social movements depend heavily on political entrepreneurs for their scale, durability, and effectiveness; (7) Once social movements establish themselves in one political setting, modelling, communication, and collaboration facilitate their adoption in other connected settings; (8) The forms, personnel, and claims of social movements vary and evolve historically; and (9) The social movement, as an invented institution, can disappear or mutate into a different political form. .

¹⁴ A 'breakdown theory' developed from the perspective of social equilibrium and order in society has roots in the thought of several scholars such as Comte, Durkheim, Gustave LeBon, Robert Park, Herbert Blumer, Talcott Parsons, Neil Smelser, and other functionalist scholars. See for instance Smelser 1962. Useem 1998 gives an extensive discussion about the application of this theory to the phenomena of collective actions.

well as other social movement groups – upon their actions. As a kind of popular politics, a social movement is not merely an alternative to institutionalized (formal) politics, or marginal politics. It is another kind of political movement, based on mass power, to influence political formation within society as well as the process of policy-making. The politics of social movements is different from the politics of political parties, for instance, because it is not involved in the struggle for power itself, but for ideas of social change. In some cases, social movement organizations also perceive struggles for power in institutionalized politics as a strategy for them to have more influence, with agendas for social changes, but as a group they are not struggling for power itself.

A political party has a political struggle cycle to face which follows the cycle of elections, whereas social movement organizations are not totally determined by election cycles. In some cases the cycles can influence them, while in other cases many social movement groups avoid the cycle of citizen politics as part of their political strategy. However, in some ways, there are similarities between a political party and a social movement organization, such as developing a membership and cadre-ship system, as well as developing local chapters to reach their constituents. In certain conditions, social movement groups can be allied with a political party or impose conditions on political party building, but they will stand outside the party as a relatively autonomous political force. When one social movement or an alliance of social movement groups creates a political party, and then merges into this party, as mentioned by Tilly (2004: 14), they will disappear, or mutate into other quite different form of politics.

However it is quite difficult to separate movements, activists and/or movement leaders. Activists are people who generated a movement from various contextual factors, as well as structural and cultural conditions. To some extent they ‘determine’ the sustainability or the decline of the movement as well, because, as pointed out by Morris and Staggenborg, ‘[leaders and activists] inspire commitment, mobilize resources, create and recognize opportunities, devise strategy, frame demands, and influence outcomes’ (2007:

170). In some cases activists use a social movement for their own political and economic interests. For instance, in electoral politics and/or struggles for power, to gain formal positions in the bureaucracy, to gain economic advantages from mobilization of resources or to manifest 'self heroism'. As a consequence, a social movement can lose its collective orientation, and its networks and resources, becoming instead the activists' personal asset.

1.3.2 Defining Rural Social Movements

When peasants involve themselves in rebellion or a revolutionary movement, essentially what they expect is to secure their livelihoods, or in Scott's words, they are carrying out 'defensive reactions to secure their minimum level of subsistence' (Scott 1976: 10). They would become involved in rebellions or revolutionary movements only because they are tied down to the 'outsider', who can put these minimum interests of 'security' into more radical political movement agendas. Scott argues that the peasantry have a familiar kind of mechanism for self-defence and/or resistance through certain 'hidden' actions, so-called 'everyday resistance' (Scott 1985, Scott and Kerkvliet 1986). But Scott also believed that, if other parties organize them effectively, peasants can be involved in collective radical actions or revolutionary movements (Scott 1977b: 289-296). In this sense, in the form of 'everyday resistance', the peasants would not express their claims and contentions to their patrons, which would be considered a violation of the 'subsistence ethic'.¹⁵ It would be different if they had an opportunity to act collectively, then their collective action could become contentious politics. As defined by Tarrow (1994: 2), collective actions become contentious when people lack regular access to institutions, using their power and conducting collective actions in the name of

¹⁵ This subsistence ethic was partly a consequence of living so close to the margin, so peasants must allocate the surplus of production to purchase other daily necessities, but also a consequence of irreducible claims of outsiders. This is why, according to Scott, the peasant has developed cultural mechanisms to maintain their subsistence, including patron-client relationships. The patron in order to reduce resistance from their client, the peasant, needs to maintain the minimum level of a peasant's subsistence needs (Scott 1976).

new or unaccepted claims, and behaving in ways that fundamentally challenge others. Contentious collective action would be continuous concerted action, while their claims have not yet become a new social construction, which produces various sequences of interaction with opponents or authorities. This is a social movement. As a complex of systematic political actions, a rural social movement can produce a new social construction of society, rather than a restoration of 'traditional rural life' as was meant by 'everyday peasant resistance' as implied by Scott (1976 and 1985).

