Strategy and subjectivity in co-management of the Lore Lindu National Park (Central Sulawesi, Indonesia)

GREG ACCIAIOLI

Introduction

In the wake of failures to maintain protected areas based on strict exclusion – the ‘fortress’ approach deriving from the Yellowstone model – considerable efforts have been made to involve peoples living in and around such areas in various co-management schemes to invoke their own sense of interest in protecting the natural resources of such areas. However, park managers have increasingly felt that effective deployment of committed participation in local co-management institutions requires fostering a ‘conservation awareness’, a subjectivity of care for the environment. In his exploration of the imposition of a conservationist subjectivity by the Indian government on some of its citizenry, a process that, following Foucault, he labels ‘environmentality’, Agrawal (2005a, b) emphasizes the role of government regulations in fostering a modern subjectivity of care for the environment through the medium of participatory mechanisms such as forest councils. Others (e.g. Severin 1997) have disputed the efficacy of governmental regulations in effecting such a transformation of sensibility, arguing that traditional orientations to the environment enshrined in custom or the exercise of volunteer participation in non-governmental organization (NGO) projects of conservation result in more profound inculcation of custodial attitudes or conservationist

Biodiversity and Human Livelihoods in Protected Areas: Case Studies from the Malay Archipelago, eds. Navjot S. Sodhi, Greg Acciaioli, Maribeth Erb and Alan Khee-jin Tan. Published by Cambridge University Press. © Cambridge University Press 2008.

sensibility. What this chapter seeks to explore is the formation of other types of cooperation around a protected area of Sulawesi, the Lore Lindu National Park (Taman Nasional Lore Lindu or TNLL), specifically the politics surrounding the formation of conservation agreements and village-level conservation organizations in the region. Through examining how elements of traditional customary (*adat*) management, modern NGO intervention, and the framework of governmentally mandated reserves and parks combine in realizations of park management, it also seeks in its conclusion to interrogate the theoretical nexus of Agrawal's model of the fostering of environmentality. Instead, it argues that overt 'care for the environment' may be largely a rationalization for making claims on the basis of indigenous status. Such a stance may be a vehicle for one specific party – indigenes – to seek dominance within the continuing operation of conflicting agendas among the parties involved in the project of conservation. Specifically, in the case of the Lore Lindu National Park, the idiom of conservation in the context of national park monitoring is used by the elders of the indigenous To Lindu to assert their jurisdiction over the land and resources of the Lindu plain and thus to control the members of other ethnic groups who have migrated to this area.

Indigeneity and national parks

Since the 1970s, as a result of a confluence of interests between the international lobby for better management of natural resources and the indigenous people's movement (Clad 1988:322), there has been greater recognition that national parks are unviable as isolated preserves if surrounded by degraded lands or by peoples who are hostile to its existence. Agencies such as the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (now called The World Conservation Union, IUCN) have sought to incorporate in protected area guidelines consideration of the rights of indigenous peoples to continue occupying traditional lands. Managers of national parks have been urged in even more recent years to formulate agreements of co-management, involving indigenous peoples in the areas of the park in conservation arrangements and utilizing them as park protectors. To name but one instance, the Australian national park system has experienced some success in training and employing Aboriginal rangers in such contexts as the Kakadu National Park and the Gurig National Park, although some authors have decried the limitation of Aboriginal participation to the status of rangers without a more substantial role in park management (Foster 1997; Colchester 1994: *Salvaging* section 4, p.7).¹ In order to surmount the first problem of surrounding land degradation, park managers have fostered development projects and land-use plans, often based on

the notion of 'alternative livelihoods', for peoples living in areas surrounding such parks and reserves to enhance the quality of their lands and thus prevent, or at least minimize, destructive incursions of such peoples into the reserve land.

However, such efforts have been focused almost exclusively on cooperation with peoples deemed indigenous. As the IUCN 'Task Force on Traditional Life-styles' defined such peoples: '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 1988:322).

Those peoples who do not meet such criteria of indigeneity, even if living within or in the vicinity of national parks and reserves, have often been neglected in the formulation of cooperative management arrangements, as they have been viewed as pursuing lifestyles based on unsustainable extraction rather than sustainable use (for example, as rubber tappers, rattan gatherers, herders or even ranchers). Even among those organizations that urge working with indigenous peoples, there has been a divergence of opinion as to the limits of such cooperation. Some organizations, especially NGOs, have argued that regimens of 'sustainable use', as embodied in indigenous peoples' practices, constitute the best foundation for preservation of natural resources. Such advocates have urged the adoption of indigenous customary practices, reconceptualized as community-based resource management systems, as a sufficient basis for preserving environmental diversity. Others have argued that such practices, while certainly more anchored in notions of harmony with nature, cannot be considered a sufficient basis for conservation. They argue that past maintenance of ecological diversity may have had more to do with the presence of a limited population and small scale of exploitation and would prove unsustainable with population increases and contact with contemporary pressures to find sources of income for financing the material benefits of modernity. In this view there is no guarantee that indigenous peoples will always wish to retain traditional technologies, settlement patterns and small-scale subsistence strategies. This outlook has also exercised considerable influence on what has come to be a dominant paradigm of conservation, the 'biosphere reserve'.

