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Abstract

This contribution is the only one in the present volume that is not related to the NCCR North-South research programme. It was chosen for publication in People, Protected Areas and Global Change: Participatory Conservation in Latin America, Africa, Asia and Europe because of its specific theoretical and regional angle, which would otherwise be lacking in the collection of cases. Greg Acciaioli provides us with a vivid example of how local powerful stakeholders use the notion of being indigenous in a subtle way to accommodate state and NGO discourses and narratives, while at the same time trying to keep control over their land in the Lore Lindu National Park area, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. Acciaioli examines how the local To Lindu group is dealing strategically with the option of a park in their area, facing immigration from people from other regions in Sulawesi. Based on the knowledge that immigrant groups have to be integrated and that, at the same time, the government of Indonesia and NGOs have an interest in conservation, the To Lindu leaders use the ideology of nature in peril due to immigrant settlers. The indigenous leaders therefore engage in a participatory conservation discourse, fostering indigenous knowledge and indigenous institutions meant for application to conservation of the forest area. While showing that they have incorporated conservation issues, their main strategic interest is to control the amount of land used by the immigrant farming communities by benefiting politically from the PA setting in which they participate. Acciaioli uses this example to give a critical reading of Agrawal’s idea of “environmentality” (Agrawal 2005) as a form of local incorporation of conservation by government and NGOs, thus making an important theoretical contribution that reaches beyond this volume. (Tobias Haller, editor)
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11.1 Introduction

In his re-traversal of portions of Alfred Russel Wallace’s travels throughout the Malay Archipelago, one of the foci of Tim Severin’s (1997) attention was how well the rich biodiversity that Wallace had observed had been preserved in various parts of the region, as well as what mechanisms had been most efficacious in the conservation endeavour:

*Nearly one and a half centuries later we would visit those same places, look again at the environment, and see what had changed and what had not. On the basis of that evaluation we might also gain some insight into what was being done to protect and preserve those unique habitats, and whether those protective measures were effective. (Severin 1997, p 12)*

Severin summed up his impressions by noting that “traditional care for the environment” – customary regulation of the commons – seemed more effective at conservation than any modern protection policies, such as gazetting reserves (Severin 1997, p 255). Severin’s experiences and conclusions are neither unique nor novel. In fact, they echo the views put forth by many environmentalist and indigenous rights NGOs in Indonesia. However, others have disputed the ability of traditional systems of custom or adat, now reformulated and re-presented as community resource management systems, to conserve habitats in the face of increasing population pressure and the allure of extending land for cash crops, such as coffee, chocolate, vanilla and others, for the global market. In this regard, it is noteworthy that, despite his nostalgic respect for the operation of adat in preserving the environment of Kai Besar, “the most competent environmental protection” that Severin witnessed was that exercised by the NGO-sponsored rangers in the Tangkoko Nature Reserve in North Sulawesi (Severin 1997, p 260). However, it is important to note that his evaluation runs counter to the views of theorists like Arun Agrawal (2005), who in his exploration of what he labels “environmentality” stresses how government regulations foster a modern subjectivity of care for the environment by means of such participatory mechanisms as village forest councils.

What this essay seeks to explore is the formation of other sorts of cooperation around another protected area of Sulawesi, the Lore Lindu National Park (Taman Nasional Lore Lindu or TNL.L), specifically the politics surrounding the formation of conservation agreements in the region. By examining how
elements of traditional adat management, modern NGO management and the framework of governmentally mandated reserves and parks combine in realisations of park management, it also seeks in its conclusion to question and supplement the theoretical nexus of Agrawal’s model of the fostering of environmentality. Instead, it argues that overt “care for the environment” may be a secondary strategy rationalising the assertion of the prerogatives of categorical indigeneity, seeking dominance for one specific party within the continuing operation of conflicting agendas among the stakeholders involved.

11.2 National parks and the problem of accommodating local settlers

As the interests of the international lobby for better management of natural resources and the indigenous peoples’ movement (Clad 1988, p 322) have converged, there has been greater recognition since the 1970s that national parks and other reserves are unviable if surrounded by degraded lands or by inhabitants hostile to their existence who have long resided there and claim the warrant of indigeneity in the region. In recent decades, agencies such as the World Conservation Union (IUCN) have attempted to incorporate consideration of the rights of “indigenous” peoples to continue occupying traditional lands. In response, managers of national parks have sought in more recent years to formulate agreements of co-management, involving indigenous peoples in the areas of the parks in conservation arrangements and employing them as park rangers. In order to surmount problems of surrounding land degradation, park managers have fostered development projects and land use plans for peoples living in areas surrounding such parks and reserves to enhance the quality of their lands and thus prevent, or at least minimise, destructive inroads of such peoples into protected areas.

However, such efforts have tended to target almost exclusively peoples deemed “indigenous”, as defined by such bodies as the IUCN “Task Force on Traditional Lifestyles”:

*The ways of life (cultures) of indigenous people which have evolved locally and are based on sustainable use of local ecosystems; such lifestyles are often at subsistence levels of production and are seldom a part of the mainstream culture of their country, although they do contribute to its cultural wealth.* (Clad 1988, p 322)
Such endeavours have thus tended to neglect those peoples who do not meet this definition of indigeneity, even if living within or in the vicinity of national parks and reserves, when drawing up cooperative management arrangements, as their lifestyles have been viewed as based on unsustainable extraction rather than sustainable use. There has been lack of agreement even among those organisations urging cooperation with indigenous peoples. NGOs focused upon human rights have tended to argue that indigenous peoples’ practices constitute “sustainable use” regimes that serve as the best basis for preserving natural resources. These organisations urge the adoption of indigenous customary practices, represented as community-based resource management systems, as a sufficient basis to protect biodiversity. Others have countered that such practices cannot be considered a sufficient basis for conservation, since the presence of a limited population and the small scale of exploitation may have contributed more to environmental diversity. Population increases and contact with contemporary incentives to find sources of income for financing the material benefits of modernity would render such small-scale practices unsustainable. Such pressures render problematic the view that indigenous peoples will always wish to retain traditional technologies, settlement patterns and small-scale subsistence strategies; in addition, it would be unethical to institutionalise “enforced primitivism”, as the World Bank terms it in its rejection of such practices, among such peoples in the interest of nature conservation. Such enforcement would simply lead to the production of human zoos, as was unfortunately exemplified during World War II with the Japanese conversion of the island of Lan Yu into a private botanical/anthropological museum with access only to government officials and anthropologists up to 1945. Although the creation of multi-purpose conservation areas – as in the case of New Zealand’s “multiple use reserves” – has accommodated aspects of the former outlook, the latter outlook has also exercised considerable influence on the rise of a popular model of conservation, the “biosphere reserve”.