Various studies of peasant resistance have stressed the importance of the role of relations to outsiders.¹⁶ Wolf (1969) asserted that the success of peasant communities in contending for power was dependent on coalitions with groups from 'outside' (see also Benda 1965, Adas 1979, Salamini 1978, Huizer 1980, Sharma 1989, Brockett 1991 and Ghimire 1999). Wolf argued that 'the decisive factor in making a peasant rebellion possible lies in the relation of the peasantry to the field of power which surrounds it' (Wolf, 1969: 290). Scott, following Wolf, pointed out that without assistance (or with insubstantial assistance), the politically weak peasantry are too vulnerable and usually too risk averse for overt protest and confrontation (Scott 1977b: 268 and 1985: 421). While Ferguson (1976: 106-107) asserted an exogenous organizing force is necessary for channelling 'free-floating' peasant discontent into collective goal-oriented behaviour.¹⁷ This does not mean the central role of the peasantry was minimized in such movements. A peasant mass group, with all its interests and grievances, is a base for power in social movements.

¹⁶ Involvement of 'outsiders' means involvement of persons who were originally not part of the class of peasants, but who came from the economic, political, and cultural realities that 'imprisoned' the peasantry. All theories of the peasantry explicitly confirm this group's dependency and subordination to other groups or to the 'other world'. See Redfield 1956, Wolf 1966, Shanin 1971, Paige 1975, and Scott 1976.

¹⁷ In addition, Huizer (1980) stated that trustworthy external allies and assistance combined with growing consciousness and organization have strengthened peasant mobilization and action. While Ghimire (1999) in his study confirmed that peasants' need for external support in modern land conflict cases to gain access to land rights as well as for land reform.

In order to understand collective protests, land occupations, struggles for local power as well as interventions in policy making, this dissertation will observe and explain forms of collective actions conducted by mixed groups of peasants and their non-peasant proponents, to express their claims politically, with new or previously unacceptable ideas to revitalize rural community livelihoods. As Tarrow said, these actions may take many forms – brief or sustained, institutionalized or disruptive, humdrum or dramatic (1994: 2). Groups of peasants, rural villagers, and outsiders who are tied together in a joint struggle should take actions collectively where possible. Instead, some studies referred to above confirm that the non-peasant group frequently leads or commands the peasant movement.

In this dissertation, I prefer to use the terminology ‘rural social movement’ to cover these rural-based collective actions. Rural social movements are composed of two main groups of actors: ‘the villagers’ including peasant groups and the ‘urban-educated activists’ that various studies quoted above call the outsiders. ‘Urban-educated activists’ are participants of social movements mostly based in urban areas, indeed some of them have no relations with rural life. But they have commitment, ideological orientation, and/or political interests in the quality of the peasantry and rural life. They are sometimes students and/or ex-students activists, NGO activists, or scholarly activists (or scholar-activists).¹⁸ These two groups of actors (the peasant and

¹⁸ The term ‘scholar-activist’ refers to ‘academic and well-educated movement intellectuals’. This is a combination of two categories proposed by Eyerman and Jamison (1991) and Barker and Cox (2002). Eyerman and Jamison (1991) made two categories of intellectuals, ‘movement intellectuals’ and ‘established intellectuals’. While Barker and Cox’s (2002) categories are ‘academic intellectuals’ and ‘movement intellectuals’. ‘This distinction suggested an initial polarity between them, in terms of tasks they undertake and the goals they pursue, their audiences and their relationship with them, their accreditation, and – perhaps most important – the form of knowledge they produce’ (Barker and Cox 2002: 1). These distinctions are based on Gramsci’s category of intellectuals, which are ‘traditional’ and the ‘organic’ intellectuals (Gramsci 1971: 5-23). In Gramsci’s perspective the ‘organic intellectual’ is the bourgeoisie scholar who cultivates strong roots in his/her community, working to maintain links with local issues and struggles that connect to the people and their experiences, while the ‘traditional intellectual’ is an autonomous group of intellectuals separated from political class struggle and strongly allied with the dominant ideology. By the first term, Gramsci denoted such people as university professors, lawyers, priests, and others; by the second, above all, activists of the Communist and other workers’ parties. The Communist Party, in Gramsci’s view, is an intellectual collective of the proletariat (Femia 1981: 133). See also Feierman 1990 who applied a Gramscian perspective on the ‘organic intellectuals’ who created and transmitted peasant political discourse in