Modelling the protected area in Indonesia: The Nature Conservancy and the biosphere reserve

A prominent proponent of the biosphere reserve concept, under its own term of 'ecoregion', is The Nature Conservancy (TNC), headquartered in Arlington, Virginia. As one of the most active players in the world of park

preservation, TNC operates the largest private system of nature sanctuaries in the world, owning over 1300 reserves in the USA alone. It has also entered into agreements with the governments of countries throughout the world, especially in the Global South, for the joint management of parks and reserves in the interest of protecting biodiversity. The Nature Conservancy has demonstrated its commitment to working with local partners, including indigenous peoples, in order to achieve this goal. However, it has rejected the notion of 'sustainable use' by local peoples as insufficient to ensure biodiversity conservation. While acknowledging the appropriateness of local participation, including formal agreements with indigenous communities within and around reserves, as well as fostering appropriate development for such communities as a capacity-building strategy, it has maintained the stance that some core areas of parks and reserves should not be subjected to human use. Its park management plans and evaluations thus depend upon a notion of zonation, with some park areas subject to human use, including the creation of enclaves, while others – core zones – are designated as out of bounds.

The Nature Conservancy's Parks in Peril (PiP) programme has become its flagship programme to implement such a strategy (Brandon *et al.* 1998). The largest single programme supporting parks in the Western hemisphere, it encompasses 60 parks in 18 countries throughout Latin and South America, covering over 30million hectares. Based on the major premise that areas protected by policies of exclusion, what has come to be regarded as the Yellowstone model, cannot bear the complete burden for conserving biodiversity, PiP works on the basis of implementing four criterial strategies: (1) establish on-site protection; (2) integrate protected areas into the economic and cultural life of local communities; (3) create long-term funding mechanisms to sustain local management of these areas; and (4) use experiences of PiP site-based activities to influence conservation in other sites in the region's most imperilled ecosystems. The PiP programme retains the notion of protected areas excluding human uses, arguing that the use of any technique of forest product harvesting or cultivation, modern or traditional, imposed or indigenous, is scale dependent; even traditional techniques, if responding to modern pressures for large amounts of extracted products, may have large-scale impacts on a region's resources. In TNC's paradigm effective conservation of biodiversity requires managing a number of different environments requiring a combination, ever tenuous, of both participatory inclusion and enforced exclusion.

As one of its projects outside the Western hemisphere, TNC has been involved with the Department of Forestry in Indonesia in the management of the Lore Lindu National Park. Taman Nasional Lore Lindu (TNLL) was officially declared a national park in 1993 (Surat Keputusan Menteri Kehutanan

No. 593/Kpts-II/93 of 5 October 1993), 11 years after the Indonesian government declared it a candidate for this status as part of its initiative announced at the Congress of National Parks throughout the World, held in Bali in 1982 (Surat Keputusan Menteri Pertanian No. 736/Mentan/X/1982), and 16 years after having been declared a biosphere reserve by UNESCO (Sangaji *et al.* 2004:17). The Nature Conservancy's managerial role in cooperation with the Department of Forestry preceded the actual establishment of the separate management authority, Balai Taman Nasional Lore Lindu (BTNLL) in 1997. The Nature Conservancy's draft management plan acknowledges that it has had to carry out this task of co-management '...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' (*Draft Management Plan* 2001).

Compared to earlier policies, the emphasis of TNC upon a collaborative management strategy with local communities, in the first instance the indigenous peoples in and around the park, has been a salutary advance. However, recent confrontations with other local peoples around the park have raised questions concerning the consensus necessary for sustaining a positive attitude to the park. The continuing harvesting of rattan and other forest products by spontaneous migrants, many of them Bugis from South Sulawesi, and the occupation of one area of parkland, specifically a 'core zone', called DongiDongi by resettlers in the Palolo Valley, who also claim rights as an 'original ethnic group' (*suku asli*) in the region, have added new dimensions to previous contestations of authority presented to the park managers. In response, local NGOs have shifted their grounds of support for such contestations, making the transition from a concern with the rights of 'indigenous peoples' (*masyarakat adat*, literally 'customary communities') to general concerns of rural poverty and agrarian social justice.

Transitions: new orientations, new conflicts

Throughout the 1990s NGO activism in Central Sulawesi was oriented to such issues as supporting, and often spearheading, the claims of 'indigenous societies' to land and other resources.² However, more recently, these NGOs have declared a change in orientation in reaction to such conditions as the continuing failure of the Indonesian economy to recover after the *krismon* following in the wake of the collapse of the Thai baht in 1997. As explained to me by the former secretary-general of the Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of Central Sulawesi (Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Sulawesi Tengah or AMASUTA), the provincial umbrella organization facilitating the campaigns of indigenous societies in Central

Sulawesi, the focus is now on the wider constituency of farmers in general rather than just 'customary societies'. In his view issues relating to land and environment were more general problems of the economy concerning the capacity of farmers as a whole rather than just the members of 'customary societies'. Poverty among farmers in general was the problem; gaining control of land was only one aspect of addressing this wider economic issue.

The wider scope of concern of such NGOs is revealed in such cases as the occupation of DongiDongi, on the northwestern boundary of TNLL. What distinguishes this controversy (Abbas *et al.* 2002) from previous ones regarding peoples like the Behoa Kakau of Katu (Sangaji 2002b) is the 'non-indigenous' status of these occupiers. They hail from four villages located to the southwest of the DongiDongi site of occupation in the Palolo upland plain along the northern boundary of TNLL. These are not long-settled villages; rather, they are largely inhabited by resettlers from various montane regions surrounding the Palu Valley, prominent among them TopoDa'a from Marawola subdistrict in the mountains to the west of Palu, but also To Winatu and To Pipikoro from Kulawi subdistrict. These peoples had been moved to Palolo as part of the programmes for the resettlement of the 'isolated peoples' (*Pemukiman Kembali Masyarakat Terasing* or PKMT) run by the Social Affairs Department (*Departemen Sosial* or Depsos) (Depagri 1992). This programme had begun in independent Indonesia in the 1950s, but had only intensified in the 1970s after the beginning of the New Order (Haba 1999). The 1970s and 1980s witnessed the efflorescence of this programme in Central Sulawesi, with the majority of the populations of these municipal villages (*desa*) in the Palolo upland valley being populated under the auspices of this programme.