11.3 **TNC’s eco-region: implementing the biosphere reserve**

Using its own label “eco-region”, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) has emerged as one of the most active proponents of the biosphere reserve concept. Headquartered in Arlington, Virginia, it has entered into agreements of joint management of parks and reserves with the governments of countries throughout the world, especially in the South. TNC has worked with local partners, including indigenous peoples, in order to achieve the goal of “pro-
... at a time of great change and upheaval in Indonesia[n] society.

Gone are the rigid directives of central planning and in their place are the needs and aspirations of the Park’s diverse stakeholders. (TNC 2001, vol 1, p 2)
In contrast to earlier policies, the emphasis of TNC upon a collaborative management strategy with indigenous stakeholders has marked a tangible advance. However, recent confrontations with other local peoples around the park have raised questions concerning the consensus necessary to produce and sustain positive attitudes to the park on the part of all stakeholders. Harvesting of rattan and other forest products by spontaneous migrants, foremost among them Bugis from South Sulawesi, and the occupation of the core zone of parkland, known as Dongi-Dongi, by resettlers in the Palolo Valley who also claim rights as an "original ethnic group" in the region, have complicated previous contestations of authority confronting the park managers. In response, local NGOs have changed their support of contesting parties, shifting from an exclusive concern with the rights of "indigenous peoples" (masyarakat adat, literally "customary communities") to wider issues of agrarian social justice.

11.4 Re-orientations in resource contestations

NGO activism in Central Sulawesi in the 1990s concentrated upon supporting, and often catalysing, the claims of local "indigenous societies" to land and other resources. However, by the end of that decade these NGOs had changed their orientation in reaction to such conditions as the continuing failure of the Indonesian economy to recover after the regional economic crisis following the collapse of the Thai baht in 1997. One such re-orienting organisation is Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Sulawesi Tengah (AMASUTA), the provincial umbrella organisation established in the wake of the first national Indonesian Indigenous Peoples' Congress originally to facilitate organisation of the campaigns of "indigenous societies" in Central Sulawesi. According to its former secretary-general, AMASUTA is now focused upon more general problems of the economy concerning the capacity of farmers in general rather than just of the members of "customary societies". He now regards AMASUTA as an "organisation for the people" (organisasi rakyat) rather than just a forum for such local customary societies as the To Lindu, although much of the work in which it engages tends still to be in the area of facilitating the formation of "customary councils" for peoples considered to be "indigenous".

11.4.1 Indigenous and "non-indigenous" peoples

However, the wider scope of concern of such NGOs is revealed in such cases as Dongi-Dongi, on the northeastern boundary of TNLL (Figure 1). This
controversy is distinguished from previous controversies involving peoples like the To Behoa Kakau of Katu (Sangaji 2002b) by the “non-indigenous” status of the occupiers of Dongi-Dongi. These occupiers have shifted from the four villages of Kadidia, Rahmat, Kamarora A and Kamarora B, located further to the northwest of the Dongi-Dongi site of occupation, off the road leading through the Palolo upland plain down to Biromaru in the Palu Valley.
near the northern boundary of TNLL. As the designations A and B betray for two of them, these are not long-settled villages; rather they have been constructed for settlers from various mountain ranges surrounding the Palu Valley, including Topo Da’ a from the Pakawa region in Marawola subdistrict, as well as To Winatu and To Pipikoro from what has just been declared a new subdistrict, Pipikoro, formerly comprising the southernmost region of Kulawi subdistrict. These peoples were moved to Palolo as part of the programme for the Resettlement of “Isolated Peoples” (Pemukiman Kembali Masyarakat Terasing or PKMT), where a remote or “isolated people” is officially defined as a “people or a group of people whose habitats/residences are located 24 hours or more in travelling time from a provincial capital city measured by using public transportation” (Depagri 1992). Following the tradition of Dutch programmes to move montane peoples – including the To Lindu now resident in the Lindu upland plain, but formerly inhabiting the foothills surrounding this plain – in the first decades of the 20th century, this programme began in independent Indonesia in the 1950s, but only intensified in the 1970s under the direction of the Department of Social Affairs (Departemen Sosial or Depsos) after the imposition of the New Order (Haba 1999). In this period the majority of these municipal villages (desa) in the Palolo upland plain, formerly an area under the control of Biromaru but now a subdistrict on its own, were populated under the directives of PKMT.

Given their transposition from their homelands by this programme, such resettlers would have difficulty being classified as indigenous people with respect to the locale of their resettlement according to the criteria for Indonesian “indigenous peoples” (masyarakat adat, literally “customary communities”) declared as a working definition by the Network for the Defence of Customary Societies in 1993:

... social groups that have ancestral origins (which have persisted for generations) in a specific geographical region, along with possessing a value system, ideology, economy, politics, culture, society and territory of their own... (KMAN 1999)

The land they are now occupying in Dongi-Dongi cannot be considered as their long-held customary land, thus denying them the basis claimed by other groups for continuing control of land in and around TNLL (Sangaji 2001). In fact, they justify their occupation in part on other grounds, noting that although this land is now part of TNLL, it was formerly part of the logging concession of PT Kebun Sari, a joint venture with a Japanese logging
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Kebun Sari had entered the concession land after the company vacated it, in order to plant coffee and chocolate; some had actually established gar-

to the customary land tenure systems of the societies of highland western Central Sulawesi (Sangaji et al 2004, p 60). The replacement land they had been promised by the government in return for abandoning gardens that were included within the boundaries of national parkland had never been granted to them (Li 2007, pp 149-191).