the outsider) originally came from different social classes. It is commonly understood that social movements are embedded in a web of alliance-building relations of movement actors in order to achieve their common goals and/or compromise different objectives and interests (Migdal 1974, Skocpol 1994 and Rucht 2007). According to Rucht (2007: 203),

The term of 'alliance' is associated with partnership, closeness, and a spirit of mutual support. Nevertheless, alliances tend to remain limited in their purpose and time frame. An alliance is typically formed by actors who want to keep some of their autonomy and distinctiveness, and therefore refrain from merging into a single entity whose prior constituent elements become more or less invisible, or completely dissolve as distinguishable units. Hence an alliance, besides signalling a willingness to cooperate, also implies an insistence on difference between allied partners.

What then does 'rural social movement' mean in this study? According to Tarrow, 'when the social actors concert their actions around common claims in sustained sequences of interaction with opponents or authorities, it would produce social movements' (1994: 2). Meyer and Tarrow (1998: 4) defined social movements as 'collective challenges to existing arrangements of power and distribution by people with common purposes and solidarity, in sustained interaction with elites, opponents, and authorities'. 'Thus if the definition of movements depends on sustained, conflictual interaction with other actors, they have seldom been very far from institutional politics' (Meyer and Tarrow, 1998: 5). In this context, Diani (1992) identified three basic components of social movements; networks of relations between a plurality of actors, collective identity, and conflictual issues. Tilly (2004: 7) called a complex of systematic political actions as a social movement when it combined three elements: (1) campaigns of collective claims on target authorities; (2) an array of claim-making performances including special-purpose associations, public

Tanzania. According to Barker and Cox (2002: 1), 'to be an academic intellectual is, in a sense, always to be member of the 'intelligentsia'; but a worker or a peasant can be a 'movement intellectual'. These types are sometimes combined together in individuals and groups. 'Scholar-activists' are academic intellectuals that dedicate their work to social movements and radical social change.

meetings, media statements, and demonstrations; and (3) public representations of the cause's worthiness, unity, number, and commitment.

Referring to the definitions above, here I define 'rural social movement' as collective challenges by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interaction with elite, opponents and authorities in order to pursue pro-rural policy changes and/or rural social changes, particularly which relates to the improvement of the quality of livelihood of the rural poor. In this definition, a rural social movement should explicitly put rural life (or 'rurality') as an arena of new claims based on the lives of rural villagers, especially the rural poor, as the base of its power.

In other words, in this thesis the term 'rural social movement' will cover wider phenomena than terms usually used in examining peasant politics such as peasant movements. The term peasant movement refers to peasant-centered political movements. A peasant community, in this sense, whether considered as a specific class that differs from other social classes – such as the proletariat, middle-class, bourgeoisie, or capitalists – or as rural cultivators, a term which covers several categories of social class within itself, is a group with specific political behavior based on political-economic interests. This study will cover the politics of groups of people who originally came from different social and class backgrounds, including groups of peasants and people who either have no roots in, or are uprooted from, rural life. But they fought collectively for a common socially imagined revitalization of rural life and society, including the idea of 're-peasantization'. The idea of re-peasantization is itself a kind of anti-thesis of the idea of 'de-peasantization', formulated by some scholars of social change to refer to a process of peasantry disappearance from rural life in many regions in the world (see, for instances, Bryceson and Jamal 1997, Elson 1997, Rigg 1998, Bryceson 1999 and Lynch 2005).¹⁹