Their relocation from their homelands by this programme has rendered problematic the classification of such resettlers as 'indigenous peoples' or 'customary communities'. Continuity with a specific geographic region was central to the definition of Indonesian indigenous peoples declared at a workshop of the Network for the Defence of Customary Societies (*Jaringan Pembelaan Hak-Hak Masyarakat Adat* or JapHama) in Tana Toraja 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 region [i.e. territory] of their own' (KMAN 1999).

Certainly, the land these resettlers occupied in DongiDongi could not be represented as their long-held customary land, denying them the basis claimed by other groups for continuing control of land in and around TNLL (Sangaji 2002a). They have thus justified their occupation on other grounds. Although DongiDongi is now part of TNLL, it was formerly part of the logging concession

of PT Kebun Sari, a joint venture with a Japanese logging firm, and is primarily covered by secondary forest; the land's status as secondary forest they use to dispute the importance of the region as a core zone within TNLL. In addition, many members of the resettlement communities from which the DongiDongi occupiers hail once worked for this company in order to gain an income to support themselves. This latter fact leads to their other argument for occupation: the failure of the Social Affairs Department to have delivered on its promises for the resettlement communities. The resettlers claim that they have not been accorded the 2 hectares of agricultural land promised for each family head by Depsos, and their claims have been supported by such NGOs as WALHI Sulteng and YTM. According to a survey conducted by these NGOs, the resettlers had only received between 0.5 and 0.8 hectares of land per family under the terms of resettlement; in fact 80 of 177 farmers surveyed in Rahmat were altogether landless, with other information suggesting up to 200 families are without land in this village (Sangaji 2002a:15). In addition, other forested land that they had used for gathering rattan and hunting, given their inability to subsist on the land actually allotted to them under the PKMT programme, was subsequently declared part of TNLL, eliminating those sources of subsistence and income that had allowed them to survive despite this inadequate agricultural land allocation. Many of those who had previously worked for PT Kebun Sari had entered the concession land after the company vacated it in order to plant coffee and cacao; some had actually opened gardens while working for the Japanese logging company. For them, such opening of land gave them ownership, by the terms of the right of first clearing recognized widely in the customary land tenure systems of the societies of highland western Central Sulawesi (e.g. for the To Kulawi of Mataue, as documented by Sangaji *et al.* 2004, p.60). Even for those willing to forsake these gardens, the replacement land they had been promised by the government as TNLL took over this land had never materialized.

WALHI Sulteng and YTM have also been instrumental in facilitating the formation and activities of the Free Farmers' Forum (*Forum Petani Merdeka* or FPM) to fight for their claims on the DongiDongi area, including a demonstration at the governor's complex on 19 June 2001. As the forum's name suggests, their support is no longer based on claims of the rights of 'customary societies' to their indigenous land, but on the economic implications for poor farmers of government development programmes, such as the resettlement scheme and the granting of concessions to outside firms. The FPM's demand that DongiDongi be granted enclave status to parallel those accorded such 'customary societies' as the To Lindu and To Katu thus rest on very different grounds than these earlier contestations. In interviews I conducted in June of 2002, both the

park director and TNC officials in Palu voiced their continuing opposition to any granting of enclave status. They denied any 'true' settlement had been established in the DongiDongi area and noted the unregulated cutting down of the forest by the occupiers, including involvement by Bugis chain-saw operators who had followed in the wake of the original Da'a and Pipikoro settlers. The occupiers themselves had, however, sought to bolster the legitimacy of their claim to have established a true settlement by bestowing on their site of occupation the traditional name *Ngata Katupua* (Settlement of Hope or *Tanah Harapan*). The continuing opposition of the park management and its partner TNC has prompted the director of one opposing NGO to label these resource management organizations as engaged in a programme of 'ecofascism' (Sangaji 2002a:16).

In the wake of past controversies and the continuing stalemate of the DongiDongi controversy, local NGO advocates have called into question the very concept of conservation they regard as the basis of such institutions as national parks. In fact, national parks and similar preserves are seen as conforming to the same mould as the New Order development projects that stripped customary societies of their land and rights. What they see as real conservation is the indigenous land-use systems that have maintained a balance with sylvan environments throughout the centuries preceding government impositions (Sangaji 2002a:14, 2002b:16), including transmigration and the granting of concessions for logging, plantations and other enterprises. The director of the Central Sulawesi WALHI office declared that national parks, such as TNLL, were historically from the West and did not fit a process of historical growth that was quite different in countries like Indonesia. With the New Order's history of granting logging concessions to its cronies in national parks and reserves throughout Indonesia, in his view it was simply unjust to consider the cutting down of trees by people like the DongiDongi occupants as illegal. Such scapegoating was just another instance of blaming local societies instead of prosecuting firms supplying Palu's 124 sawmills with logs from throughout the surrounding forests, many of them illegally obtained. To advocates from NGOs such as WALHI Sulteng and YTM, controversies like DongiDongi are not issues of conservation, but of agrarian social justice, an unjust blaming of only 'small people' for crimes like deforestation. They assert that authority to monitor resource use must be given to local societies, whose systems of forest use have never been justly valued, despite centuries of sustainable use before the onslaught of development projects. For such advocates human occupation and preservation of environment are not incompatible, as long as that occupation is based upon traditional modes of land management, even when practised by people no longer living in their homelands.

