


Spring 2017

Agrarian Reform in Sumber Klampok

Emma Trainor
SIT Study Abroad

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection

 Part of the [Agricultural and Resource Economics Commons](#), [Agricultural Economics Commons](#), [Asian Studies Commons](#), [Environmental Monitoring Commons](#), [Inequality and Stratification Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), [Place and Environment Commons](#), [Politics and Social Change Commons](#), and the [Social Policy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Trainor, Emma, "Agrarian Reform in Sumber Klampok" (2017). *Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection*. 2619.
https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/2619

This Unpublished Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the SIT Study Abroad at SIT Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection by an authorized administrator of SIT Digital Collections. For more information, please contact digitalcollections@sit.edu.

AGRARIAN REFORM IN SUMBER KLAMPOK

By Emma Trainor

ISP Advisor: Ngurah Karyadi, KPA Bali

SIT Study Abroad Indonesia: Arts, Religion, and Social Change

Spring 2017

Acknowledgements

This research project would not have been possible without the help and support of my teachers, mentors, and family back in America. I would like to thank my parents, first and foremost, for giving me the incredible opportunity to study and research in Indonesia. I love you both and feel so blessed to have had your support throughout this entire process, in every sense of the word. A big thank you also goes out to my incredibly supportive boyfriend, Ben. You have been a wonderful listener the past few months of both my complaints and my joy about this experience, and you have made me feel loved from all the way across the world! Next I would like to thank my advisor, Ngurah, for guiding me through my research in Sumber Klampok and putting me in contact with some very influential people. Your passion for land rights issues inspired me to want to learn more. Thank you to Ibu Indra and her family, who housed me for three weeks and allowed me to observe numerous meetings and conferences, as well as interview and talk to informed members of the community. Next I would like to thank Bu Ari. The amount of time you have put into creating a positive and educational experience for all of us students this semester is inspiring. I appreciate all you have done for us more than I can put into words, and intend to pay it back by holding this new awareness and open-mindedness you have helped create with me in my own life. Next I would like to thank the Bahasa Indonesia teachers, whose patience, light-heartedness, and good humor have made my time here more meaningful. I would not have been able to communicate with the locals without your help. Thank you to Jonathan for guiding all of us students in our research process and offering advice. Thank you to all of the Ibu's that have housed and fed me during my time in Indonesia. Lastly, I would like to thank my peers in this program for sharing this experience with me, and for being my teachers simply by

being yourselves! It has been a pleasure to be on this journey with you all, through both the ups and the downs.

Table of Contents

• Abstract.....	5
• Introduction.....	6
○ Personal Reflections.....	6
○ Methods and Ethics.....	6
○ Challenges.....	7
○ Limitations.....	8
○ Findings.....	8
• Historical Background of Agrarian Reform and Politics.....	10
○ Early Agrarian Reform.....	10
○ Activism During the New Order.....	12
○ Transformations Post-New Order.....	15
○ Modern Agrarian Reform.....	18
• Sumber Klampok History.....	22
○ Dutch and Chinese Land Ownership.....	22
○ Conservation Issues: Bali Barat National Park and National Forest.....	27
○ Taking Action.....	31
• Sumber Klampok Now.....	35
○ Conversations with the Special Committee.....	35

- Conferences and Meetings.....38
- Conclusions.....43
- Suggestions for Further Research.....46
- Bibliography.....46

Abstract

Agrarian reform in Indonesia is part of a movement beginning after independence was gained in 1945. Farmers have been fighting to obtain rights to their land from a government that has a history of violence, repression, and corruption for decades. Environmental, indigenous peoples', peasant, and agrarian movements were given a legitimate, legal framework to work within after 1960 when the Basic Agrarian Law was passed, protecting the rights of the people to their land. However, during both the Old Order and especially New Order regimes, the law was often ignored by the government, and many grassroots organizations had to work under secrecy, as land reform movements were often associated with the Indonesian Communist Party, members of whom were killed after the transition from the Sukarno to Suharto presidency. After the fall of Suharto, agrarian movements were able to openly come together to begin strategizing and forming organizations that still exist and are very influential today. One of these organizations is Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria (KPA), an Indonesian NGO based in Jakarta that works on agrarian issues. The head of KPA Bali, a sub-division of the KPA, lives in Sumber Klampok village in the Buleleng regency. She works diligently with the special committee of the village on a variety of land rights issue, especially to obtain certificates for the villagers that give them legal land ownership. The history of Sumber Klampok begins in 1922 when it was made into a slave plantation by Dutch companies. The people who have inhabited the area have never had rights to the land since this happened. Sumber Klampok now is a well-developed, rural, agricultural village with only 849 families. This village is a good example of what many Indonesian farmers and indigenous people have endured at the hands of the government, and also the uncertainty that many of them face in the future regarding their land rights.

Introduction

Personal Reflections

As an environmental studies major, agriculture has always been a topic that I have wanted to know more about. After spending a week in a rural, rice farming village, I knew that I loved being in such a beautiful landscape and that I wanted to learn more about the lives of farmers. Indonesia's agriculture is unique compared to agriculture in the United States, specifically rice farming and the subak system¹. When I began to formulate this study I did not know what my specific research question would be, I just knew I was attracted to the agricultural system. After having a conversation with my advisor, Ngurah Karyadi, two days before beginning this study, I was inspired by what he said about current agricultural issues. He talked a lot about agrarian reform, and said that I should stay in Sumber Klampok with the head of KPA Bali². I had never heard of agrarian reform, the KPA, or Sumber Klampok, and he told me that agrarian reform has to do with land rights issues between farmers and the government. This he told me was currently a big issue in Sumber Klampok, and that KPA Bali is an NGO that is working on gaining land rights for the people there. I was excited by the prospect of focusing on activism currently happening in Indonesia around agrarian reform and to have the opportunity to live with the founder of such an influential NGO.

Methods and Ethics

¹ Subak refers to the irrigation system used in rice farming in which communities delegate water resources and practice spiritual rituals in their agricultural methods.

Ethics have to be a major concern for anybody doing research that involves human subjects. Going into this study, I was conscientious of the privilege I carried traveling to a rural, Indonesian village and asking people questions about their struggles, and the imbalance of power between myself and some of my subjects. These people have been subjected to injustice and even violence from the government, and I knew I needed to be sensitive to that in my research. In interviews I always asked my interviewees if I could record and had them sign a consent form so they knew what they were agreeing to. I was lucky to talk to people who were open and receptive to my questions, and were even happy that I was writing about the topic as there is not currently a lot of literature on it. I tried to be as uncritical and unbiased as possible in my observations, conversations, and writing, but of course this is not possible to do 100%. The methods that I used in my research included serial interviews, one-off interviews, casual conversations, observations, and reading second-hand sources.

Challenges

The reason this process has been so rewarding is because of the numerous challenges that have emerged throughout my research. The biggest obstacle I faced during my three weeks in Sumber Klampok was the language barrier. If it were not for my ISP advisor Ngurah Karyadi, my English speaking friend Ismu, and the Bahasa Indonesia teachers, I would not have understood any of the conversations I observed and interviews I conducted. Basic communications with my homestay hosts were frustrating and nearly impossible at times. Sometimes I would go to events that I was clueless about what was being talked about, however I was able to learn a great deal simply by being at conferences and meetings that were in another language. Another major challenge was my location. Sumber Klampok is in rural Indonesia. I had no access to the luxuries that I had gotten used to during my time in Indonesia, such as air

conditioning, Wi-Fi, food of my choice, and public transportation. I was off the map and on the locals' time. After accepting these circumstances, I realized I was in the perfect environment to collect extremely useful and relevant information very quickly, and that I had no distractions around me outside of my research topic. By leaning into my challenging experience, I was able to obtain substantial information that I would not have if I had been passive or avoidant to often time's uncomfortable and frustrating experiences.

Limitations

Agrarian reform in Indonesia is an extremely broad and complex topic. There are legal, environmental, social, and political aspects to land rights issues. The agrarian reform movement is connected to agricultural, conservation, peasant, and environmental movements as well. In addition to these complexities, the village of Sumber Klampok has a dynamic history and many start-up groups working with land issues. In order to create a comprehensive study, I would have needed more than a month. Because of this, I chose to narrow my scope to the history of the legality of agrarian reform up until the present, as well as background information of agrarian reform in Indonesia. Even within this specific topic, there are so many details that need to be understood to get the full picture of what is happening in Sumber Klampok. Because of this I have decided to limit my study to land rights issues in Sumber Klampok.