¹⁹ Arguments on 'de-peasantization' are substantially centered in the phenomena of social change in mostly rural villages that are no longer dependent on subsistence production in rural areas, especially from subsistence agricultural activities. This change is caused by pressure on rural peasants such as capitalist intervention and intensified agricultural commercialization, as well as urban spatial

As Woods (2003) has indicated, the emergence of a phenomenon of movement actors was not merely rural-based and local, but integrated, involving many groups who had become interested in the peasantry, and who identified themselves as 'pro rural'. They had political concern for the grievances of rural society, which had been exploited for the social and economic development of others. In spite of a romanticism about harmony in rural life and society, this vision of pro-rural reflected more the revitalization of political, economic and cultural rights of rural society, along with an agenda of political reform, either from an authoritarian regime or other political regimes that exploited rural life as a basis of social development.

1.3.3 Movement Leadership, Participation and Exchange of Interests

Klandermans distinguished three fundamental reasons why movement participant is appealing to people. People may want to change their circumstances, they may want to act as members of their group, or they may want to give meaning to their world and express their views and feelings (2007: 361). Following Downtown and Wehr (1991, 1997), he mentioned leadership, ideology, organizations, rituals, and social relations that make up friendship networks as contributing to the maintenance of sustained commitment (Klandermans 2007: 373). But Klandermans did not mention the importance of interests among the movement participants as a significant factor in the social bonding process within the movements. Here, following Migdal (1974) and Skocpol (1994), I will argue that the interests, especially exchange of interests, is the significant factor that bind the movement's participants in certain collective actions.

development that made peasants respond by engaging in alternative livelihood strategies, some of which involve interaction with urban areas, including non-farm economic activities. This interaction with urban circumstance was to make changes in traditional social ties among rural peoples. Capital accumulation in agricultural production and increasing non-farm economic activities transformed small numbers of peasants into farmers and more often into wage labor. In conclusion, Elson noticed that 'the peasantry' – as a kind of social formation in rural areas – at the end of a long series of historical processes 'has been radically reconstituted into a series of more modern categories of social formation' (Elson, 1997: 240-241).

In rural social movements, either mass movements or branches (*onderbouw*) of political parties, the leadership of group activists as well as intellectuals are a social reality that has already been well studied (for instances van der Kroef 1963, Wolf 1969, Mortimer 1972, Petras and Merino 1972, Scott and Kerkvliet 1973, Salamini 1978 and Dhanagare 1983). These movement leaders were not originally from the peasant class or were well-educated peasants, some have already lived outside the rural community, particularly in urban circumstances, for long periods: they are usually capable people, who have appropriate skills in analysis of grievances and problems of peasants.²⁰

In the case of Indonesia, critical rural organizations were frozen for a long period during the New Order (Bachriadi 1996, Fauzi 1999, Aspinall 2004 and 2005, Boudreau 2004, Farid 2005, Heryanto 2006, and Fauzi and Bachriadi 2006). This led to the involvement of non-peasant class members – particularly groups of students, youth, scholars and NGO activists – which became a characteristic of rural social movements in Indonesia over the last two decades. On the one hand, these groups of activists, were people with no specific rural-based experience or economic interests, but were more concerned about social and political change from an authoritarian regime to democracy, as well as wider social change within the nation. On the other hand, some of them were also young middle-class people with a specific political interest in struggles for power. They were also far from united ideologically.

In examining current rural social movements in Indonesia, this dissertation proposes that particular urban forces – especially the group of ‘urban-educated activists’ – will lead those movements and direct rural radicalism into collective actions, although in the process making the movements’ agendas beyond the real interests of the peasants. Why were these

²⁰ According to Feierman (1990), based on studies of Tanzanian peasantry after independence, peasants intellectualizing does not merely come from ‘outsiders’. Peasants themselves can act as ‘organic-intellectuals’ – using Gramsci’s terminology – for the development of their groups. Nevertheless, we must note here that Feierman’s study was conducted not in the context of peasant struggles against political power such the state as well as big corporations, but in the context of the social development of the peasantry.

activist groups willing to involve themselves and/or work with the peasantry? Did they have specific political as well as ideological agendas? Aspinall (2004 and 2005) and Eldridge (1997) found that radical ideas of social change emerged among certain urban-educated activists during the 80's and 90's when opposing the Soeharto dictatorship. In spite of this involvement, why did they continue to work with peasant groups when Soeharto – their representative of the common enemy – was forced to step down in 1998?