11.4.2 Claiming non-indigenous rights, and local reactions

NGOs in Palu, such as Yayasan Tanah Merdeka (The Foundation for Free Land, or YTM) and Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia Sulteng (Friends of the Earth Indonesia, Central Sulawesi Branch, or WALHI Sulteng), have also been facilitating the formation and activities of the Free Farmers’ Forum (Forum Petani Merdeka or FPM) to fight for the settlers’ claims to the Dongi-Dongi area. As the very name of that forum suggests, NGO support is no longer based on claims of the rights of masyarakat adat to their indigenous land, but on the politico-economic implications for impoverished farmers of government development programmes, such as the granting of forest concessions to outside firms and the forced resettlement of members of “isolated societies”. FPM’s demand that Dongi-Dongi be granted enclave status to parallel that accorded to such “customary societies” as the To Lindu and To Katu thus has a very different basis than earlier contestations (Abbas et al 2002).
To date the settlers’ claims have gained little sympathy from either the government or the TNLL park managers, although some officials from the Department of Forestry and from the provincial government, which nominally has no authority in national park areas, have endorsed their claims. The Governor of Central Sulawesi issued an order for Dongi-Dongi to be vacated on 18 August 2001, while, not to be outdone, the Bupati of Donggala Regency gave the police three days to empty Dongi-Dongi of any “squatters”, another order which failed in implementation. The park director also requested a police investigation of another Palu-based NGO working with the Free Farmers’ Forum, the People’s Legal Aid Society. Both TNC officials and the TNLL director expressed their strong opposition to any granting of enclave status to Dongi-Dongi during interviews I conducted in June 2002. They stressed the lack of any real settlement in the Dongi-Dongi area and condemned the unregulated cutting down of the forest by occupants, including Bugis chain-saw operators who had followed the original Da’a and Pipikoro occupants from the resettlement villages in Palolo. Yet, in order to further their claims to permanent occupation, the settlers themselves had accorded their burgeoning community the traditional name Ngata Katupua (Settlement of Hope or Tanah Harapam) and allocated land among themselves in blocks corresponding to each of the four villages in Palolo providing occupants. Nevertheless, the park management and its partner TNC have continued to reject this settlement, leading the director of one opposing NGO to label the park co-managers as embarking on a programme of “eco-fascism” (Sangaji 2002a, p 16).

11.4.3 Questioning the concept of conservation

As a result both of prior controversies and of the continuing deadlock regarding Dongi-Dongi, local NGO advocates have questioned the Western concept of conservation that they regard as the basis of such institutions as national parks. They regard national parks and similar preserves as continuing the same tendencies as development projects that have deprived customary societies of their land and rights. Instead, they see as real conservation the indigenous systems of land use that have maintained a balance with forest environments throughout the centuries preceding government impositions upon their lands by means of transmigration, the granting of concessions for logging, plantations and other development projects (Sangaji 2001, p 14; 2002a, p 16). According to the director of the Central Sulawesi WALHI office, national parks, such as TNLL, are historically from the West; they are not consistent with the divergent pattern of historical growth in Indonesia
and similar countries. Compared to the New Order’s history of granting logging concessions in national parks and reserves throughout Indonesia, it was unjust to consider the cutting down of trees by people like the Dongi-Dongi occupants as illegal. Such an accusation was another instance of blaming or “scapegoating” local societies rather than the urban entrepreneurs underwriting the logging in the area.

Advocates from local NGOs such as YTM and WALHI Sulteng regard controversies like the one surrounding Dongi-Dongi not strictly as an issue of conservation, but of agrarian social justice, since they witness only the “small people” (i.e. local villagers) being blamed for deforestation and other transgressions. According to these advocates, authority to monitor resource use must be given to local societies, as they are the ones whose systems of forest use have never been sufficiently valued, despite centuries of sustainable use before the destructive impact of development projects. Human occupation and preservation of environment are not incompatible in the view of these NGO advocates, as long as that occupation is based upon traditional modes of land management, even when practised by people no longer resident in their own customary territory, such as the settlers of Dongi-Dongi.

11.5 Emergent forms of co-management: the evolution of conservation agreements

Although still viewing such arguments for the sufficiency of sustainable use on customary grounds as insufficient to carry through the project of sustaining biodiversity, such transnational conservation organisations as TNC, along with the Indonesian government, have introduced measures to increase the commitment of surrounding stakeholders to the conservation regulations of parks such as TNLL. They have particularly sought to foster local commitment to their model of zonation, requiring strict exclusion from core zones (zona inti), limited exploitation of materials in forest zones (zona rimba), and limited production in use zones (zona pemanfaatan). New forms of co-management agreements with local society members have sought to involve a greater number of inhabitants than only the indigenous peoples included in earlier overtures. Understanding the import of such measures requires a brief overview of the history of such agreements in the region.

Numerous NGOs of different type and scale have been involved in the setting up of conservation agreements in the region of TNLL, and each has
taken a different approach. One of the very first was the Palu-based NGO YTM, which brokered a conservation agreement between the Katu society and the TNLL management as part of the granting of enclave status to the Katu people, allowing them to maintain their stable swidden regimen within the boundaries of TNLL (Mappatoba and Birner 2004, p 26; Sangaji 2002b). Following that model, YTM has also facilitated conservation agreements with two other villages bordering the park, and in each case the emphasis was upon the recognition of indigenous rights with regard to land and other resources in return for the community carrying out such activities as patrolling for rattan theft from parkland.

In contrast, a second organisation facilitating such agreements is CARE, the North-American-based international relief and development organisation. In contrast to YTM’s focus, CARE’s emphasis has been upon the advancement of rural development, including agricultural extension and infrastructure provision. In the agreements brokered by CARE, regulations pertaining to conservation practices were drawn up only as part of establishing a general set of procedural rules for the village concerned as a prerequisite for the provision of development services facilitated by CARE. Given this focus on community development, CARE has tended to work with formal village governments, village heads and administrative staff, rather than following YTM’s practice of dealing primarily with members of customary institutions, such as the customary councils (lembaga adat). However, after having overseen about a dozen such agreements, CARE ceased to be involved in such transactions, instead providing funds to a Palu-based sister organisation, Yayasan Yambata, which began the process of overseeing contracts in five villages where the protection of the maleo bird and its eggs constituted a major challenge. In contrast to CARE’s focus, Yambata has followed lines more similar to YTM’s in focusing upon customary institutions to oversee such contracts (Mappatoba and Birner 2004).