Findings

Four major questions guided this research. They are:

- What is the history of agrarian reform issues and laws in Indonesia?
- What is the history of Sumber Klampok in the context of agrarian reform?

- What does the village look like now in terms of livelihoods, quality of life, and current agrarian challenges?
- What action is being taken by the leaders of the village to address land rights issues?

Sumber Klampok has transformed drastically over the past one hundred years, but the provincial government in Bali is still reluctant to grant villagers rights to the land. I found that there is a lot of ongoing action to gain land rights in Sumber Klampok, and that agrarian reform agendas have been part of an ongoing conversation, and often times battle, between grassroots groups and the Indonesian government since independence was gained in 1945. Below I have included a map of the area that I studied in West Bali. There are no official maps of the boundaries of Sumber Klampok, but its location can be seen here.



HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF AGRARIAN REFORM AND POLITICS

Early Agrarian Reform

Agrarian reform movements in Indonesia are a complicated topic. Many environmental justice, agrarian, indigenous peoples, and conservation organizations and movements arose after 1945 when Indonesia declared its independence from the colonial Netherlands. The term *agrarian* refers to more than just cultivated land, and in legal contexts often refers to forests as well. Agrarian reform takes place on a mostly parliamentary and legal level, with grassroots movements and organizations coming together under the umbrella term. After 1945, one of the first agrarian organizations to form was the Indonesian Peasants' Front, BTI (Barisan Tani Indonesia). Peluso, Rachman, and Afiff define 'peasants' as small landholders and occupiers who have no land outside of occupied areas. In the 1950's and 1960's, peasant organizations, especially the BTI, had close ties with the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI).³

The PKI and the BTI became the most active proponents of Indonesian land reform, which was set in motion in 1960 when the Basic Agrarian Law was passed. The passing of this law was very important to Indonesia's history. Law No. 5 of 1960 (UUPA) authorizes the state to determine, allot, utilize, and preserve the earth, water, and space within the nation's borders; it devolves the power to exercise state rights to control land to the province, regency, district, and village levels; it provides that the exercise of rights conferred by this law must serve the public interest; it authorizes the state to grant ownership/property rights to Indonesian citizens; it

³ Peluso, Afiff, and Fauzi, 2008

prohibits/limits foreign ownership of the country's land, and provides safeguards against foreign expropriation of the country's natural resources; it prohibits absentee land ownership in agricultural land, because of its tendency to promote exploitative practices ; it sets the minimum size for landholdings to ensure that the land owner has enough land to provide for his/her family. These are some of the key parts of UUPA that affect agrarian reform. The law initially meant progress for agrarian reform activists because it established a single, unified land law. September 24th, 1960, the day the law was passed, is still celebrated annually as "Hari Tani", or "National Peasant's Day".⁴

The policies and implementation of the Basic Agrarian Law changed completely when Suharto came to power in 1965. Land reform courts were abolished and land reform committees were disbanded. During this time, all Communist party members and their affiliates were criminalized. Hundreds of thousands of peasants and farmers were killed for being associated with the PKI and BTI. Following this horrific tragedy, peasant organizations were pushed underground for several years and replaced by Himpunan Kerukunan Tani Indonesia (HKTI- Indonesian Peasant's Harmony Association), an organization managed by military or other government officials. Those who resisted faced violent punishment. After Suharto's rise to power, the Basic Agrarian Law equated the people's well-being with that of the state. Therefore, the law was largely ignored or reinterpreted, although it was not completely eliminated. Tensions rose between "the people" and "the state", as the two had different interests in how to manage the land. Plantations on state lands, many of which used to be owned by the Dutch, became

⁴ Peluso, Afiff, and Fauzi, 2008

attractive development sites for tourist attractions, housing, and large scale projects later on in the 1990's.⁵

The regulations of the Basic Agrarian Law should have given protection to long term land occupants of colonial plantation land, but this never happened. The Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation (YLBHI) critiqued the failure of implementation of the Basic Agrarian Law and assisted villagers in land rights disputes. The disputes that exist currently on former plantation lands are largely the result of unfulfilled land reform promises made by the government of Indonesia. Despite the fact that the UUPA was largely ignored by the government, neither the Old Order nor the New Order regime attempted to repeal or amend the law because their leaders knew that it would trigger mass protests.⁶

The Basic Agrarian Law being ignored is correlated with the passing of the Forest Law/1967. It constructed forest and agrarian environments as legally, institutionally, and conceptually separate. State ownership was given to about 75% of Indonesian forests (all land not held under private title). The people inhabiting these areas who had legal rights to communal, individual, customary, or private use guaranteed by the 1945 Constitution and the Basic Agrarian Law, were ignored. Their forest uses were deemed illegal, and they were subject to displacement whenever they got in the way of state-capitalist plans of exploitation and development.⁷

Activism During the New Order

Until the 1980's the New Order regime maintained strong anti-communist control. Rural protests were almost unheard of. Coalitions of rural and urban activists and NGO's had to work

⁵ Peluso, Affif, and Fauzi, 2008

⁶ Securing the Right to Land: An Overview on Access to Land in Asia

⁷ Peluso, Suraya, & Rachman, 2008

underground forming coalitions to discuss potential strategies. The authors of *Claiming the Grounds for Reform* compared the early environmental movements of the 1980's in Indonesia to those of grassroots environmental justice movements. Political opposition to the state was intolerable during the time of the Suharto era, so environmental law and advocacy acted as a safe haven for many concerned agrarian activists looking for a platform. Large-scale extractive projects became a focus during the reign of Suharto. For example, between the years of 1982 and 1999, a total of four million hectares of Indonesia's forests were converted into plantations, according to the Ministry of Forestry and Crop Estates statistics⁸. With the massive environmental destruction wrought on forests and natural areas, it is no wonder the environmental movement began to grow at this time. Outside of plantations, farmers were unable to hold onto legally certified land because of corrupt local officials working in the name of "development" of the New Order. While grassroots action was taking place, environmental law, policy, and institutions were working on transforming Indonesian policies to be more environmentally sustainable as well. *Claiming the Grounds for Reform* authors argue that this multi-scaled approach was critically important to both the successes and the constraints faced by environmentalists later on.⁹

Within the environmental justice movement happening during the New Order, there were many variations of focus working under one umbrella of environmental protection. Some activists were concerned about their own plots of land being taken by the government, while others focused more on conservation issues. Sometimes these social justice and conservationist groups had different agendas within the environmental movement. For example, despite the

⁸ Lucas & Warren, 2003

⁹ *Claiming the Grounds for Reform*

natural resource exploitation and environmental degradation caused by New Order projects, conservation advocates often joined government foresters in blaming deforestation on shifting cultivators and forest-dwelling peoples. Even though there were disagreements between conservationists and social justice advocates, the conservationists were able to make the government more aware of environmental problems. For example, during the Suharto era both the Ministry of Forestry and the Ministry of Environment were established, giving environmentalists a legal and political platform to work from. However, the Ministry of Forestry received more government funding than the Ministry of Environment. Environmental debates were the only public platform that farmers who were concerned about loss of access to land through extractive practices could discuss such issues, since any criticism of the new order government would have been considered disruptive. At the same time, the Ministry of Environment was developing relations with international environmental legal advisors, which in some ways, as the authors of *Claiming the Grounds for Reform* argue, helped unify conservation and justice initiatives in Indonesia.¹⁰

The role of NGO's and activist groups during the later years of the Suharto regime became increasingly important. By the mid 1980's, student groups, Legal Aid, and other NGO advocacy organizations in Java and Sumatra acted as coordinators, negotiators, and supporters for land rights issues. By the 1990's, the movement broadened to outer island regions, linking local NGO's with broader environmental movements, and after 1993, (The Year of Indigenous Peoples), indigenous people's rights. Human rights and environmental protection became the

¹⁰ *Claiming the Grounds for Reform*

frameworks within which local struggles were being articulated before Suharto's downfall, and they attracted substantial support from international donors.¹¹