Although there were many opportunities for activists to be involved in institutional politics during and after the transition to democracy, the pro-peasant and agrarian reform activists preferred to show their commitment for change by their involvement in rural protests in the period before 1998. They built pro-agrarian reform movement organizations and/or peasant's organizations as the manifestation of that commitment. There were many arguments along the way and the demand for agrarian reform had developed along with these rural protests, a demand that was not fulfilled even though the state regime was changed (see Bachriadi 2001d and 2008, Poniman *et al.* 2005, Bachriadi and Juliantara 2007, Fauzi 2007 and 2009, Bachriadi and Wiradi *forthcoming*). Other activists used these emerging peasant's organizations to become involved in institutionalized politics.

For peasant groups who needed land or who had already got their land back, alliances with peasant's organizations would provide protection and security. While for villagers who needed improvement in rural facilities, their alliances with existing peasant's organizations would provide an instrument to pressure the government, which they could not do during the New Order period. The convergence of these two potentially explosive kinds of activism explains that, as contender groups, they had been increasing their capacity to challenge the ruling regime which they perceived as the common enemy, on the one hand, and influencing claims related to agendas of social change beyond change from an authoritarian to a democratic regime, on the other.

One condition that must surely count in this relationship is the exchange between the peasants and the activists. Following Migdal (1974) who studied

the involvement of peasants in politics, here we can point out that beneath the process of institutionalization of a peasant-based movement, there was an exchange of interests and resources between the activists and the peasants. This exchange was stable and mutually rewarding enough to account for peasant support and participation in institutionalized movements (Migdal 1974: 228-229). Activists must attempt to stimulate demand for, and then supply, more collective benefits even just at local levels (Skocpol 1994: 228). According to Skocpol, there are two kinds of benefits that can reward local peasants, namely 'class benefits' and 'security benefits'. As class benefits, peasants could get redistributed land and/or local power. As security benefits, peasants could get village defence against counter-movement forces. From these kinds of benefits, peasants could unite against landlords, power holders and/or their 'common enemies'. In turn, the activists could ask for major sacrifices of resources and manpower from the peasantry (Skocpol 1994: 228).

We can say then, on the one hand, as long as this substantial exchange could be maintain, rural social movements can sustain collective actions, both to achieve the minimum demands of the peasants and other villagers for joining the movement, and for gaining more ideas about social change. On the other hand, we can assume that internal tensions will occur among the movement's actors – particularly between the activists and the peasants – based on different ideas and interests in sustaining the movement. In Benda's words (1965: 434) four decades ago, 'the two streams could, and did, occasionally meet and coalesce, but they could easily diverge again'.

Both groups can ride or even manipulate the movement. Petras and Merino (1972) from their study of peasant revolts in Chile gave a good example. Based on their observation, 'once the land is distributed, the outlook of the peasants begins to shift: they continue to support those who facilitated the reform but they also look to those political forces that can preserve or expand their newly gained economic resources' (Petras and Merino 1972: 32). In comparison, Kowalchuk (2005) showed how wrong decisions made by

movement leaders in El Salvador, which was mostly based on their political interests, at the end created 'demobilization' of peasant protest on land rights.

Here, it is assumed that that changes in the movement's orientation, strategies and tactics will be made by those in the movement's circles trying to maintain a balance of different interests among the various actors and members. They will look more radical at one time – particularly when they are using a strategy of direct land occupation actions - and then visibly less radical at another time. Thus different real interests among the actors and movement's participants could cause local peasants who participate in the movement's circles to retreat, directly or indirectly, from such collective actions, which are not conducted in their perceived interests.