11.5.1 Refocusing on indigenous rights: the CSIADCP

More recent have been the efforts of the Central Sulawesi Integrated Area Development and Conservation Project (CSIADCP), a long-term plan of rural development and conservation initiatives funded by the Asian Development Bank, to oversee the drawing up of such agreements. Initially, under conditions set by the Asian Development Bank, CSIADCP had supported plans to resettle indigenous groups like the Katu out of conservation areas, but after the park director’s according of enclave status to the Katu com-
munity (Sangaji 2002b) it was forced to re-orient its policies. Soon after the turn of the millennium, CSIADCP began a process of arranging conservation agreements with sixty villages in the vicinity of TNLL, though most of those agreements were not formalised until May 2004. And despite the lengthy development period, CSIADCP officials admit that these agreements constitute only an “entry point”, having been based only on consultations and workshops of one day’s length in each village. The agreements have a standard title – “Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat Adat Desa X Kecamatan A” (“Conservation Agreement of the Customary Village X in Subdistrict A”) – and follow a standard format. These agreements first list the laws and regulations that form their legal basis, then proceed to declare their aims – which in many instances are oriented primarily to ensuring the free flow of watercourses and continuous provisioning of freshwater. They also record the contracting parties – members of the customary community (masyarakat adat), customary functionaries (tokoh adat), religious functionaries (e.g. Salvation Army officials), social functionaries (including the governmental apparatus) – with perhaps a map attached showing the location of the village relative to TNLL. Only then are the specific contents of the agreement given, usually merely restating, in slightly greater detail, the aims declared earlier. The agreements end with a list of the signatories. For example, the contents of the specific agreement with the customary community of Pilimakujuwa in Kulawi subdistrict are given as follows:

III The Content of the Agreement:

A. To maintain the conservation of the ecosystem of the river basin area and not to cut trees in the vicinity of the water intake or the rivers’ flood plains;
B. To maintain and raise the level of sanitation near sources of clean water in the vicinity of the intake so that there does not occur any contamination of the clean water;
C. To put into effect customary sanctions against transgressions;
D. This conservation agreement is made by the people of the village in their respective capacities and is signed by a representative of adat functionaries, social functionaries, religious functionaries, a youth representative, a women’s representative, the head of the village customary council, the head of the village representative body (BPD).
What is most apparent from such an example, besides the conservation focus on water quality issues, is the social focus on local “indigenous peoples”. This focus aligns these agreements with those facilitated by YTM and Yam-bata, all of which presume a relative homogeneity of the contracting community and the continuing authority of the adat council as adjudicator of transgressions. Yet, such a presumption is precisely what has been called into question by the Dongi-Dongi controversy and similar contestations of park authority where settlers in the region surrounding the park have been the primary agents in transgressing park regulations.

11.5.2 A different approach: The Nature Conservancy

Building upon earlier agreements, TNC has developed a different strategy in drawing up its conservation agreements with communities surrounding and within TNLL. Beginning at roughly the same time as CSIADCP’s efforts, as of 2004 TNC has managed to initiate fourteen conservation agreements, though only five of them have been completed and approved by the TNLL management office (Mappatoba and Birner 2004, p 18). These first agreements were negotiated in Lore Utara on the eastern side of the park, and have already been the subject of review (Khaeruddin 2002). I focus here on a more recent (i.e. March 2005) agreement entered into with the four villages of the Lindu plain, whose surrounding lands constitute an enclave within TNLL (Desa Puroo, Langko, Tomado dan Anca 2005 Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat Dataran Lindu, Kecamatan Kulawi, Kabupaten Donggala [hereafter “Lindu Conservation Agreement”], unpublished). As Mappatoba and Birner (2004, p 28) have noted, TNC has taken a very different track from other organisations facilitating such agreements. While still working with both customary functionaries and administrative village officials, TNC has created new village organisations to deal with the issue of local-level monitoring and enforcement of conservation regulations, especially the opening beyond enclave boundaries of gardens for coffee, chocolate and other cash crops, as well as harvesting of forest products – not only timber, but also non-timber products such as rattan. Yet there have been transitions in its orientation as well, as it has shifted from a position of broker-
ing between communities and other organisations and projects providing development services and infrastructure for community development in the periphery of the park, insisting on commitment to observing conservation rules in exchange for provision of such services as drinking water and marketing assistance for organically grown coffee. More recently, in accordance with its interpretation of Forest Act No. 41/1999 on community participation in forestry, it has made TNLL management recognition of customary rights, including accessing products from customary land (tanah adat) now forming part of the national park, contingent upon community enforcement of park regulations.

11.5.3 The conservation agreement for the Lindu plain

While similar in its basic format to the agreements transacted earlier by CSIADCP, the Lindu Conservation Agreement, signed only in 2005, is a more sophisticated document of greater range. It begins with a more theoretical opening section that succinctly sets forth the interdependence of all living beings as the basis of biodiversity conservation, positioning humanity as a dependent link in the great chain of life (Lindu Conservation Agreement, p 1). While asserting the necessity of national parks as a measure to combat the increasing rate of extinctions in this chain, the agreement admits that the unilateral action of determining park boundaries without consultation has not only disadvantaged local inhabitants, but also led to the failure of conservation programmes. It acknowledges the prior existence of “customary land / communal use / and living space for the societies of the area who have resided there continuously, long before the existence of the national park” (Lindu Conservation Agreement, p 1; see Laudjeng 1994). However, it also asserts the need to balance recognition of customary rights with the preservation of biodiversity in a manner acceptable to all parties to the agreement, in order to promote sustainability. The fundamental project of the agreement thus requires balancing respect for the rights of the societies in the vicinity of the park with the control and management of natural resources.