Transformations Post-New Order

The fall of Suharto in 1998 that was accompanied by a transformation in the political economy of Indonesia, is referred to as Reformasi. When this happened, the repression faced by the many agrarian movements of the New Order was eliminated. Immediately after Suharto's demise, tens of thousands of peasants and farmers, landless people and smallholders occupied state forests and plantations, chopped down trees and planted their own crops. As early as 2000, the Director General of the Department of Forestry estimated 118,830 hectares of national land had been seized, as well as 48,051 hectares of private lands. Agrarian reform groups no longer had to work underground, and the result was the formation of peasant organizations as well as alliances in and outside of the government, land politics debates, and plans for mobilizing agrarian reform. Farmers were initially reluctant to join protests and demonstrations, as they may have appeared similar to those that occurred in the 1960's accompanied by violence from the government. Also, now their biggest opposition was the Ministry of Forestry, who controlled about 2/3 of the nation's land base.¹²¹³

The rate of deforestation in Indonesia for the period from 2000-2005 was the fastest in the world. During each of these years, around 1.871 million ha of forests were lost every hour. The Basic Forestry Law facilitated large-scale investments in the forestry sector. Upon this law taking effect, the number of applications for timber concession permits skyrocketed. All

¹¹ Lucas & Warren, 2008

¹² Lucas & Warren, 2008

¹³ Peluso, Afiff, and Fauzi, 2008

commercial forestry has become the preserve of private investors holding forest concessions. Communities that live in or around forest areas are prohibited from cutting timber within concession areas, and could do so only if they have a permit from the concessionaire. Conflicts between communities and forest concession holders have thus erupted.¹⁴

Suharto's successor passed a Presidential Decree to decentralize the government. This Decree of the People's Consultative Assembly IX/MPR/2001 on Agrarian Reform and Natural Resources Management is also known as TAP MPR IX/2001. It seeks to correct the errors of agrarian reform implementation under the Basic Agrarian Law. It mandates specific government entities to conduct a study of various laws and regulations related to agrarian matters in order to harmonize the policies of the sectors; it implements a land reform program based on the "land to the tiller" principle; it conducts a land registration program through a comprehensive and systematic survey of the control, use, ownership, and exploitation of the land; it resolves all agrarian disputes, and forestalls future conflicts by strictly implementing the law; it strengthens the institution responsible for implementing agrarian reform; and it seeks out funding for agrarian reform implementation. Using the framework of this law, the laws on mining (Law No. 11 of 1967), forestry (Law No. 5 of 1967) and plantations are contradictory to its provisions and should be revoked.¹⁵ District level government gained more authority as a result, and some of them were willing to support agrarian movements. The Ministry of Forestry was now required to negotiate with regional governments over management of above ground natural resources. By the time pro-agrarian movements re-emerged, environmental discourses had transformed political fields, as well as law and policy on a national and international scale. According to the

¹⁴ Securing the Right to Land: An Overview on Access to Land in Indonesia

¹⁵ Securing the Right to Land: An Overview on Access to Land in Asia

authors of *Claiming the Grounds for Reform*, these changes were critical in shaping the strategies, positioning, and rhetoric of agrarian and environmental movements after the fall of Suharto, while at the same time, their common ground began to erode.¹⁶

The enactment of TAP MPR No. IX/2001 has the potential to give peasant movements and the agrarian struggle new momentum. This law declares that “the prevailing agrarian/natural resources management has been creating environmental degradation, inequality of land control and ownership, and agrarian conflicts.” The decree goes on to instruct the House of Representatives (DPR) and the Indonesian President “to immediately withdraw, amend, and/or to change any laws and related regulations that are not suited with this decree” (Article 6). The MPR Decree also gives the government the mandate “to implement [...] land reform, to solve agrarian conflicts, and to provide [...] the funds for [the] agrarian reform program and resolution of agrarian conflicts” (Article 5). The Decree thus gives agrarian advocates and the peasant movement in Indonesia the legal right to push the government to implement land reform and to solve agrarian conflicts.¹⁷

Despite this law, many peasant struggles from 1998 to present are still regarded by the government as illegal acts. At the same time, the government has passed several laws that contravene the intent of TAP MPR IX/2001, and that go against the grain of the Basic Agrarian Law. The resolution of land and agrarian conflicts is contingent on the revocation of anti-peasant laws. Toward realizing the agrarian reform agenda, at least five main tasks must be undertaken:

1. Resolution of all land and agrarian conflicts and disputes.
2. Implementation of land reform programs.
3. Rearrangement of rural production and improving productivity by prioritizing

¹⁶ Peluso, Affif, and Fauzi, 2008

¹⁷ Securing the Right to Land: An Overview on Access to Land in Asia

peasants in efforts to improve access to land. 4. Revocation of anti-people and anti-peasant land laws and regulations. 5. Development of a strong and democratic peasant-based organization.¹⁸

Modern Agrarian Reform

Indonesian NGO's have blamed the country's agrarian crisis on three factors. First is the concentration of the ownership of land and other natural resources on a small group of owners: either big landlords or big corporations. The second factor is the inefficiency of production that is the legacy of many years of feudalism. Modern technology has benefitted big business, corporations, and landowners instead of small peasants. The third is state violence and anti-democratic, anti-people, and anti-peasant policies of the government. Peasant leaders have been arrested, jailed, and even murdered. NGOs in Indonesia are conducting their advocacy work in response to these three factors contributing to the agrarian crisis. To name a few, these groups include peasant movements such as AGRA (Alliance of Agrarian Reform Movement, STN (Serikat Tani Nasional), API (Aliansi Petan Indonesia) Petani Mandiri, KPA (Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria), WALHI (Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia), and YLBHI (Yayasan Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Indonesia). The Indonesian peasant movement is demanding an end to state violence directed at their sector, and the release of peasant leaders that have been thrown in prison on the basis of anti-peasant laws. At the same time, the Indonesian peasant movement rejects the plan of the current government to repeal the UUPA. The draft law intended to replace the UUPA strongly favors the interests of big land owners, totally rescinding the spirit and intent of the UUPA to carry out agrarian reform.¹⁹

¹⁸ Securing the Right to Land: An Overview on Access to Land in Asia

¹⁹ Securing the Right to Land: An Overview on Access to Land in Asia

There are too many NGO's that focus on agrarian reform to recognize in this paper. However, the Consortium for Agrarian Reform (KPA) is important to note because it plays a large role in land rights issues in Sumber Klampok. KPA was formed in 1995 during the underground period of agrarian activism. It is an umbrella organization based in West Java, established by and for NGO's working on land and agrarian issues. It has coordinated some hundred groups working on those issues and compiled an inventory of land conflicts since the 1970's. It has also been one of the agrarian groups willing to work with environmental NGO's, in part because some environmental groups had provided funds to KPA to finance occupations and protests.²⁰ As of 2001, they had documented 1,475 cases in 2,277 villages covering 2.5 million hectares of land and affecting almost 2 million people. These cases involved disputes between local people and government departments (42%), private corporations (45%), state corporations (10%), or the military (3%). Direct military involvement is reported in 7% of the cases covered. KPA developed training programs for district parliament members in the early years of Reformasi. Through these workshops, they could discuss the implications of these new laws, and the possibilities for different scenarios of agrarian reform.²¹

Dr. Sadjarwo, Minister of Agrarian Affairs of Indonesia, has identified several stumbling blocks in implementing agrarian reform in the country. First is that the ineffectiveness of land administration made it difficult to determine how much land was available for distribution under the agrarian reform program, and this opened up opportunities for many deviations. The public has not fully appreciated the need for agrarian reform to complete the country's "revolution" for poverty eradication, and agrarian reform is blamed on any pretext. Committee members have

²⁰ Peluso, Afiff, and Fauzi, 2008

²¹ Lucas & Warren, 2008

shown little interest in agrarian reform, either because they are otherwise preoccupied or because it goes against their self-interest. This negligence on the part of committee members has been blamed for the tampering of land registration records, such that names of registrants have been deleted from the land lists, or addresses of registrants are mixed up. Peasant mass organizations that are supposed to provide support and oversight are not sufficiently represented in land reform committees at the regional level. The agrarian reform lobby is still not strong enough to withstand the psychological and economic pressure that landlords can bring to bear on them. The sheer number of impermanent tillers and changes in government administration have hampered the land reform committees. Lastly, the work of defining priorities in agrarian reform has been an obstacle in and of itself.²²

Land reform is a policy option that few governments take willingly. The state is never a consistently rational, unified, and benevolent entity. Hence, the state cannot be expected to adopt policies benefitting a fragmented and unorganized peasantry at the expense of landlords and other groups on whom it depends for support. For these reasons, the development of a strong and democratic peasant-based organization is a very important agenda in agrarian reform implementation as well as the most urgent strategic intervention in Indonesia today. From the beginning, peasant protests and struggles have significantly influenced the dynamics of Indonesian social movements- even if many of them had started out as a reaction to land eviction brought about by the expansion of capital in rural areas in particular, and development activities in general. Peasants and poor farmers are the beneficiaries of any agrarian reform program. In