New forms of co-management: conservation agreements as a response

The Nature Conservancy still views sustainable use along customary lines as insufficient to carry through the project of sustaining biodiversity, but it has responded with its own innovations to increase the commitment of surrounding stakeholders to the conservation regulations of TNLL. New forms of co-management agreements with local society members have constituted one such response, as TNC has sought to encompass a greater range of inhabitants than just the 'indigenous peoples' who had been the target of earlier conservation agreements transacted around TNLL. Brokered by organizations as diverse as the Palu-based indigenous rights NGO YTM, the international relief and development organization CARE, as assisted by its local sister organization Yayasan Yambata, and the Asian Development Bank-funded Central Sulawesi Integrated Area Development and Conservation Project (CSIADCP), these earlier agreements had focused almost exclusively on the 'indigenous peoples' (*masyarakat adat*, literally 'customary communities') around TNLL (Mappatoba & Birner 2004; Sangaji 2002b). In most all these agreements, the local customary councils (*Lembaga [H]Adat*) had been the key players on the village side to whom these organizations looked for the implementation of the terms of these agreements, including the imposition of sanctions for transgressions. Such agreements thus presumed a relative homogeneity of the contracting community and the continuing authority of the customary council as adjudicator of transgressions. Yet, such a presumption is precisely what has been called into question by such contestations of park authority as the issue of DongiDongi, where settlers in the area have been those most active in transgressing park regulations.

The Nature Conservancy has taken a different tack in drawing up its conservation agreements in the vicinity of TNLL (Mappatoba & Birner 2004:28). By 2004 TNC had managed to initiate fourteen conservation agreements, with five of them completed and approved by the TNLL management office (Mappatoba & Birner 2004:18). These first agreements were transacted in Lore Utara on the eastern side of the park. As they have already been reviewed (Khaeruddin 2002), I concentrate here on the more recent (March 2005) agreement entered into with the four villages of the Lindu enclave within TNLL (Desa Puroo, Langko, Tomado dan Anca 2005). While working with both customary functionaries and administrative village officials, TNC has sought to form new village organizations to deal with the issue of local-level monitoring and enforcement of conservation regulations, especially encroachment of gardens for coffee, cacao and other cash crops within the park and harvesting of both timber and non-timber

forest products. The Nature Conservancy has moved away from a position of exchanging provision of drinking water, marketing assistance for organically grown coffee, and other development services and infrastructure in return for communities' commitment to observing conservation rules – the previous orientation of agreements brokered by CARE. Recently, following its interpretation of Forest Act No. 41/1999 on community participation in forestry, TNC has linked community commitment to conservation with park management recognition of customary rights, including the right to access products from customary land (*tanah adat*) now claimed as part of the national park. Hence, it has moved closer to the position demanded by YTM and other critics of its policies with regard to the communities of the enclaves and perimeter of TNLL.

The 2005 'conservation agreement with the society of the Lindu plain', while similar in basic format to earlier CSIADCP contracts, reveals a sophistication and range that far transcends such earlier agreements. Its section of basic considerations (*Menimbang*) succinctly sets forth the basic principles of biodiversity conservation, asserting the interdependence of all living beings (*makhluk hidup*) on earth, positioning humanity as only one link in the great chain of life. Biodiversity conservation is phrased as a prerequisite for sustaining livelihoods: 'On the basis of such thinking, it is clear that conservation efforts to preserve the sustainability of life for particular living beings constitutes indirectly an effort to preserve the continuing life of humankind' (*Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat Dataran Lindu Kecamatan Kulawi Kabupaten Donggala* [hereafter *Kesepakatan Lindu*], unpublished). While asserting the necessity of national parks as a measure to combat the increasing rate of extinctions in the chain of life, it admits that the placing of park boundaries was a unilateral action taken without consultation, resulting not only in losses to the interests of local inhabitants, but also the failure of conservation programmes as a consequence. It recognizes 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' (*Kesepakatan Lindu*, unpublished). The agreement thus signals respect for these interests, but also the need to balance them with the preservation of biodiversity for the sake of the sustainability of all life as a whole in a way that is acceptable to all parties to the agreement. Balancing respect for the rights of the societies in the vicinity of the park with the control and management of natural resources is proclaimed as the fundamental purpose underlying the conservation agreement. The two following sections of the agreement quote a much wider range of laws and regulations related not only to conservation, but also basic human rights and agrarian issues, than other conservation agreements.

The ensuing chapters of the agreement – space precludes the listing of their contents in detail – seek a balance between the acknowledgement of customary institutions, such as the Adat Council of the Entire Lindu Plain and the individual customary councils of the plain's four villages, and the assertion of the authority of the national park institutions. The document proclaims its commitment to a 'participatory management planning' process, but also insists on the park framework of zonation, though opening up the possibility of subsequent determination of boundaries of zones on a participatory basis, balancing both ecological and social considerations. Besides these basic principles and general stipulations, specific paragraphs set limitations within park land on felling trees (allowed for local house decorations, customary rituals, etc.), harvesting rattan, hunting, gathering dammar and taking other natural resources – bamboo, *enau* sap for palm toddy and sugar, roots and herbs for traditional medicines, stones and sand, honey, and others – as well as opening up land for gardens, grazing livestock and dealing with water courses. The possibility for further development of these stipulations in accord with the basic principles is also signalled.