The actual chapters of the agreement seek to balance the acknowledgement of customary institutions, such as the adat councils of the enclave’s four villages, as well as the council operating for the entire Lindu plain, with the assertion of the authority of the national park institutions. While maintaining the necessity of zonation, the agreement proclaims its commitment to a “participatory management planning” process, opening up the possibility of subsequent determination of boundaries of zones on a participatory basis that relies on both ecological and social factors.
However, the most distinctive aspect of the agreement with regard to participation is how it specifies the institutions for carrying out the agreement’s aims. Even in its early specification of discussions contributing to the formation of the agreement, the agreement did not differentiate between the *adat* councils of Anca, Langko and Tomado, villages whose populations are all dominated by indigenous To Lindu, on the one hand, and the *adat* council of Puroo, which is exclusively made up of settlers from more mountainous regions elsewhere in Kulawi and Pipikoro subdistricts, on the other hand. Whereas YTM, Yaphama and CSI/ADCP focused in their agreements only on the indigenous groups long resident in the area, TNC’s agreement encompasses settlers as well. This inclusiveness is even more evident in the specification of the “village conservation councils” (*lembaga konservasi desa* or LKD) in Chapter 6, §21 and §22, of the agreement. The LKD are labelled as “the institutions that represent society in conservation efforts in TNLL at the village level”. They are designed to provide an umbrella for communication and the implementation of participatory park management planning.

The village conservation councils are formed “on the basis of the Decision of the Village Head in accordance with the results of village consultations that have been attended by the Park Management of Lore Lindu National Park, the Village Government, the Village Representative Body, the Adat Council and other members of society” (*Lindu Conservation Agreement, p 7).* However, as in earlier agreements, the *adat* councils of the enclave are charged with adjudicating transgressions of park regulations and deciding upon punishments in the presence of park management staff, the village government apparatus, the “village representative body” (BPD) and the LKD. These punishments are specified in the traditional idiom of fines requiring payment of water buffalo, brass plates and traditional *ikat* cloths, though usually actually paid by means of a cash equivalent. Disputes among village members that are related to the conservation agreement are also to be settled by the customary councils. In the final paragraph devoted to “miscellaneous matters”, the aim of the agreement is clearly stated as constituting an endeavour to “obtain acknowledgement of its [the local society’s] management of natural resources in the customary territory that is located within the region of the Lore Lindu National Park” (*Lindu Conservation Agreement, p 8*) – a bold statement, at least on paper, that the notion of customary territory is to be respected. The imposition of the national park thus does not entirely supersede the local conceptualisation of customary territory.
11.5.4 Subverting the village conservation councils in operation

Like earlier conservation agreements for TNLL, the Lindu agreement still relies on the customary mechanisms of the local indigenous people in the judicial function exercised by adat councils of passing judgement upon transgressors of park regulations. However, this agreement is distinguished from earlier agreements by its potential encompassment of all ethnic groups within the Lindu plain with regard to the executive function of conservation enforcement. It is thus both located within and beyond the framework of indigenous custom. This dual positioning entails certain contradictions, which also characterise the operation of the village conservation councils as the main local agents of monitoring and enforcing compliance with the conservation regulations of the park. According to the terms of the conservation agreement, recruitment to the LKD is open to members of all ethnic groups in the plain. Indeed, the Puroo village conservation council is composed of Kulawi settlers, while representatives from migrant groups in Kanawu—a hamlet of the village of Tomado on the eastern side of Lake Lindu, the population of which is largely composed of Bugis settlers from South Sulawesi, Pipikoro resettlees (local transmigrants) from the mountainous regions of neighbouring Pipikoro subdistrict, as well as, more recently, Toraja farmers from the northern highlands of South Sulawesi—also may belong to the Tomado LKD. Yet, indigenous To Lindu members constitute the majority of LKD membership. Many of these To Lindu LKD representatives are also members of the adat councils in the Lindu plain, which are composed exclusively of indigenous To Lindu aristocrats. While promoting the LKD as an organisation to uphold conservation regulations for the whole Lindu enclave, as prescribed by park directives, these LKD members also use it as a vehicle to declare their precedential rights to land and resources as indigenous To Lindu in the Lindu plain, which they regard as their ancestral territory.

11.5.5 Local environmental governance: the village conservation councils

The contradictions in their representative functions have already become evident in the activities of the village conservation councils. The Lindu LKD were actually in operation before the formal signing of the Lindu Conservation Agreement on 30 March 2005. They undertook their initial activity as a group in early 2004, when LKD members from all four Lindu villages were escorted by TNC staff to visit the areas of the Palolo plain devastated
by massive floods in December 2003, which TNC claimed were a result of the widespread felling of trees by the occupiers in the Dongi-Dongi region. Motivated by witnessing the devastation following the transgression of conservation regulations, representatives of the LKD of three of the four Lindu villages (there was no representation from Anca, for external reasons) proceeded in the company of a TNC representative, a park ranger and the village secretary of Tomado to this village’s hamlet of Kanawu, on the eastern shore of the lake, in order to investigate reported incursions into national parkland beyond the boundaries of the Lindu enclave, especially by the Toraja settlers, but also by the longer-term Pipikoro residents and others in the two most remote sub-hamlets of Kanawu. The team’s activities began on the evening of 17 May 2004, as LKD team members met with selected representatives from Kanawu, setting out the motivations of the stay and planning the survey of the regions of encroachment in parkland the next day. The following morning, team members embarked on the survey to the sub-hamlet of Sangali and various gardens in parkland above the Lombosa River. The establishment of these gardens higher on the slopes outside the enclave had been blamed for the heightened flooding of the river and the shortage of water in the dry season for the wet rice fields, which had long been established by Bugis migrants and indigenous Lindu farmers in the lower reaches of Kanawu, extending down to near the shore of Lake Lindu (Figure 2). The team’s visit ended with a public meeting on the evening of that second day, 18 May 2004, at which the purpose and results of the day’s survey were announced and the possibility of sanctions against those whose gardens encroached on national parkland was discussed.

The ways in which the need to deal with such transgressions was framed by various team members emphasised an overt convergence of interests among all the inhabitants of the Lindu plain with the aim of constructing a unified constituency. However, in their speeches the indigenous To Lindu members of the LKD, who also belonged to the adat councils of the plain, covertly asserted a claim to precedence-based control over land and other resources. In his opening presentation to the assembled villagers of Kanawu on the second night of the LKD’s survey, the TNC facilitator focused on the imperative to ensure the “sustainability” of the natural resources of the Lindu plain, as well as the role of the LKD in their management, as he had emphasised earlier in the day in his exhortations to transgressing farmers. Emphasising the enclave’s development potential, he noted the need for assuring a constant water supply to realise this potential, explaining how this supply depended crucially on the preservation of the surrounding forest. Shortly
after this opening, the government representative – the Tomado village secretary – gave his support to this position, emphasising the need to carry out all agricultural activities in an "environmentally friendly" manner.