²² Securing the Right to Land: An Overview on Access to Land in Asia

this regard, the participation and support of peasants through their strong and democratic organizations will be a decisive factor in the successful implementation of agrarian reform.²³

Peasant activists who organize themselves to bring about reform usually comprise a small minority of the rural poor, especially in repressive contexts, but they invariably have the support of a much larger constituency. The privatization of land has been governed by the law of supply and demand: land goes to the highest bidder, benefitting the land speculators and big corporations first. The spread of formally democratic multi-party political regimes offers new opportunities for pressing for reform through the electoral process. Environmental movements can become powerful allies of the rural poor as well as social movements. The concentration of economic and political power in national capitals and imperialist country centers leaves governments more exposed to pressures for reform from national and international progressive social movements. Progressive NGOs and committed international organizations can play an important role as catalysts in helping grassroots peasant and landless movements organize and press their demands for land. They can help through research focused on the livelihood and sustainable development problems of the rural poor, provide valuable technical assistance, material recourses, and legal aid, facilitate the use of modern communication technologies by peasants and others struggling for reform, publicize violations of socio-economic and human rights, corruption, and other abuses suffered by the poor, and advance land reforms through advocacy at all levels. However, their roles will always be auxiliary to what must fundamentally be a domestic political process. The main actors in bringing about and consolidating genuine land reform must always include the landless and near landless, together with their political allies and the state. Well intentioned NGOs and international organizations can help, but they could

²³ Securing the Right to Land: An Overview on Access to Land in Asia

also hinder the peasants' struggle if they fail to take into account the complex social dynamics that underlie the pursuit of agrarian reform.²⁴

Sumber Klampok History

Dutch and Chinese Land Ownership

Sumber Klampok Village is located in the Buleleng regency of West Bali and covers about 600 hectares of land. If you visit Sumber Klampok now, it looks like the typical, rural village you would find in many regions of Bali. There are currently 849 families, about 3,817 people. They live in close proximity to each other, children play in the streets and everyone seems to know each other. Cows munch on hay in many family compounds as people whiz by on motorbikes. There is a village office on the main road where the head of the village, special committee, and other public figures meet and do work. There is a school that is in the process of renovation, and the teachers of which are paid on donation from the villagers. There is a temple, a mosque, and health care houses (puskesmas) as well. On the coast of Sumber Klampok there are fishermen and a diving training facility. The only facilities paid for by the government are the head village office and a new project for access roads in the village. In the forest areas at the base of the mountains you can find many chili and corn plots, along with various other crops. The quality of life here is good. People are happy when you pass them on the street, and it is clear that many people feel well settled. These observations may seem very basic, but they are important to note in the context of agrarian reform, because they show that the people here are

²⁴ Securing the Right to Land: An Overview on Access to Land in Asia

connected to their land. What you would find in Sumber Klampok now is very different from what you may have found in the past.

The history of Sumber Klampok begins in 1922, when the village became a slave settlement owned by Dutch companies. The situation of Sumber Klampok during the colonial era was typical of many Balinese villages during the time. Three Dutch men named AW Remmert, Johan J. Pownell, and Gerrit Van Schermbeek wanted to clear the forest of West Bali for palm and cotton plantations. In 1927, plantation permits were granted by the Dutch government. The total area of plantation land granted for Sumber Klampok was 623.846 hectares. People were brought to west Bali from Madura, Java, as well as other areas of Bali to work on the plantations and had to farm what the colonials wanted. Many slaves died of malaria, starvation, or ran away. In 1942 the Dutch granted land use to the slaves. There were about sixty families in the village at the time. They were not paid, but were given one hectare of land to plant food on per family.²⁵²⁶

Bapak Mah Jatim is one of the oldest public figures in Sumber Klampok. He was born in 1942, and can still remember what life was like back then.

“When the colonial was still here, there was no violence towards us the local people who came from Java or Madura. Everything was going okay, no issue. We worked and got paid with rice. In short there was no violence but in contrast the Dutch helped us about the economy and also they paid for our hospital bill and helped to clean up our neighborhood so then there was no more malaria. Everything was fine even until the Dutch returned to their country. Then the Dutch acknowledged the religion practices in here like Islam and Hindu. Whenever there were ceremonies of one religion, let’s say an Islam ceremony we would gather in one place. There

²⁵ Gustave & Hidayat, 2008

²⁶ Ni Made Indra Wati

would be Hindu priests or figures as well and entertainments like dance. When I was ten, I became a babysitter for the Dutch children. Those children I babysat were Ms. Koni and Mr. Robi and they always come visiting me here every year. When the Dutch began the forest clearing, they took people (to do the job) from Madura, Java. This was all initiated by the Dutch, but after Dutch people were not allowed to stay in Indonesia anymore because they refused to become Indonesian citizens. Finally the Dutch named this village Sumber Klampok, at first the name was Gedebong Bunyuk but the Dutch then changed it because there was water crisis occurring and they ordered local people to dig the ground to make a well and because the water spring was found underneath a Klampok tree. Then they call it Sumber Klampok. When in the colonial era, Mr. Raymond and Ms. Koni were really fond of the local society so every time they earned something they shared it to the society, like rice or fish if they got some from the sea. That was very kind of them. And also if there were sick villagers, they would be brought to the hospital immediately. Because of malaria outbreaks, those Dutch really cared for the villagers. (If we compare) the life when there was the Dutch around and after reformation in this village Sumber Klampok, the time when the colonial was here was better, especially when there were sick people. They would be brought to the hospital, get treatments, and go home without the need to worry about money or how to pay it. There were protests and demonstrations after the Dutch left about the land that it could not be handed over to the locals but the villagers remained here.”²⁷

Despite the fact that villagers in Gedebong Bunyuk (as Sumber Klampok was named up until 1961) were slaves, they were taken care of. According to Ni Made Indra Wati, the villagers liked the Dutch because they would often give out fish and bring sick people to the hospital

²⁷ Bapak Mah Jatim (personal communication) April 9th 2017

when they needed it, as Bapak Mah Jatim said. In 1955, when the Dutch company plantation contract was terminated, life changed for the villagers. The regional government delegated the land in Sumber Klampok to companies called PT. Dharmajati and PT. Margarana in 1957 that were managed by the Chinese and controlled by the Indonesian military. Villagers were allotted ¼ hectare of land for their own use. The Chinese joined alliances with the military, and night guards monitored the coconut, cotton, and palm plantations. If the villagers illegally harvested crops, they were threatened. During this time, the military and the Chinese benefitted from the work of the farmers, while farmers received no compensation. Sumber Klampok villagers were enslaved.²⁸²⁹ Bapak Mah Jatim said,

“When PT. Margarana and PT. Dharmajati ran the land here, they forced us to plant only corn, peanut and chili peppers. Orange and coconut were prohibited to be planted unless the PTs themselves planted it. There was no money involved in the payment system but we divided the harvest into three parts; two parts for the farmer and one part for the PT’s.”

During the time the Chinese companies owned Sumber Klampok land is when villagers suffered the most injustice. Between 1962 and 1965, Barisan Tani Indonesia (BTI), a peasant mass organization connected to the Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI) got involved with Sumber Klampok land rights issues. They were able to help villagers reclaim the land that was once owned by Dutch companies. However, it was during this time that the “cleansing” of communists in Indonesia took place, as well as anyone who was associated with the PKI. Former BTI members who survived the massacre lived in secrecy under the New Order government, which had strict anti-communist regulations. In 1966 some 89 heads of household who identified

²⁸ Hidayat & Gustave, 2008

²⁹ Paraphrased from I Gusti Ngurah Komang Karyadi

as BTI members were expelled from PT. Margarana plantations based on a letter from the Regional Head of Bali³⁰. Bapak Mah Jatim said about this time period,

“The Dutch had returned and the Indonesian army occupied this area and after that the PT. Margarana company came. In 1964-65, the PKI/BTI movement occurred resulting in many casualties here, either shot or mutilated. Then the PKI/BTI was raided by the army. There were about twenty to thirty people that died here and also thirty or more died in PT Dharmajati. So there was the violence happened, not in the colonial era but in Suharto era. Because of that atrocity, many people went back to their origin in Madura and Java.”