1.4 Research Aims

As mentioned earlier, this dissertation will attempt to formulate a theoretical explanation of the strategy changes developed by pro-peasants and agrarian reform movements to challenges different regimes in Indonesia since the New Order period. It will describe and explain (1) the dynamics of discourses on land and agrarian reform in Indonesia post 1965; (2) the dynamics of 'transmutation' of rural social movements in Indonesia from the 80's until now and (3) the dynamics of relations among social movement actors in such groups that were institutionalized as local peasant's unions to achieve their objectives. For the latter purpose, two cases of the emergence, development and consequences of local peasant's organizations, namely the Pasundan Peasant's Union (SPP, Serikat Petani Pasundan) of West Java and the Bengkulu Peasant's Union (STaB, Serikat Tani Bengkulu) of Bengkulu, will be discussed to support arguments developed in this dissertation. These two 'instrumental cases' (Stake 2000: 437) of rural social movement organizations have been selected in order to investigate comparative general conditions and

political processes of the emergence and development of organizations at local level.²¹

1.4.1 Propositions

Based on the theoretical standpoints above, a set of propositions are useful in clarifying the objectives of this research as follows

1. The activists generated pro-peasant and agrarian reform movements from the New Order period for two inter-connected objectives, namely to rebuild rural mass politics in Indonesia and to build rural bases for their political interests including being involved in institutionalized politics.
2. The activists 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.
3. 'Transmutation' processes which occurred in the Indonesian rural social movements trajectories were mostly determined by the creativity of the activists and scholar-activists to generate the movement rather than it being determined by external social and political factors.
4. Both participant groups of the rural social movements, the rural villagers and the 'urban-educated activists', have joined movements to achieve different interests.
5. The political struggles and conflicts of interest among rural social movements' leaders and the more open political space during the transition to liberal democracy, allowed them either to support the movement organizations or to pursue their own individual interests, but

²¹ According to Stake, an instrumental case study is used mainly to provide insights into an issue or to reformulate draw a generalization. Two other types of case study are: (1) the collective case study, in which the researcher tends to jointly study a number of cases in order to investigate a phenomenon, population, or general condition; and (2) the intrinsic case study undertaken because the researcher wants a better understanding of a particular case (2000: 437).

this weakened the ability of rural social movements in Indonesia to push the implementation of radical agrarian reform.

1.4.2 Strategies of Inquiry and Analysis

This dissertation is based on qualitative research that intends to explore and analyze how and why particular people generated and developed rural social movements and what are the consequences of these movements. Several forms of data collected will support the analysis. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 3),

Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consist a set of interpretative, material practices that make the world visible... qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.

The units of analysis of this study are participants of rural social movements in Indonesia, either urban-based activists or rural villagers. In order to generate such descriptions and explanations, data was collected from various related sources, such as: (1) narrative visions of movements' actors, organizational documents and archives, and observed behavior of the movements' actors and organizations; and (2) documented news and reportages of the media/press as well as archives from other sources. This research used both interviews and secondary sources to review agrarian politics in Indonesia generally, but particularly in Bengkulu and West Java, to explore the background and roots of the movements. Statistical data on land holdings and land use from the Indonesian Agricultural Censuses will be used to give a picture of agrarian changes. To gain base line data about movement participants in Bengkulu and West Java, this research used surveys of the SPP and STaB members.²²

²² Copies of questionnaires for both surveys are provided in Appendix 2.

These two surveys were conducted to covers as many members of both organizations as possible. The SPP survey covered 19,631 individual land claimants who are members of around 8,590 SPP households (or around 43% of total household-members of the SPP).²³ If we assume a household-member of the SPP on average has 4 people as individual land claimants, this survey covers around 24% of the possible total land claimants organized in SPP. While the STaB survey had 2,722 STaB members as respondents spread over in 7 Bengkulu districts (North and South Bengkulu, Lebong, Rejang Lebong, Kepahyang, Seluma and Kaur). In total this survey covered around 21% of STaB members.

These surveys collected information about the origin and socio-economic backgrounds of both organization members and their involvement in these movements. The purpose of these surveys was to have comprehensive information about membership composition of the two movement organizations including their history of land holdings. The survey of the SPP members was conducted in 2003-2004, when the writer was involved in the People-centered Advocacy Institute (PERGERAKAN, Perhimpunan Penggerak Advokasi Kerakyatan). The purpose of this 2003-2004 survey was to build base-line data of the SPP members, and complete results of this survey have not yet been published.²⁴ While the survey of STaB members was conducted in 2007 during fieldwork.