Several speakers emphasised the policing function of the LKD within the overall management strategy, often in the context of preserving the environment for the sake of future generations:

We are looking out for the coming generation. We want to preserve, to conserve this environment for the coming generation, so that our coming generations will not revile us, will not blame us... Where else can we go? (Transcript of the speech of an LKD member, 18 May 2004, translation by the author)

Such general consideration of the importance of the local society conserving the environment provided the constant refrain interspersed among the more specific discussions of the need for a coordinator of the separate village conservation councils of the four villages, for clear procedures to deal with encroachments on parkland, and other practical matters (Figure 3).

However, after being introduced as a prominent member of the adat council of Langko, the head of the LKD from this village began to reveal the inser-
tion of another agenda. Using the example of how the devastation in Dongi-Dongi exemplified the fate of those who opposed government regulations, he argued strongly that Kanawu should not be formalised as a separate administrative village (desa) — long a project of the Bugis settlers there, with considerable support from some Pipikoro local transmigrants, seeking freedom from the authority of the adat council in Tomado. Kanawu should be retained within Tomado administrative village so as to guard more effectively against illegal migrants, some of whom might be seeking refuge from the environmental ruin in Palolo. In making this appeal, he was quick to label in Indonesian all those present as Lindu people (orang Lindu), “because we are all, because Lindu, we all possess Lindu, not just the [indigenous] To Lindu, but all people at Lindu, we possess this all, because we have all lived here…” (transcript of the speech by the To Lindu LKD member, 18 May 2008, translation by the author). Yet, despite this appeal to the unity of all inhabitants at Lindu, his agenda of maintaining the dominant position of the indigenous To Lindu in the conservation project ran as a subtext throughout his speech. For example, while overtly in agreement with the assertion by the TNC facilitator of the need to align the indigenous Lindu customary “zoning” according to suaka with the national park zonation scheme, the head of the Langko LKD also developed this point in a direction that emphasised the prior (i.e. precedential) rights of the indigenous To Lindu to this territory:
So, my thoughts concerning the customs of my ancestors, this is all adat lands. If I speak, I have ancestors who lived here in this Olu, for Olu is its name, not Kanawu or anything else, but Olu. So, if I recite the names of all these settlements, I know them all proceeding to Kangkuro, Salumpalili, Tumawu, Tawaiki, Salu Suo, Bonbaria, Boya, Lewonu, Sangali, Tae Lampangga, Tae Ropo. I know them all, because of what? Because my ancestors from time immemorial have lived here, my ancestors from time immemorial have sacrificed to extinction their livestock, because of this plain. But now the regulations are different. Gentlemen, my brothers and sisters who have come here, now we no longer think of only ourselves, we think of all of you, Bugis fathers, Toraja fathers, Kantewu fathers, we speak of all of you as Lindu people. And now once we speak of Lindu people in general, then how should we orient our thoughts to preserving this environment, how do we orient our thoughts so that we are all the same, all of us have approximately the same land, so that none of us inhabitants has too much land, that is my proposal... (Transcript of the speech by the To Lindu L.K.D member, 18 May 2004, translation by the author)

In this passage, the To Lindu elder begins by asserting his prior rights (and, by extension, those of all indigenous To Lindu) to the land, since his ancestors had sacrificed the blood of their livestock upon it (later in the speech he also alluded to these sacrifices as an indigenous To Lindu conservation measure to prevent the effects of overgrazing). By reciting the original – the real – names of all the customary territories on the eastern side of the lake, he stakes a claim to precedential custodianship of this land as a commons whose use is to be regulated by the To Lindu adat councils. Even his declared acceptance of all those now settled in the Lindu plain, indigenous and migrant, as equally Lindu people is then used to reiterate the demand of the indigenous adat council of the Lindu plain that no inhabitant of Lindu may cultivate more than 2 hectares of land, a measure aimed squarely at the Bugis and Kulawi settlers, some of whom had opened 12 hectares or more, if all their plots devoted to coffee, chocolate and other cash crops were counted (Acciaioli 2001). So, even in his assertion of the contemporary equality of all Lindu inhabitants, echoing what has been proclaimed by the TNC facilitator, this To Lindu elder advances the indigenous cause of ensuring customary control of land as a regulated commons by the indigenous To Lindu adat councils. By further connecting erosion as a punishment from God with the exceeding of the cultivation limit declared by the adat council, he also
manages to supply a religious warrant to the environmental wisdom he has constructed for the indigenous customary council and the To Lindu noble ancestors: "Thus, those people of former times may not have gone to school, but they understood, and they had been given indications by the Lord so that they acted in a way to preserve Lindu." (Transcript of the speech by the To Lindu LKD member, 18 May 2004, translation by the author)

A meeting of the provincial-level indigenous people’s organisation, AMASUTA, whose secretary-general’s views were discussed above, held in the village of Langko some three months later to discuss the problems faced by indigenous people in the Lindu plain, revealed even more clearly the connection of such assertions to the To Lindu agenda of seeking to use the LKD to further their own ethnic group’s interests (Figure 4). At that meeting many of the same To Lindu individuals who had spoken in the role of representing the LKD in Kanawu chose to speak instead in their role as To Lindu elders. Much of the discussion at this meeting emphasised the necessity for the To Lindu adat councils, as the official representative bodies of the indigenous people of the Lindu plain, to retain control of such subsistence activities as fishing in the lake by members of all ethnic groups resident in the plain. While considerable discussion did focus upon the problems of deciding upon the respective domains of the various adat councils of the Lindu villages, the ultimate authority within the Lindu plain of this type of institution to regulate use of resources in the plain as a customary commons was asserted as being unquestionable. Of utmost importance was the need to enforce the adat stipulation of limiting each person’s land to 2 hectares. The same To Lindu elder who had spoken at length in Kanawu as the head of the Langko LKD emphasised how the national park had appropriated customary land within park boundaries, and openly speculated whether such land was not better managed by traditional means rather than by TNLL. Another participant went even further to assert that perhaps the best solution to problems encountered with the TNLL management office was simply to reclaim all the parkland as its customary owners. Even the head of the Langko adat council suggested that, if necessary for the council’s continued functioning, the national parkland should just be reclaimed. Whereas the village conservation councils were too limited by the restrictions imposed by the park management office, the To Lindu adat councils might be freer to act with determination in preserving the local environment without them. Hence, when discussing the empowerment of their own indigenous institutions, the commitment that To Lindu elders had shown for the TNC-organised village conservation councils seemed rather to evaporate, revealing an enduring
preference for the adat councils as the vehicle for regulating the resource commons at Lindu as opposed to the modern regulations of a national park.