In 1967 for the first time ever, the Sumber Klampok community took initiative to hold elections for village chief. Pawiro Santono was chosen for head of the village, and Sumber Klampok was divided into three hamlets³² that still exist, named Banjar Sumber Klampok, Banjar Sumber Batok, and Banjar Tegal Bunder. Land rights were transitioned to Hak Guna Usaha PT. Margarana company from January 11th, 1968 until December 31st, 1993. 1970 was the first year the community applied for land rights from the government. In the request the head of the village stated that villagers do not own their own crop land and were living in makeshift houses, and that they wanted rights to the land, but they got no response. In 1979 the village head filed another petition on the grounds that the land in Sumber Klampok has been occupied and cultivated for 57 years, and that the villagers should be the legitimate heir of the land, but still no response. This action was repeated again on January 7th, 1980 with no response a third time. Meanwhile, the concession occupied by villagers was set to expire on September 24th of the same year. According to the Presidential Decree No.32 / 1979 and Regulation of the Minister of

³⁰ Ni Made Indra Wati

³¹ Gustave & Hidayat, 2008

³² A hamlet is a sub-village

the Interior No.3 / 1979, it is society that should get priority first and foremost to acquire ownership of the land. Therefore, the provincial government was violating Indonesian law in Sumber Klampok.³³

Conservation Issues: Bali Barat National Park and National Forest

On top of already existing conflicts between government and community interests as well as the oppression of the Suharto era, in 1984, forests used by community members were designated as Bali Barat National Park (BBNP) land, and more conflict arose. The Ministry of Forestry was created during the Suharto era and gained enough power to delegate land purposes. The national park in this area is used for tourism and conservation, whereas the national forest is used for timber production. Because Sumber Klampok territory exists as an enclave between the national park and the national forest, villagers were restricted to their once readily available natural resources; they were prohibited from collecting, managing, and cultivating sea products such as fish and seaweed on the coastal areas, as well as plants and trees in the forests within BBNP. Those who broke rules enforced by park rangers were subject to arrest and sometimes even violence. People were accused of being bird thieves and forest destroyers. However, villagers claim that they have taken initiatives to participate in conservation of their land, even before the BBNP came. In an interview with village members Abdul Kadi and Mohammad Jatim documented in 2008, it is clear that they have a deep awareness for the ecosystem they co-exist in with other species, contrary to what national park rangers believe.³⁴

³³ Ni Made Indra Wati

³⁴ Gustave & Hidayat, 2008

“I know that exactly in the eighth month, hundreds of Starlings³⁵ stay in the west side where they drink and rest. In the fifth month they drink in the east, feed in Kotal Brumbun, and sleep at Telok Kelor³⁶. During the dry season in the ninth month towards the tenth month, the Starling no longer sleeps in the natural forest but among the production forest trees, sawo and widara. Sumber Klampok villagers never hunt the Starling, saying they tried the meat but it was bitter. That is why we never hunt and eat the Balinese Starling. Until 1971, hundreds of Balinese Starlings were visible everywhere. But after it was declared a rare species, many park rangers were there but the birds disappeared. How could this happen? In 1982 I seldom saw the Balinese Starling any more. When I still had my Breadfish nursery in Teluk Kelor, myself along with my 174 workers were also monitoring the starlings, coral, and fish from thieves coming from Java. But since my business was burned down by the national park I could not participate in guarding the birds, coral, and fish in the sea. At that time, Teluk Kelor was guarded by park rangers and police. The weird thing was that in fact birds disappeared.”

When I asked Bapak Mah Jatim about BBNP, he said,

“Before it was established, the TNBB³⁷ asked for permission from Sumber Klampok and promised that they would support us in economy and everything, but after it was finally formed, it seemed they did not care about the community. Just in 2004 they gave us signal that they were willing to fulfill their past promises by giving us farm animals like Jalak Bali (a type of Balinese bird) and pigeons.”

³⁵ The Bali Starling is an endangered bird species that is protected under conservation laws in BBNP.

³⁶ Teluk Kelor and Kotal Brumbun are areas near BBNP.

³⁷ TNBB is another acronym for the national forest. It stands for Tani Nasional Bali Barat.

I received another perspective on the issue of land conservation from Istiyartu Ismu. He is 46 years old and has been living in Sumber Klampok, in the hamlet Banjar Tegel Bunder. Most people in Sumber Klampok come to the village because they have family that lives there, or they marry in, or they are like Ismu and come for another reason. He started working as a researcher for a fisherman community in July 2006. During this time he met Ni Made Indra Wati, and continued to build communications with her after the two months he was in Sumber Klampok. In 2008 Ismu got a job working with a program called RARE³⁸. Ismu's opinion is that there is a gap between the national park and Sumber Klampok village. The Bali Starling has become endangered due to poachers and environmental degradation. Their once savannah habitat has been turned into fields, and invasive species in the forests have taken over. Poachers existed until the early 1980's, when the national park was created. Ismu said that managing conservation area is a classic problem in Indonesia. The government focuses only on plant and animal areas and forgets about the surrounding communities who depend on the natural resources for their livelihoods. People lose access when conservation areas are established by the law. People used to use the park for certain plants, such as rattan³⁹. They collected leaves and grass for husbandry. If people tried to use these resources after the establishment of the national park, they would be stopped. Their livelihoods were halted, so they stopped caring about the forest. They cut trees and kept birds because their access was cut off.⁴⁰

Since 2010, Ismu and his friends tried to collaborate with the national park by starting a Bali Starling breeding group. There are currently seventeen licensed breeders in Tegel Bunder

³⁸ RARE is an international NGO whose stated mission is to help communities adopt sustainable behaviors toward their natural environment

³⁹ Rattan is the name for about 600 species of old world climbing palms, and is used in making furniture and building structures.

⁴⁰ Ismu (personal communications)

and 124 birds. These birds are sold within the village as well as being sent to Jakarta. Ismu also said that every day he sees people illegally cutting down trees to sell to timber companies near his home. He feels helpless when he sees this happening, and that all he can do is educate his neighbors, friends, and family not to do this. Another community initiative he started was growing Albasia trees. One of the daily activities of many people in Sumber Klampok is cutting branches of trees. When they no longer had access to the surrounding forests, this became a problem. Ismu showed them how they could plant Albasia trees in their fields and use their branches for firewood and animal feed. At first he tried this experiment on one plot of land with seven other people, and now people grow this tree all over the village. The conservation of forests by the national park directly impacted the lives of Sumber Klampok villagers. Despite the fact that conservation laws were enacted in the Sumber Klampok area, this did not create a sense of conservation stewardship amongst villagers.⁴¹

In 1990, the national park made plans to evacuate Sumber Klampok village because they saw villagers as a disruption and detrimental to the conservation of BBNP. At this time there were about 419 households with 2,075 inhabitants. The governor of Bali, Ida Bagus Oka, visited Sumber Klampok village and determined that the area should be reforested as well as made into a tourist attraction, and that people needed to vacate the area within the next year. This governmental decision spurred Sumber Klampok residents to take action beginning February 28th, 1991, when 56 residents showed up at the House of Representatives in Jakarta. Village members undertook a series of actions and applications for the coming years to get land rights and to stop the migration of families to other areas. They interacted with the House of Representatives, the Minister of Home Affairs, the National Land Agency, the governor of Bali,

⁴¹ Ismu (personal communications)

and BBNP in alliance with student activist groups. They held several protests, and pleaded with the Balinese government to give them the land that they believed was rightfully theirs, because according to Article 33 of the Indonesian Constitution, all natural resources belong to the state for the benefit of the people. For the next three years Sumber Klampok villagers pressed the governor of Bali to recognize Sumber Klampok as a legitimate village through various complex legal and political actions. They were either ignored, told to wait, or offered an alternative to what they really wanted.⁴²

Villagers made another attempt to gain access to land in 1999 when they initiated the Global Environment Facility Small Grant Program (GEF SGP). They wanted to open up national park zones to accommodate villagers' interests, but did not receive any support from the regional government and the project was terminated. Management by the national park and Forestry Department is top down and communication lacks transparency with the community in regards to area management planning. The community has never been involved in area management planning and implementation, and still has no legal rights to their land. They have received no benefits from TNBB, and barely any villagers work for them (some do as guides).