However, what is perhaps most important in this regard is the specification of institutions for carrying out this agreement. In its early sections the conservation agreement made no differentiation between the *adat* councils of Anca, Langko and Tomado, villages all dominated by indigenous To Lindu, and the *adat* council of Puroo, which is exclusively made up of settlers from elsewhere in Kulawi subdistrict. In contrast to the approaches of YTM, Yaphama, and CSIADCP, which focused only on the indigenous groups (*masyarakat adat*) of the area, the TNC agreement is meant to encompass settlers as well, as is made clear in the specification of the 'village conservation organizations' (*lembaga konservasi desa* or LKD), 'the institutions that represent society in conservation efforts in TNLL at the village level'. The LKDs are intended to:

- a provide an umbrella for communication between the society and the park management of the Lore Lindu National Park;
- b socialize the conservation agreement of the society of the Lindu Plain to the society;
- c Carry out participatory planning with the park management of the Lore Lindu National Park;
- d supervise the carrying out of the conservation agreement;
- e evaluate the carrying out of the conservation agreement;
- f report on the results of the evaluation of the conservation agreement to the village headman.

Membership in the LKD is determined '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 the society' (*Kesepakatan Lindu*, unpublished), with members serving for three years. Responsibility for adjudicating transgressions, as well as administering punishments along traditional lines, and resolving disputes among village members related to the conservation agreement, is allocated to the *adat* councils of the plain. However, cases are to be tried in the presence of the LKD, village representative body (BPD), other members of the village government apparatus and park management staff. The final paragraph restates the agreement's aim 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', thus reiterating its own recognition of the notion of Lindu customary territory, which is not displaced by the imposition of national park status and which retains implications for the terms of management.

Institutionalizing (and undermining?) the village conservation organizations

The encompassment of all the ethnic groups within the Lindu plain in regard to conservation enforcement is a notable aspect of the Lindu conservation agreement, though it still relies on the customary mechanisms of the dominant 'indigenous society' (the To Lindu, strictly speaking)³ in the adjudication of transgressions. It is thus both located *beyond* and *within* the customary framework. Certain contradictions ensue from this double positioning. These contradictions are most evident in the operation of the village conservation organizations in their monitoring and enforcing compliance with the conservation regulations of the park, but with an eye to the upholding of customary regulations as well. In theory, the membership of the LKD is open to members of all ethnic groups in the plain. The membership from Puroo is composed of Kulawi settlers, while the Kanawu LKD includes representatives from all the migrants settled in subhamlets located on the eastern side of the lake away from the municipal village centre – spontaneous Bugis migrants from South Sulawesi, Pipikoro resettlers (local transmigrants) from the mountainous regions of southern Kulawi, as well as more recently arrived Toraja farmers from the northern highlands of South Sulawesi. Yet, the largest proportion of the LKD is made up of indigenous Lindu members, many of them also members of the *adat* councils of the Lindu plain, whose own composition is exclusively made up of indigenous local aristocrats (*maradika*). Their double role sets up a tension of representation. These *adat* elders promote the LKD as an organization

to uphold conservation regulations for the whole Lindu enclave, as prescribed by park directives, but they also use it as an instrument to declare the To Lindu's precedential rights to land and resources according to indigenous notions of ancestral territory.

Such claims have been evident in the activities of the LKD to date. The Lindu village conservation organizations were actually functioning before the formal signing of the Lindu conservation agreement on 30 March 2005. Indeed, their first activity as a group took place in early 2004, when they were taken by TNC staff to visit the areas of the Palolo plain devastated by the December 2003 floods, which TNC claimed were a result of the widespread felling of trees by the occupiers in the DongiDongi region.⁴ Armed with this evidence of the environmental consequences of the neglect of conservation regulations – in this case, the occupation of a core zone, so designated in part because of its watershed functions – representatives of the LKD of three of the Lindu villages journeyed with a TNC representative, a forestry policeman (PPA/Polhut) and the Tomado village secretary to Kanawu. Numerous encroachments into park land had been noted, as gardens had been opened on the slopes of Mt Nokilalaki beyond the boundaries of the Lindu enclave by not only the most recent Toraja settlers, but also by some of the longer-term Pipikoro residents and others. The team's activities commenced on the evening of 17 May 2004. At a meeting with selected representatives of Kanawu, team members enunciated the motivations of the stay and planned the survey of the regions of encroachment in park land the next day. After undertaking this survey of the most remote subhamlets and several of the gardens outside the enclave, the team convened a public meeting on the evening of that second day, in which the purpose and results of the day's survey were announced and the possibility of actions against those whose gardens encroached on national parkland were discussed.

The framing of the need to deal with such transgressions revealed overtly a converging of interests and a moulding of a unified constituency, but covertly a continuing claim to precedential land and resource rights by the indigenous To Lindu LKD members who also represented the *adat* councils of the plain. The Nature Conservancy facilitator began the first night's meeting by emphasizing the need to ensure the sustainability of the natural resources of the Lindu plain, and the role of the LKD in their management, a theme he also emphasized in his encounters with transgressing farmers during the survey and with the assembled hamlet members on the second night. At that second meeting he constantly endeavoured to maintain focus on the development potential of the area, as well as the need to assure a constant water supply, crucially dependent upon the preservation of the surrounding forest, to realize this

potential. In this enunciation he was constantly supported by the government representative, the Tomado village secretary:

Firstly, what makes up our aim is nothing other than how we can manage well this region of protected forest that we have in our territory...it is our hope from the [village] government that we can all do the good thing for continuing to keep watch over the region that we inhabit together, so that it continues to be preserved. Let us manage it, keep watch over it, let us carry out our activities, both in our gardens and our wet rice fields in ways that are environmentally friendly [*ramah lingkungan*]...'