11.6 Conclusion: re-evaluating environmentality

The contestations over land and other resources in the Lore Lindu National Park (TNLL) reveal many of the problems associated with resource control in multi-ethnic regions where protected areas have been imposed. Early conservation agreements signed by park officials and representatives of villagers living along the park’s boundaries focused upon indigenous peoples living in the region, including those brokered by YTM, Yayasan Yambata and CSIADEC, as well as the early agreements of TNC with the communities (To Pekurehua) of Lore Utara (Khaeruddin 2002). Non-indigenous local peoples have been subjected to very different treatment: the To Rampi migrants of Dodolo village, which had been encompassed within the park boundaries, were forced to resettle, while the To Katu, with a much stronger claim to indigeneity as an offshoot of the To Behoa, who had already been granted an enclave, resisted such efforts and were eventually granted their own enclave status (Sangaji 2002b; Sangaji et al. 2004). The Dongi-Dongi case highlights even more clearly many of the ambiguities regarding the treatment of peoples living in and around national parks. The resettlers of Dongi-
Dongi, long resident in the Palolo Valley adjacent to TNLL, but originally from the upland regions of Marawola and southern Kulawi (now Pipikoro), have perhaps even less claim to indigenous status in the park region than the inhabitants of Dodolo. Yet NGOs that had earlier oriented themselves more exclusively to the rights of the indigenous peoples in the region have supported their occupation of parkland. In response to the failure of the Dongi-Dongi occupants to gain enclave status from the park authorities for their settlement, their strongest NGO supporters, WALHI Sulteng and YTM, have publicly questioned the entire project of national park imposition as a colonial enterprise, echoing the critique of Western models of conservation as continuing colonialism (Stevens 1997, p 24). They have called for a moratorium on TNLL and, by extension, of national parks in Indonesia in general. The director of YTM has called for the repeal of TNLL as a protected area so that the traditional claims of both the “authentic societies” (i.e. indigenous peoples) and the other peoples that inhabited the region prior to the imposition of the national park can be duly recognised. In his view, only after such official acknowledgement has been extended should a roundtable meeting be held, involving all stakeholders, to discuss an appropriate policy of community-based area management.

The Dongi-Dongi incident is not simply another instance where indigenous interests need to be accommodated by appropriate agreements stressing participatory management of a national park. It represents instead a clash of two conflicting conservation ideologies. TNC and its government partners have acknowledged the need for consultation and negotiations over appropriate management with indigenous (and, more recently, other local) stakeholders, but they remain committed to a biosphere model of biodiversity conservation that demands that some areas be maintained as core zones completely protected from human use. In contrast, such local NGOs as YTM and WALHI Sulteng are committed to a model of “sustainable use”. They argue for the adequacy of local community-based resource management for all conservation purposes and regard the protected areas as a colonial imposition, a miscarriage of agrarian social justice that reproduces the poverty of local farmers, both indigenes and settlers. Despite past accommodations of indigenous interests through such strategies as conservation agreements and declaration of enclave areas, the present impasse precipitated by the resettlers’ occupation of Dongi-Dongi presents a different type of scenario that challenges the adequacy of the conjunction of conservation ideology with indigenous interests that has previously supported the park’s existence.
Yet, TNC has more recently attempted to initiate measures that can begin to accommodate the non-indigenous interests so salient in the Dongi-Dongi case. While still privileging indigenous interests in the allocation of judicial functions to indigenous adat councils, the conservation agreement TNC has brokered for the Lindu plain does attempt also to accommodate the interests of non-indigenous settlers through the formation of village conservation councils (LKD), whose membership is recruited from all the peoples settled in the enclave. Yet, although Bugis, Pipikoro and Kulawi settlers work together with indigenous To Lindu representatives on these councils, the indigenous representatives still feel conflicted. They accept the wider ambit of participation in the conservation project and the acknowledgement of settler rights of habitation it implies, but also manoeuvre to advance the agenda of according precedence to their own indigenous rights in the rationales they invoke to justify their pre-eminent position in the multi-ethnic project of conservation.

11.6.1 Challenging environmentality

Analysing the use of the village conservation councils by the indigenous To Lindu members to advance their agenda of reasserting control over all the migrant ethnic groups in the Lindu plain provides a potential challenge to Arun Agrawal’s (2005) theory of environmentality. Agrawal’s own analysis emphasises how local participation by Kumaon villagers in the village forest councils imposed by the Indian state constructs a new subjectivity, a nascent orientation of concern for the environment. What he labels “practice”, the theoretical term in his model covering various sorts of participation in forest councils and monitoring of forests to ensure compliance with council-endorsed regulations, is the crucial factor that leads to change in subjectivity. Innovative social action precedes transformation of belief. Although local villagers may feel at first compelled to participate in state-mandated councils, eventually through participation in village forest councils – a medium of “intimate government” – they begin to espouse the cause underlying this governmental regulatory strategy of council creation: concern for forest conservation. Agrawal accords the label “environmentality” to this process of forming a new subjectivity in line with government aims through regulated participation. The very morphology of the term, with its “-ity” suffix, reveals its genealogy from Foucault’s conceptualisation of “governmentality”, a source which Agrawal himself acknowledges. Environmentality is that form of governmentality that constructs concern for the environment. In accordance with this Foucauldian model, village forest councils operate as
both a “technology of power”, imposed through the institutions of governmentality, and a “technology of self”, effecting a transformation of subjectivity. In Agrawal’s conceptualisation the practice of participation is a more important factor in accounting for villagers’ emergent attitude of care for the environment than any ascriptive constituent — gender, caste, etc.