Taking Action

On November 7th, 1993 the first protest was held in the village. The villagers camped out in tents on the road side in Sumber Klampok holding signs and banners and made a soup kitchen. On the first day the police chief threatened the villagers that if they did not disperse, the military troops were going to come. The action continued for four days and was attended by the police chief and armed forces. According to Ngurah Karyadi, one of the members of KPA Bali, this

⁴² Ni Made Indra Wati

protest was part of “Reclaiming the Right of Land Action” by Sumber Klampok people and also Sendang Pasir⁴³ villagers, and that they were forceful in their protests. People blocked one of the main roads, burned down the kapok, coconut, and other trees that they had been forced to cultivate by PT. Margarana and Dharmajati companies, and even burned down the company office. The location where they set up camp became known as “Demo’s Temple”. Nobody from Sumber Klampok was arrested, but twelve people in Sendang Pasir were and charged with trespassing. They received six months to a year jail time. The result of the action was that the local and provincial government banned the companies of PT. Margarana and Dharmajati, and changed the land’s status to state land rights. Since this action, the people of Sumber Klampok are not oppressed and can cultivate and harvest whatever they like such as corn, chili, tapioca, vegetables, oranges, etc. They are no longer subjected to military violence and oppression, they can make their own goods and they are not in the trap of poverty.⁴⁴

Following the 1993 protest, communication with the Bali provincial government continued as villagers advocated for the land rights of Sumber Klampok. In 2012 there was another protest held outside of the Bali government office by Sumber Klampok villagers, and again in 2013. The governor of Bali, Made Mangku Pastika, had been unresponsive to villagers’ proposal to own the land through Abandoned Land Settlement claims based on law No.11/2010 on Abandoned Land. They protested by blocking one of the major roads in the village starting on November 7th. The next day the head of Bali’s police officers asked them to unblock the road and for some written information on the land dispute so he could have a better understanding of the situation. The villagers obliged, on the condition that he bring back the governor of Bali to

⁴³ Another village in Buleleng that is getting help from KPA Bali to obtain land rights.

⁴⁴ Ngurah Karyadi (personal communications) April 18th, 2017

speak with them. The governor had invited them to meet on November 11th, but they rejected the invitation because they wanted the governor to come to them. The governor never came, and the coordination meeting went on without Sumber Klampok representatives. The Bali Regional House of Representatives planned to settle the dispute by giving the villagers 400 square meters of homage and the rest of the land would be given the right to manage (not ownership). The villagers rejected this proposal, as it was not a settlement based on the Abandoned Land Law. Indra Wati said in regards to the decision,

“It is suspected to be a case of corruption, collusion, and nepotism.”

DD Shineba, Chairperson of Networking and Political Department of the KPA, said,

“The Bali’s governor must revoke his petition and lawsuit on the land, and he also has to issue a recommendation letter to Central BPN to discipline and harness the former right to use land of PT. Dharmajati, and PT. Margarana as abandoned land, so it can be agrarian reform object for all tillers in the village, such as stated in Government Law No. 11/2010.”⁴⁵

On December 5th of 2013, a Sumber Klampok representative along with KPA Bali and KPA National representatives went to Jakarta to ask for an explanation from the National Land Agency of the Republic of Indonesia (BPN RI) about the progress of Sumber Klampok’s land case and status, because the status in the past few weeks had worried the residents. The hearing had also aimed to ask for a follow up of the previous meeting on July 3rd-4th of 2013, because BPN had not given any information since about the settlement process. The result of the hearing was unclear to the Sumber Klampok residents. According to BPN, Sumber Klampok’s land status is a provincial asset to Bali, and there is not a certificate of Right to Manage on the land.

⁴⁵ Kpa.or.id

This statement supports the governor of Bali's claim that without any clear origin, the land belongs to Bali as a provincial asset. I Putu Artana, a Sumber Klampok leader, was disappointed from the hearing results, saying,

“We have fought for our land for a long time, we followed its procedure towards settlement process as it was agreed, suddenly the Provincial Government wanted to put marks stating that our land was Provincial Government's asset, and now BPN said it was no longer their concern and the residents had to deal with Ministry of Finance when it came to provincial government's asset. Information about the exposure was considered state's secret”

To respond to the inconsistency received from BPN in settling the agrarian conflict in Sumber Klampok, residents declared their position in six statements: They refuse the governor of Bali's statement about Sumber Klampok's land status as a provincial government asset, they refuse the formation of the Asset Special Committee by the Regional House of Representatives, they demand the formation of Special Committee for Agrarian Conflict and Land Dispute Settlement on Sumber Klampok land and in Bali in general, they promote the legal review on land status in Sumber Klampok by various parties, which include the Regional House of Representatives, National Land Agency of the Republic of Indonesia, and civil society organization, they encourage the National Land Agency and the Regional House of Representatives to conduct a mediation process for the agrarian conflict and land dispute settlement in Sumber Klampok between the residents and Bali's Provincial Government in the framework of agrarian reform implementation as mandated by the Basic Agrarian Law of 1960 and TAP MPR No. IX/2001, and they encourage factions in the Regional House of

Representatives of Bali's Province to take favor of Sumber Klampok's villagers' interest by not acknowledging the village land as a provincial asset.⁴⁶

This has been the type of battle KPA Bali has been fighting since 1995 when it was established. There has been a lot of back and forth between the provincial government and Sumber Klampok, with no agreement reached. The provincial government believes the land belongs to them since the concessions left, while Sumber Klampok villagers think that it belongs to them because they have been cultivating the land since 1922 with no legal recognition. It is an ongoing battle that villagers still have hope of winning.

Sumber Klampok Now

Conversations with the Special Committee

Sumber Klampok villagers have established livelihoods, raised families, and developed their economy since the plantation contracts were terminated. To be uprooted by the government, a very real possibility in the future, would be devastating for thousands of people that live here. I had the opportunity to observe several meetings with the special committee of the village, and was able to interview some key actors in Sumber Klampok's land rights battle.

I Wayan Sawitra Yas has been head of the village for three years. He reiterated that the issue of land has been taking place since the colonial era, when people from Java and Madura were invited to work on coconut plantations, and that even after 1945 when Indonesia gained independence, there were still land rights issues. Privatization of West Bali National Park has

⁴⁶ Status of Sumberklampok Land in Bali Get Unclear, BPN RI's and Bali's DPRD's Commitment Questioned." KPA. N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2017. <<http://www.kpa.or.id/news/blog/status-of-sumberklampok-land-in-bali-get-unclear-bpn-ris-and-balis-dprds-commitment-questioned/>>.

victimized residents. As head of the village he facilitates people to organize themselves when they're asking for rights to the land and helps them with planning to develop the land. He also acts as the representative of the Sumber Klampok people in the region of Bali. According to him, the people are stigmatized as criminals by the provincial government. They are also worried the villagers will sell the land if given legal certificates, which is why they are reluctant to give it over. But he believes because they have been fighting for over 25 years, villagers will sell the land to outsiders. He wants to make sure that if there is someone who wants to sell their land that it stays within the ownership of people in the village. According to I Wayan Sawitra Yas, the soil here is very fertile and people live a lot better than they used to, as Sumber Klampok was once in extreme poverty. Buildings were not made of bricks, rather bamboo, and nobody had bicycles or motorbikes. Now they do have these things, and his point was that they can manage the area in their own way to develop themselves. He believes one day the land will belong to the people. I asked him about the relationship Sumber Klampok has with the national park. He said they are lucky to be next to Menjengan Island⁴⁷, and people here want to get benefits from tourism. 15% of the local people work in tourism. Mostly in boat transportation, also resorts, and tour guides. They are currently trying to promote community based eco-tourism in the village, in which the people who live there use their own knowledge of culture and traditions to attract tourists.⁴⁸

I Putu Artana is one of 23 members of the special committee for land rights in Sumber Klampok, who are considered informal leaders in the village. Right now the basis of their work, and most important task, is to organize and create a data base of the subjects and objects of land. The subject means individual info of villagers such as name, age, marital status, etc. The object

⁴⁷ An island off the coast of Sumber Klampok that is part of the national park and is a popular snorkeling destination for tourists.

⁴⁸ I Wayan Sawitra Yas (personal communications) April 10th, 2017

means how many hectares of land they have, and whether their land is classified as a farming field or space for housing. It is critical that the special committee collects accurate data. After they collect the data, they submit it to the National Land Agency to support their claim to land rights. They also need to create accurate mapping for Sumber Klampok. In his work he faces some technical problems with GPS mapping. The border lines between Sumber Klampok, surrounding villages, and the national park needs to be made clear. They also want to map out what areas in the village would be good for what resources, because agrarian reform includes the issue of access in addition to assets- in other words, what type of crops should they grow and what techniques should they employ?⁴⁹ As of right now, they cannot afford equipment and need funding. Ngurah Karyadi added,

“It’s good that they have a little, otherwise they’re not working. A lot of money will ruin everything.”