The policing function of the LKD within the overall management strategy was reinforced by several speakers, often in the context of preserving the environment for the sake of future generations.

However, the head of the LKD from Langko, whose prominent role in the *adat* council of that village was also referred to when he was invited to speak, also revealed the play of another agenda. While eloquently discoursing upon how the devastation in DongiDongi exemplified the fate of those who opposed government regulations,⁵ he also used this example to argue strongly that Kanawu should not be formalized as a separate administrative village (*desa*) – long a project of the Bugis settlers there, with considerable support from some Pipikoro local transmigrants, wishing to get out from under the authority of the *adat* council in Tomado. Instead, Kanawu should be kept within the fold of Tomado administrative village so as to more effectively guard against illegal migrants, some of them doubtlessly fleeing the environmental ruination in Palolo to Kanawu, Lindu's most vulnerable illegal entry point: 'Let this not be like a roll of string that has unravelled and cannot be wound back [into a unified roll]'. In making this appeal, he was quick to label all those present as Lindu people, 'because we are all, because Lindu, we all possess Lindu, not just the [indigenous] Lindu people, but all people at Lindu, we possess this all, because we have all lived here...' However, his agenda of maintaining the dominant position of the indigenous To Lindu in the conservation endeavour was soon even more apparent, despite the appeal to the unity of all inhabitants of the Lindu plain.

Near the meeting's end, the TNC facilitator attempted to emphasize the 'synergy' of park management and customary interests:

That's my opinion, thus for the future, if nothing else, for our conservation agreement, if nothing else, we have to unify the conservation of customary forest with the conservation of the Lore

Lindu National Park forest. That's what we have to bring together. That's the most important thing. I think that here, between the national park and customary territory, there's a single unity that we have to preserve, together. There's no difference here, because the customary territory that we have to watch over, that's also the territory of the national park that we have to watch over. In order to watch over the activities of the peoples who are in the village. That's all.

Later, he also spoke of the need to align the indigenous Lindu customary 'zoning' according to *suaka* with the national park zonation scheme. While overtly agreeing with such assertions, the LKD *adat* elder from Langko also expanded this theme in a direction that emphasized the prior 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, Banbaria, Boya, Lewonu, Sangali, Tae Lampanga, 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...

In this passage, within the general framework of a purported unity of all inhabitants of the plain, the To Lindu elder adroitly asserted his prior rights to the land as an indigenous To Lindu, since his ancestors had sacrificed the blood of their livestock upon it (all in an indigenous conservation effort to prevent the effects of overgrazing, as he later noted). Only he could still recite the real, the original, names of all the customary territories on the eastern side of the lake, thus warranting his custodial right of precedence. He then used an assertion of the equality of all Lindu inhabitants to support the demand of the customary

council of the Lindu plain that no Lindu inhabitant may cultivate more than two hectares of land, a measure aimed squarely at the Bugis and Kulawi settlers, some of whom had opened up to 12 hectares, including all their plots devoted to coffee, cacao and other crops (Acciaoli 2001). So, even in his assertion of contemporary equality, as innocently proclaimed earlier by the TNC facilitator, this wily Lindu elder was able to advance the project of insuring the customary control of land by the indigenous Lindu *adat* council. By further linking erosion as a punishment from God with the careless extension of plots beyond what the *adat* council stipulated, he managed as well to supply ultimate religious undergirding to the wisdom of the indigenous customary council and its members' 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.'

In his comments to individual transgressing farmers during the survey, this To Lindu elder made ready use of idioms of the New Order government, in particular the rhetoric of the Department of Social Affairs (*Departemen Sosial* or *Depsos*). The farmers of the remote subhamlet Sangali, dispersed in their field huts scattered throughout the forest at the eastern edge of Kanawu hamlet, were 'wild farmers' (*petani liar*) or 'nomadic swidden farmers' (*peladang berpindah-pindah*), opening up land in one spot, then bestowing it upon an incoming relative (issues of illegal entry again!), and moving on up the mountain to open up other plots deeper in the forest, specifically the forest of the national park. He exhorted them to become like the other farmers of Kanawu, who neatly arranged their plots concentrated next to each other in a wide expanse, where one could see one's neighbours for two kilometres or more:

Because here in Kanawu, I say that the Bugis, the Kantewu [i.e. Pipikoro] people, all these people are visible, even as far as two kilometres one can see humanity, ah! This is what we want, living together!

The continuity of such rhetoric is perhaps understandable, for the Lindu people themselves had formerly been assimilated to the status of *suku/masyarakat terasing* ('most isolated societies/tribes') targeted by the Department of Social Affairs during the New Order, since the Lindu plain was only accessible by horse trail and located far from medical and other 'civilized' facilities. However, this elder's assertion of the need to render the Sangali populace 'visible', as a densely settled whole, referred not to state projects of rendering a subject population visible (Scott 1998), but to the continuing need for surveillance by not just the LKD as agents of conservation interests, but by the Lindu *adat* councils as the primary custodians of the Lindu environment, their dominance

warranted by precedence of settlement and their conception of immemorial custom.