Agrawal views the formation of villagers’ subjectivity as an internalisation of the orientations and constraints of a disciplinary regime originating from outside (i.e. governmental regulations) yet mediated through participatory practice. However, although he invokes the term “practice”, his Foucauldian model leaves little room for the exercise of agency on the part of villagers, as most versions of practice theory would demand. The state, as the ultimate manipulator of subjectivity, achieves its aim of constructing environmental concern through institutionalising intimate government, specifically the imposition of forest councils whose aims villagers eventually internalise through their very participation in these institutions. A Foucauldian model leaves little room for the choice of villagers to participate in councils on the basis of other interests, that is, as strategising agents rather than only as subjects. Announced concern for the environment may be an instance of what Bourdieu calls a “second order strategy” (Bourdieu 1977, pp 42ff.), an official pronouncement that makes action that may derive from quite other, “first-order strategies” appear as mere compliance with a valued norm or prescription (e.g. parents in the Kabyle region of North Africa choosing a particular spouse for their child in accordance with a “rule” of prescriptive patrilateral parallel-cousin marriage, although the wealth of that spouse’s father and thus the dowry to be bestowed may be a more weighty “first-order” factor in assessing marriage prospects (Bourdieu 1990, pp 162-166).

11.6.2 Aiming to control settlers: environmentality as strategic action

In fact, the participation of indigenous To Lindu elders in the village conservation councils (LKD) established by the Lindu Conservation Agreement brokered by TNC in cooperation with the government management authority can be fruitfully interpreted in just such terms. The pronouncements of To Lindu elders when in meetings convened by the village conservation councils reveal great care for the environment, an environmentalist subjectivity that, at the very least, was not as publicly evident prior to the formation of these councils. However, these utterances require contextualisation with regard to the concrete proposals these To Lindu elders put forth as members
sitions of government, the internalisation of subjectivity is a more subjective side of the decision making process, etc.

The context of internalisation of the indigenous system of village governance – a system originating from adat, the traditional customary law of part of villagers, is a central theme in environmentalism literature, specifically the idea that villagers should not only individually internalise the principles of adat, but also collectively in councils on a more collective level, rather than only individual ascription as an instance of partiality (see Lamelas 1977, pp. 42ff), an argument that originates from quite other, non-perspectival, non-indigenous, non-valued norm or group thought. However, the idea of choosing a different role, a different “spouse” of prescriptive and descriptive “spouse” of that spouse’s perspective, as a more weighty “first-spouse” (see Lamelas 1977, pp. 162-166).

Subjectivity as "Contextualisation"

The village conservation management agreement and management authorisations were announcements of the village conservation council's commitment to the formation of a commons, contextualisation with the government as members of the adat councils – limitation of land cultivation by all inhabitants of the Lindu plain to 2 hectares (to be enforced by the indigenous Lindu adat councils), continuing incorporation of migrant-populated hamlets within To Lindu-dominated administrative villages, recasting of all previous land transactions considered by their new settler owners as instances of buying land as only temporary grants of use rights, even when settlers have obtained official certificates of land ownership from the government land board, etc. (Acciaioli 2001, 2002).

Such contextualisation reveals that To Lindu use of the idiom of environmentalist concern and enduring stewardship under the aegis of their indigenous local custom (adat) may operate as a second-order strategy by which they justify and officialise their attempts to re-assert and maintain control of the migrants who now occupy the Lindu plain as well. Environmentalism is part of the agenda of strengthening the claims of indigenous Lindu customary institutions to regulate the Lindu plain as a commons. In this context, indigeneity as a categorical ascription appears more important in determining their mode of participation and their enunciation of environmentalist orientation than the circumstance of participation in the LKD itself. What the case of the realisation of a cooperative management agreement and operation of village conservation councils in the Lindu plain reveals is that such institutions of intimate government may very well be accepted by some villagers because they serve as vehicles to advance non-governmental agendas originating from the participants themselves. In following a Foucaudian model of state-imposed subjectivity, Agrawal may exemplify the same analytical shortcoming that he notes in others, as in his critique of Benedict Anderson's failure to analyse the politics of how official nationalism is imposed on populates to the detriment of popular nationalism. Agrawal too may neglect the latent political dimensions of participation. The strategic actions of To Lindu elders reveal how the practice of environmentality may be less an instantiation of a subjectivity desired and imposed by the Indonesian government and its transnational conservation partners than an overt idiom of officialised allegiance used by local agents in order to further their own political agendas of reclaiming the Lindu plain as a commons under indigenous customary control.
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2 This contribution is based on a paper presented at the 10th Biennial Conference of the International Association for the Study of Common Property (IASC) in Bali, in June 2006. The author kindly agreed to inclusion of the paper in this volume in 2007. The editors added an abstract and keywords, in order to make the paper fit into the overall design of the present publication. Apart from these additions and some cuts by the editors and the author, the original structure was left intact; the paper therefore follows a somewhat different structure than the other articles in this book. It was selected by the editors for inclusion in the present volume because of its unique theoretical approach, which is of great help for the process of conceptualising the comparison between the case studies. The author corrected the final version prepared for this volume and provided photographs. (Tobias Hulier, May 2008)

3 A subsequent governmental declaration in 1999 redefined the borders of the park. In its current form, TNLI extends over 217,991.18 hectares (TNC 2001, p 2; Lindu Conservation Agreement, p 2), stretching from 1° 8' to 1° 20' southern latitude and from 119° 58' to 120° 15' eastern longitude (Sangadji et al 2004, p 16).

4 The immediately succeeding paragraphs set out in analogous terms the composition and function of the “Butler Zone Forum” (Forum Wilayah Penyangga or FWP), an institution originally set up under the auspices of the Central Sulawesi Integrated Area Development and Conservation Project (CSIADCP) to deal with more widely relevant issues at the subdistrict level, such as disputes regarding conservation between villages. As the Lindu participants do not wish to be subject to this subdistrict-level institution, these paragraphs are likely to be deleted or amended in subsequent deliberations over revisions to the agreement.
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