Ni Made Indra Wati is at the center of agrarian reform in Sumber Klampok. She is the head of two NGO’s and an informed member of the special committee. I have been told by several of her friends that she is the “big boss”, that everybody knows her and that she works very hard for these legal rights. In 1995 she founded KPA Bali which is a sub division of the larger organization of KPA and consists of four other people. Right now KPA Bali is in the process of obtaining land certificates for Sumber Klampok and another village in Buleleng called Sendang Pasir. In Sumber Klampok, every villager needs one land certificate for the land that they have their homes on, and another for the land that they cultivate, if they have farm land. These certificates provide protection from the government as they represent legal land

⁴⁹ I Putu Artana (personal communications) April 10th, 2017

ownership. Ismu, one of the members of KPA Bali and a Sumber Klampok villager, said a village without a land certificate is

“...like body no soul, so they like a zombie.”

It is critical that Sumber Klampok villagers obtain land certificates so that they have legitimate ownership and protection of their land. It is unfair that neighboring communities such as Gili Manuk have land certificates and are recognized by the government, but Sumber Klampok still is not. Even though the government knows that Sumber Klampok is a village, it does not mean much without legal certification. Ni Made Indra Wati is currently in the process of writing a proposal that contains the “who and what” of land rights issues in Sumber Klampok, or the subject and object of the land, as mentioned previously. I was able to attend several events and meetings with Ni Made Indra Wati that had to do with agrarian reform.

Conferences and Meetings

The first event was a conference with an international organization called Swissindo⁵⁰. There were at least 100 people at the conference, and Ni Made Indra Wati was one of the guest speakers. This was a platform for her to speak about agrarian reform. Another meeting she had was with Peduli Alam Dan Lingkungan, or PILANG (it means caring for nature and the environment). This is another NGO that she founded in 2005. It focuses on conservation issues, gaining economic access, and community development for people in the Buleleng regency. We went to the coastal area of Sumber Klampok where the PILANG office is located. They

⁵⁰ Swissindo is an international organization based in Switzerland and has joined the Indonesian government. Their focus is reclaiming money from the World Bank that they believe is theirs because their ancestors were never paid by England, Holland, and Spain for their labor. Now they want to use this money for education, helping the poor, health care, homelessness, and those in debt.

discussed plans for developing eco-tourism in the area. After the meeting we went to survey an area in Gerokgak, a neighboring village to Sumber Klampok in Buleleng. The main attraction here was a beautiful dam with surrounding hiking trails. PILANG was checking out the area to be turned into an area for eco-tourism. Another day we went to a beautiful, sprawling melon farm in Sendang Pasir, another neighboring village that is still fighting to get land certificates with the help of KPA Bali. When we got there we met a big group of melon farmers, as well as a Bali Tribune reporter that wanted to interview Ni Made Indra Wati about agrarian reform. I was able to speak to the owner of the farm and a farmer's group there called Serikat Petani Bali. 55 year old Bapak Rasik said that the business is thriving, but that the people are still hoping to be given ownership status of the land by the government, like in Sumber Klampok.

Within Sumber Klampok village there are also seventeen groups regarding farming and land use, as well as two fishermen groups. The difference between farming and agrarian groups is that farmers groups focus on the crops whereas agrarian groups focus on the land. There are other groups of people in Sumber Klampok that focus on developing eco-tourism and conservation. A group called Pukit Sari has the same goal of KPA Bali in gaining land rights for the village, but its main target is the Ministry of Forestry instead of the governor of Bali, another influential pressure point to focus on. Maguk Jakak (Beautiful Bird) is a Bali Starling breeding group in Sumber Klampok. People will breed the birds and sell them to people who want to keep them for "pride". At first I was skeptical of this as the Bali Starling is an endangered species (maybe the government is correct in calling the villagers bird thieves), but Ismu said it was another means of conservation and preservation, and that the people in the group must report every month to a bigger birding group the number of birds and if any are sick. I think it is important to note these various groups because they fall under the umbrella of land use and

development, and their work would be stopped if the government were to exploit the land for large scale eco-tourism, reforestation, or other purposes. Although these groups are not technically classified as agrarian reform groups, their existence shows that Sumber Klampok villagers are dedicated to developing their community in an economically and environmentally mindful way. Ni Made Indra Wati works in collaboration with many of these groups as well while focusing on agrarian reform.

One of the most important events I observed Ni Made Indra Wati prepare for was a workshop and meeting in Jakarta with the heads of the KPA. On April 20th she, Ismu, and I drove to Denpasar to meet with the secretary of KPA Bali, Samsul Arifin. On the way there she announced reading the news that on April 5th the government gave one million hectares of land to farmers in Indonesia, which she was very excited about. Once at the office in Denpasar, they discussed the structure of KPA Bali and programs that they want to implement in the upcoming months. I was not able to travel with them to Jakarta, but when they returned on April 25th, Ismu was able to update me on what happened. He had gone through a “capacity building” workshop, which basically involved him deepening his understanding of agrarian reform and how to create accurate databases of relevant statistics in Sumber Klampok. He said there was a training for agrarian reform topics, a discussion about problem solving in the KPA Wilayah region, and a workshop on the economics, history, and current situation of agrarian reform in Indonesia and the world. They got experience with social analysis, community organizing, and they made a short term three month plan for action in the Bali region.⁵¹

⁵¹ Ismu (personal communications) April 26th, 2017

The target for KPA Bali right now is finishing the data base by the end of April, because in May KPA Jakarta is coming to Sumber Klampok to cross check it. Data and information is a new division within KPA that did not exist until recently. In Sumber Klampok they found non farmers in a database that is only for farmers. They must make this accurate because the applicants for land certificates must have the occupation status of a farmer, so they need to provide proof for the farmers who do not identify as farmers on their ID cards without remaking the ID card. The facilitator gave them advice to speed up the process of data collection and to send a request letter three times to the regional and provincial governments. They also need to get a total number of men and women in Sumber Klampok, and make a clear map of where the borders of the village are.

On April 27th there was a meeting with the village of Sumber Klampok to educate the people about the village pushing for land reform. It is part of a national KPA program to get people land certificates but also educate them that the land is not for selling but should be kept for farming. People need to know that the process of certification is not the only purpose. The certificate is only provides legal proof that somebody owns land. At least one hundred people gathered at the head office to hear the special committee speak about land reform. The audience was listening intently and would chant in unison when Ni Made Indra Wati would say something they felt strongly about.

Ismu was able to give me more perspective after the meeting. The government at the moment is giving land to people, but not the original settlers. KPA wants the indigenous people to have ownership of the land. In Jakarta they found out that KPA East Java formed a process like in Sumber Klampok. They also have land reform issues, but their process is faster than in Sumber Klampok. National KPA will go there to discuss with the people and they will get a

certificate not this year but in the near future. Why is the process faster and more advanced in a region that is younger than Sumber Klampok? That is something important that villagers must learn with an open mind from other regions. Despite the fact that they have been fighting for 27 years, the process is moving very slowly. People in this village need to not be stuck in their ways. They must get out of Sumber Klampok and learn from different perspectives. Land reform is not the only issue in the village, and Ismu is frustrated that people's minds are not opened about this. Ni Made Indra Wati works with many businesses that are not just KPA, and sometimes they overlap. Ismu wants to communicate the knowledge of national KPA to Sumber Klampok people and bridge the communication. Ismu is not a farmer, so he is not interested in land, because he has no farm land. Many people do not care about agrarian reform because they are not farmers, but this is a misconception because land reform is not only for farming. He sees that the young generation is not being taught about agrarian reform in the local curriculum. There is no education about local knowledge. He is worried that when they become adults they will not care about the village. He educates his children that their homeland is Sumber Klampok and they should care about the land. He starts with educating his family, then maybe his neighbors. He tries to understand who he can talk to about knowledge and land, but it is still in process. He feels he must give something to Sumber Klampok because he is a beneficiary.⁵²

I interviewed one of the special committee members after this meeting with the community took place. Rahabit is 41 years old and farms corn, peanuts, and chilis on his 2,500 square meter plot of land that was passed onto him by his mother and father. He believes that if people do obtain their land certificates, they will not sell their land but use it to boost the economy in the village. The connection between land use and obtaining a land certificate is that