The connection of such assertions to the To Lindu agenda seeking to use the LKD to further their own ethnic group's interests became even more apparent at a meeting sponsored by AMASUTA in the village of Langko some three months later to discuss the problems faced by indigenous people in the Lindu plain. At that meeting many of the same players who had delivered speeches in the capacity of representing the LKD in Kanawu spoke instead in their capacity as To Lindu elders. Most emphasized the necessity for the To Lindu *adat* council, as the official representative body of the 'indigenous people' (*masyarakat adat*) of the plain, to retain the control of such activities as the management of fishing in the lake by all fishermen, whether To Lindu, Bugis or from another ethnic group. The ultimate authority of the *adat* council for management of resource issues in and around the Lindu plain was not questioned. The need to bring all inhabitants into line with the *adat* stipulation of limiting each person's land to two hectares was reiterated. In fact, the very Lindu elder who had spoken as the head of the Langko LKD in Kanawu emphasized how the national park had appropriated customary land in its allotment of land to the park, and wondered out loud whether such land was not better managed by traditional means rather than through institutions of the national park. Indeed, as one participant opined, perhaps the best solution to problems encountered with the TNLL management office was simply to claim back all the park land so it reverted to its customary owners. Even the head of the Langko *adat* council agreed to the possibility of claiming such land back if it was necessary for the council's continued functioning. He considered that the LKD was too limited by the restrictions imposed by the park management office, and the To Lindu customary council might be freer to act with determination in preserving the local environment without it. Hence, when placed in the context of discussing the empowerment of their own indigenous institutions, the commitment that Lindu elders had shown for TNC-organized village conservation organizations was largely absent, revealing a different locus of continuing indigenous loyalty.

Conclusion: environmentality reconsidered

The DongiDongi case on the northeastern boundary of the Lore Lindu National Park highlights many of the ambiguities regarding the treatment of peoples living in and around national parks. Initially, the conservation agreements signed by park officials and representatives of villagers living along the park's boundaries were targeted at indigenous peoples living there, such as those negotiated by YTM, Yambata, and CSIADCP, not to mention the early

agreements of TNC with To Pekurehua communities of Lore Utara (Khaeruddin 2002). Non-indigenous local peoples have proved to be a different story. It is no accident that the To Rampi migrants from South Sulawesi resident in Dodolo village, which had been encompassed within the park, ended up being resettled, while the To Katu, with a much stronger claim to indigeneity as an offshoot of the local To Besoa, resisted such efforts and were eventually granted enclave status under the auspices of a conservation agreement (Sangaji *et al.* 2004). The resettlers of DongiDongi, originally from the upland regions of Marawola and southern Kulawi (now Pipikoro), but for many years resident in the Palolo Valley, have perhaps even less claim to indigenous status than the inhabitants of Dodolo. Yet, they have won the support of NGOs that had earlier oriented themselves more exclusively to the rights of the indigenous peoples in the region. The failure of the DongiDongi occupants to win an enclave status from the park authorities has motivated their strongest NGO supporters, WALHI Sulteng and YTM, to question the entire enterprise of establishing national parks as a colonial imposition, echoing the critique of Western models of conservation as continuing colonialism that have been voiced elsewhere (Stevens 1997:24). They have called for a moratorium on TNLL and by extension national parks in Indonesia more generally. The director of YTM has called for the revocation of the status of TNLL as a protected area so that the traditional claims of both the 'authentic societies' (i.e. indigenous peoples) and the other communities that have inhabited the area covered by the park and its periphery since before its imposition can be duly acknowledged. Only after such official acknowledgement does he suggest a round-table discussion involving all stakeholders focused upon an appropriate policy of area management that would be community based.

Clearly, such a contestation does not represent simply another case of indigenous interests needing to be accommodated by appropriate agreements stressing participatory management of the national park. It represents instead a clash of two conflicting ideologies of conservation. On the one hand, TNC and its government partners have certainly foregrounded consultation and negotiations over appropriate management with indigenous (and, more recently, other local) stakeholders; however, they remain committed to a biosphere model of biodiversity conservation that demands some areas – core zones – be protected from human use and habitation. On the other hand, such local NGOs as WALHI Sulteng and YTM are committed to a model of 'sustainable use', arguing for the adequacy of local community-based resource management for all conservation purposes. In their view the imposition of protected areas is a miscarriage of agrarian social justice, reproducing the poverty of local farmers, whatever their origin. Despite a laudable history of park managers

accommodating indigenous interests through such strategies as conservation agreements and declaration of enclave areas, the present impasse precipitated by the occupation of DongiDongi by resettlers presents a different sort of contestation of park authority, one whose implications undermine the very basis of conservation ideology's incipient alliance with indigenous interests that has so far preserved the park. As one of the WALHI Sulteng advocates declared in an interview, 'There is no meeting point.'

Yet, TNC has more recently attempted to provide such a 'meeting point'. The conservation agreement it has negotiated for the Lindu plain does continue to privilege indigenous interests in the allocation of sanctioning transgressions to indigenous *adat* councils. Yet, it also attempts to accommodate the interests of non-indigenous settlers through the formation of village conservation organizations (LKD) whose recruitment includes all the peoples settled in a park-related region. Certainly, the LKD have catalyzed the cooperation of Bugis, Pipikoro and Kulawi settlers with indigenous Lindu representatives. But the indigenous representatives are caught in a position of conflicting loyalties, both accepting the wider ambit of participation in the conservation project and the acknowledgement of settler rights it implies, but also manoeuvring to advance the agenda of preference for indigenous rights in the warrants they invoke to justify their position in the multiethnic project of conservation.