Some primary data on involvement of key persons in the SPP struggles were taken from in-depth interviews that were conducted during 2002 and 2003. These interviews was conducted as part of a research project to collect oral histories of oppressed people in Indonesia, organized by the International

²³ Distributions of households in this survey are 1,272 households in Garut District; 1,025 households in Tasikmalaya District; and 6,290 households in Ciamis District.

²⁴ A preliminary analysis of these survey results was presented in one reflective and planning meeting among SPP leaders in 2004. Unfortunately, the “not for quotation” notes for this presentation were subsequently quoted arbitrarily by Aji in his book (see Aji 2005).

Institute of Social History (IISH) Amsterdam under its CLARA-Project led by Ratna Saptari.²⁵

Besides these sources, this research also conducted in-depth but unstructured interviews of leaders and participants of the movements, as well as members of student groups that became organizers of the rural social movements in SPP and STaB. Interviews of activists and scholar-activists included local politicians and members of parliaments at district and national levels; particular political parties' leaders both in Jakarta and in Bengkulu and West Java; several NGO officers and leaders who were related to the 'pro-poor rural' and agrarian reform movement's activities in Indonesia; leaders and organizers of several national coalitions of peasant's organizations, and some ex-student activists who were involved in the 80s pro-peasant movements in Indonesia.²⁶

Focus Group Discussions (FGD), each of around 15 to 20 participants, conducted during field work in both Bengkulu and West Java, gained other data related to the movements' visions, claims and frameworks developed among participants of rural social movements. These FGD helped shorten the interview processes since there are many persons – leaders and members – who were spread across many, villages and towns – whose ideas needed to be explored through interviews. As mentioned by Morgan, one of the strengths of the FGD is being 'quick and easy' and its 'relative efficiency in comparison to individual interviews, at least in terms of gathering equivalent amounts of data'

²⁵ I and my research assistant, Hilma Safitri, were involved in the part of this project entitled 'peasant groups as an oppressed people under the New Order authoritarian regime'. This research project covered groups of oppressed peoples, and peasants' which were only one category of subject. To carry out this research, we conducted interviews and covered research subjects who were not limited only to SPP members but included other local peasant leaders in West Java. In fact, the purpose of this Oral History Research Project was not to produce any direct publication materials, but to collect primary historical sources based on individual histories as raw materials for further research, which would be stored in the IISH Library at Amsterdam. Taped copies of these interviews are also stored in the Agrarian Resource Center (ARC) Library, Bandung ('Berjuang untuk Tanah, Penghidupan, dan Kebebasan', 2003). In principle, other researchers can access these primary historical sources subject to certain regulations of these institutions.

²⁶ List of the interviewees is provided in Appendix 1.

(Morgan, 1997: 13). To reduce some information bias that may possibly occur in this technique, I followed up points addressed by discussion participants through subsequent observation and individual interviews of related topics/issues.²⁷

During the time of field work, 10 months in 2007, I spent 4 months in Bandung and Jakarta to interviews informants and collecting secondary sources related the 80's and 90's student movements, national coalitions for agrarian reform, national coalition of peasant organizations, and national agrarian policies. I spent another 6 months in the village bases of the STaB and the SPP to conduct participant observations of their organizational dynamics and collective actions at the grass roots level. Participant observation was also used for collective events such as land occupation actions, demonstrations, rallies, campaigns, organizational meetings, as well as political educations for peasant leaders.

In the interviews, participant observation and Focus Groups discussions, my position and involvement in social movement networks from 1987 until I went to the post-graduate program at Flinders University, were both an advantage and a weakness. Because of this long involvement with the movements, some interviewees sometimes criticized me as person that needs no more information from them. In their view I already understood their movements. However, this long association with the movements made it easier for me to gain access to sources of data, especially sources of sensitive information.