⁵² Ismu (personal communications) April 27th, 2017

once people have legal rights to their land, they feel safe to invest more in it, instead of worrying that the land might be taken from them. If they don't get certificates, he worries there will be chaos. He also is worried about the next generation in the village. He believes that there will be a positive outcome in the efforts to obtain land certificates, but he thinks that the next generation lacks the spirit this generation and previous generations have had in agrarian reform conflicts as the process has been so slow and long. However, he believes the younger generation can increase their awareness through education. He works with an organization called ANSOR, which is a sub group from a big Muslim organization in Indonesia called NU. He is the chief of the sub district that includes fourteen villages, one of them being Sumber Klampok. It is a strong group that educates youth on social, cultural, and environmental issues. I asked him if people stay here after they finish school, and he said most do and either continue farming or work in tourism, and that some go to the city to get jobs. Rahabit feels a strong connection to his land, and has a desire to keep his own plot not only for his generation but for future generations as well.⁵³

Conclusion

Agrarian reform in Indonesia has evolved since independence was gained in 1945. The word agrarian refers to cultivated land as well as forests and housing development. One of the first groups to address land rights issues was the BTI, and was closely connected to the PKI. During the New Order regime the Basic Agrarian Law of 1960 was established which meant progress for agrarian reform activists. However, Suharto coming to power in 1965 slowed the momentum of the agrarian reform movement. Thousands of Indonesians associated with the PKI, many of whom were BTI members, were massacred. The Basic Agrarian Law was largely

⁵³ Rahabit (personal communications) April 28th, 2017

ignored during the Suharto era, and many agrarian, environmental, and peasant activists were forced underground. State capitalist development plans that exploited natural resources often displaced people on the basis of the Forestry Laws passed in 1967. The Ministry of Environment acted as a safe haven for many different activist groups to come together and make plans for both agrarian and environmental agendas. During the 1980's and 1990's many influential NGO's were formed that still exist today, such as the KPA. When Suharto fell from power in 1998, agrarian activists were free to publicly come together as well as separate from environmental groups with conflicting agendas. Suharto's successor passed a presidential decree to decentralize the government, which in theory was supposed to support agrarian movements. However, many agrarian and peasant actions are still regarded as illegal by the government today, and land rights issues are still a big concern for many villages in Indonesia. Sumber Klampok represents the conflict faced between the Indonesian people and the Indonesian government in the context of agrarian reform.

Sumber Klampok has a history of land rights issues that begins with its birth in 1922. It was originally a slave settlement owned by Dutch companies up until 1955 when their contract ended and ownership was passed to Chinese companies that were far more violent towards villagers and restrictive of their land use. Many villagers were killed during the communist cleansing that took place in Indonesia from 1965-1966 because they were associated with or were part of BTI. Even after the contracts of PT. Margarana and PT. Dharmajati ended and the Indonesian government sued the companies, the villagers were still not granted access to their land, and the provincial government of Bali claimed ownership. After Sumber Klampok initiated its own elections for village head in 1967 and divided the village into three sub villages, they also started to take initiative in demanding land rights from the government. The first application

was sent to the Balinese government in 1970, with no response, the beginning of a pattern that continues to this day. Access to land was further restricted to villagers in 1984 when Bali Barat National Park was established. Ni Made Indra Wati has written a detailed history of actions taken by Sumber Klampok villagers in the past three decades, which includes many interactions with the provincial government and protests to demonstrate the urgency and frustration felt by villagers. KPA Bali, founded by Ni Made Indra Wati in 1995, has been a key part of the progress made in gaining land rights, but the process is far from over.

Observing Ni Made Indra Wati work for three weeks and talking to Sumber Klampok villagers gave me a basic understanding of what the village is like and what the obstacles are to gain land ownership. Right now the Sumber Klampok special committee and KPA Bali are focused on collecting accurate subject and object data to submit to the provincial government for review. This is the next step in the process of obtaining land certificates for all of the villagers. If KPA Bali and the special committee fail to get land certificates for the villagers, they risk losing their land to the government. Right now the land status is technically state land, but the government has not taken any action with it as a provincial asset. They have also been reluctant for years to give villagers legal land rights. This may be because of fear that villagers will sell their land to companies looking to develop or exploit it, but most likely it is because the land is worth a lot of money. Forcing villagers off their land so that it can be sold for large-scale eco-tourism projects, exploitative practices, or reforestation are all real possibilities in the future, which is why getting land certificates is so urgent. Sumber Klampok villagers have successfully developed the village's infrastructure and farming, and have created several farmers, fishermen, and conservation groups as well. All the work to further develop the village and cultivate the land is in a vulnerable position without land certificates.

Suggestions for Further Research

Sumber Klampok is in the midst of a battle for land rights that is far from over. Further research will be needed to have a more comprehensive understanding of Sumber Klampok's history and its future. There are details of Sumber Klampok's past that are missing due to language barriers between myself and the locals and the lack of English literature on the topic. More time with this topic would allow for a more comprehensive historical account. A more thorough understanding of Indonesian land laws will be helpful in understanding Sumber Klampok's struggle as well. In addition to the history, more research needs to be done in Sumber Klampok in the future to see how the land status changes or stays the same. Either the villagers will gain legal ownership of the land or they will not. If they do, they will either continue to develop their economy and cultivate their land, or there will be a decline in interest with the next generation, in which case the land may be sold off. If they do not obtain the land certificates, there may not be anything that happens initially. However, the government has the power to force people off their land so that they can do what they want with it. This might be reforestation as part of conservation initiatives by BBNP, eco-tourism projects, or timber exploitation. This research did not explore the perspectives of the provincial government would also be important in further research.

Bibliography

1. "Status of Sumberklampok Land in Bali Get Unclear, BPN RI's and Bali's DPRD's Commitment Questioned." KPA. N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2017.
<<http://www.kpa.or.id/news/blog/status-of-sumberklampok-land-in-bali-get-unclear-bpn-ri-and-balis-dprds-commitment-questioned/>>.

2. Peluso, N. L., Afiff, S., & Rachman, N. F. (2009). Claiming the Grounds for Reform: Agrarian and Environmental Movements in Indonesia. *Transnational Agrarian Movements Confronting Globalization*, 8, 377-407.
3. Gustave, R., & Hidayat, A. W. (2008, July). Sumberklampok Community Conserved Area— a declaration of community rights. Retrieved April 2, 2017, from <http://www.bing.com/cr?IG=977DE9C4F7954E098C73D24001A35F8F&CID=09D1CCF6FA2668300CDAC6AEFB1769C9&rd=1&h= IOxs5g0CstgOv1vG 7NgrGviVeSxDwvkeGklNvgLjc&v=1&r=http%3a%2f%2fcmsdata.iucn.org%2fdownloads%2fsumberklampok%20bali%20report%20icca%20grassroots%20discussions.pdf&p=DevEx,5061.1>
4. A., & A. (n.d.). Agrarian Reform Consortium. Retrieved April 02, 2017, from <http://www.kpa.or.id/news/en/>
5. Lucas, Anton, and Carol Warren. "The State, the People, and Their Mediators: The Struggle Over Agrarian Law Reform in Post-New Order Indonesia." *Indonesia* (2003): 87-126. JSTOR. Web. 9 Apr. 2017. <<http://jstor.org/stable/3351350>>.
6. Li, Tania Murray. "Masyarakat Adat, Difference, and the Limits of Recognition in Indonesia's Forest Zone." *Cambridge University Press* 35.3 (2001): 645-76. JSTOR. Web. 9 Apr. 2017. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/313184>>.
7. ANGOC. *Securing the Right to Land: An Overview on Access to Land in Indonesia*. 2nd ed. N.p.: n.p., 2012. Print.
8. Ni Made Indra Wati (personal communications)
9. I Gusti Ngurah Komang Karyadi (personal communications)
10. Istiyarto Ismu (personal communications)
11. I Putu Artana (personal communications) April 10th, 2017

12. Bapak Rahabit (personal communications) April 27th, 2017
13. Bapak Mah Jatim (personal communications) April 9th, 2017, April 13th, 2017
14. I Wayan Sawitra Yasa (personal communications) April 10th, 2017
15. Ketut Budi Astra (personal communications) April 9th, 2017
16. Bapak Rasik (personal communications) April 11th, 2017