In addition to this strategy, I also used notes and archives about movement activities in these two areas, provided either by the SPP and the STaB or by other organizations such as the Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria (KPA) and the PERGERAKAN. Moreover, several published and unpublished studies related to this research were used as secondary sources, such as

²⁷ List of the focus group discussions is provided in Appendix 1.

assessments and studies conducted by the IADI-Program and the SPREAD-Program in 1999-2003, as well as conducted by PERGERAKAN in 2002-2004.²⁸

1.5 Structure of the Dissertation

This dissertation is formulated as follow:

Chapter 1 Agrarian Reform and Rural Social Movements in Indonesia

This chapter explains the background, theoretical standpoints, and methodology of the study.

Chapter 2 Developmentalism and Economic Liberalization

This chapter recounts development and agrarian policies from the New Order period until 2006 that have caused agrarian problems in Indonesia. It gives the contexts and conditions for the current pro-peasant and agrarian reform movements in Indonesia.

Chapter 3 The Fate of the Land Reform Program from the 1960s to the 1980s

This chapter describes briefly the implementation of the land reform program in 1961 – 1965 that was halted following the regime change in 1966. This chapter also describes some policy advocacy initiatives led by academicians during the 70s to the 80s that failed to revive this program.

Chapter 4 Land Conflicts and the 1980s Urban-based Social Movements

This chapter describes the origin of urban-based social movements against the New Order's land evictions in the 80s and the early 90s, that became the vehicles for urban-educated activists to revive mass politics in

²⁸ In 1999-2002, two projects ,the IADI (Initiatives of Advocacy Development in Indonesia) Program and the SPREAD (Supporting Program for Participatory Advocacy Capacity) conducted a series of assessments of 'social movement circles' (*lingkar gerakan sosial*) in several areas including the 'Garut-Tasikmalaya-Ciamis' area. In 2003-2004, PERGERAKAN conducted two studies related to the topic of peoples' organization in certain areas, including Bengkulu and 'Garut-Tasikmalaya-Ciamis'. These studies produced several reports such as Pact-Indonesia 2002, SKEPO 2002, Rusin *et al.* 2002, Sandjaja 2004, PERGERAKAN 2004a and 2004b.

rural areas and to generate the pro-agrarian reform movement and peasant's organizations.

Chapter 5 Broadening the Coalition for Agrarian Reform in the '90s

This chapter describes the emergence and decline of the first local peasant's organization namely the West Java Peasant Union (SPJB, Serikat Petani Jawa Barat) and the emergence of the Consortium for Agrarian Reform (KPA, Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria) as a broad coalition for agrarian reform. It includes debates among the activists about movement strategy of this coalition that led to the emergence of national coalition of peasant organizations.

Chapter 6 The Emergence of New National Coalitions of Peasant Movements

This chapter discusses the emergence of national coalitions of peasant organizations, particularly the Indonesian Federation of Peasant's Union (FSPI, Federasi Serikat Petani Indonesia) and the Alliance for Agrarian Reform Movement (AGRA, Aliansi Gerakan Reforma Agraria), both related to the development of KPA. Both coalitions claimed to be anti theses of KPA to generate pro agrarian reform movement in Indonesia.

Chapter 7 'Struggle for Agrarian Reform': The Pasundan Peasant's Union (SPP) of West Java

This chapter examines the origin of another local peasant's organization in West Java, namely the Pasundan Peasant's Union (SPP, Serikat Petani Pasundan), the character of its membership and consequences of its collective actions on land claimed in three district of the eastern Priangan area of West Java (Garut, Tasikmalaya and Ciamis).

Chapter 8 'Land and Power for the People': The Bengkulu Peasant's Union (STAB)

This chapter traces the origin of a local peasant's organization in Bengkulu namely the Bengkulu Peasant's Union (STaB, Serikat Tani

Bengkulu), its membership and consequences of its collective actions on land claimed and rural advocacy in the Bengkulu province.

Chapter 9 Local Dynamics of Rural Social Movement Organizations

This chapter makes a comparative analysis of the two local peasant's organizations in the two previous chapters. It analyses the performance and characters of both movement organizations to clarify orientation of these movements.

Chapter 10 Conclusion: The Dynamics of Pro Agrarian Reform and Rural Social Movements in Indonesia post-1965

This chapter addresses explanations about the dynamics, changes and continuation of pro agrarian reform and rural social movements in Indonesia post-1965, based on the five main research questions in this dissertation.