The use of the village conservation organizations by the indigenous Lindu members to advance their agenda of reasserting control over all the migrant ethnic groups in the Lindu plain presents a challenge to the theory of environmentality posited by Arun Agrawal (2005a,b). In that theory Agrawal emphasizes how local participation by Kumaon villagers in the village forest councils imposed by the Indian state leads to a new subjectivity, an emergent orientation of concern for the environment. Practice, the theoretical term in his model by which he labels 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 belief. Social action precedes subjectivity: local villagers may feel at first compelled to participate in state-mandated councils, but eventually through participation in this medium of 'intimate government' (Agrawal 2005b:195) they come to espouse the cause underlying this governmental regulatory strategy of council creation: concern for conservation of the forest. This process of forming a new subjectivity in line with government aims through regulated participation Agrawal labels 'environmentality'. The very form of the term reveals its debt to Foucault's notion of governmentality, as Agrawal (2005b:216) readily acknowledges. Environmentality is that form of governmentality that focuses upon the creation of concern for the environment. Forest councils can be seen as both a 'technology

of power' and a 'technology of self' in the Foucauldian sense, for they not only are imposed institutionally upon villagers but they also operate to induce a change in subjectivity. For Agrawal the practice of participation, or lack thereof, is a far more potent factor than any categorical ascriptions of local villagers – gender, caste, etc. – in accounting for their (transformed) subjectivity.

However, Agrawal's invocation of such a theoretical dynamic implicates him in the very shortcomings that plague the Foucauldian framework. The formation of individuals' subjectivity is seen as a process of the internalization of orientations and constraints of a disciplinary regime imposed from above. Despite Agrawal's invocation of the term practice, and some allusions to Bourdieu to bolster it, his basically Foucauldian model leaves little room for the exercise of agency from below that characterizes a more fully developed practice theory. The state is the ultimate manipulator of subjectivity and achieves its aim of fostering environmental concern through the medium of intimate government, specifically the imposition of forest councils whose aims villagers come eventually to endorse through their subjectivity-moulding participation. But this model de-emphasizes how villagers may choose the terms of their participation in councils on the basis of diverse motivations. Enunciated concern for the environment may be simply what Bourdieu labels a 'second order strategy' (Bourdieu 1977:42), an official pronouncement that makes action that may derive from quite other 'first-order strategies' appear to be nothing but compliance with a norm or prescription generally valued or imposed.

Such a reading can be given to the participation of indigenous Lindu elders in the village conservation organizations (LKD) negotiated by TNC as part of the conservation agreement for the Lindu enclave. The pronouncements of Lindu elders when in meetings convened by these organizations manifest a strong orientation of care for the environment, a custodial subjectivity that certainly was not so publicly highlighted previous to the formation of these organizations. But an understanding of the political motivations underlying those pronouncements, as readily evident in the concrete proposals they put forth to assure To Lindu dominance of the conservation project, reveals that their espoused environmentalist concern, couched in the idioms of enduring stewardship and the superior custodial function of (their) custom, is very much a second-order strategy by which they justify their more encompassing attempts to reassert and maintain control of the migrants who now inhabit the Lindu plain as well. Environmentalism is part of the agenda of strengthening the executive force of indigenous To Lindu customary institutions and regulations.

Indeed, the opportunity to assert the prerogatives of their categorical indigenous status seems of far more weight in determining their mode of participation and their enunciation of environmentalist orientation than the fact of

participation in the LKD, potentially interpretable as a practice inducing the emergence of an environmentalist orientation. Agrawal perhaps too naïvely accepts the Foucauldian dynamic of the power of the state imposing a subjectivity it desires through the medium of intimate government. Villagers may very well accept the terms of cooperative management agreements and operation of village conservation organizations because they function as vehicles for the advancement of non-governmental agendas from the participants themselves under the guise of the governmentally desired orientation. In downplaying the political dimension of participation, the pragmatic contextualization of declarations whose semantic content he takes at face value, Agrawal's analysis may suffer from the same shortcoming that he attributes to others: paying insufficient attention to on-the-ground politics. The Foucauldian dynamic of environmentality may be less an imposition of government-desired subjectivity than an overt frame to which allegiance is shown by local agents in order to further their own political agenda of re-asserting customary control under the warrant of indigeneity.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the assistance provided by grants from the Australian Research Council and the University of Western Australia that allowed undertaking the research on which this chapter is based. Facilities for writing the initial draft of this paper were graciously provided by the Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore. Sponsorship of the field research was extended by PMB – LIPI. I would particularly like to thank Dr Riwanto Tirtosoedarmo and Dr Johannes Haba of this research body for their support during and after field work. Members of numerous organizations with offices in and around Palu – TNC, CARE, WALHI, YTM, AMASUTA, and others – patiently fielded my queries, for which I thank them. Above all, I wish to acknowledge the generosity and hospitality of all the peoples of the Lindu plain, who endured my incessant questioning and allowed me to be present at and record numerous gatherings.

End notes

1. Colchester (1994: *Salvaging* section 4:7) notes Cordell's observation on the lack of substantial sharing of power in co-management of national parks in Australia: 'Judging from Kakadu and Uluru, Aboriginal involvement in protected area management is on the verge of degenerating into Smokey Bear-style ranger training, in which the role of traditional owners is simply to add an

- interpretive and marketable 3. The term *to*, along with its ethnic element to running the parks.'
2. See Acciaioli (2001, 2002) for accounts of how the To Lindu in the early 1990s were aided by Yayasan Tanah Merdeka in alliance with other NGOs in Palu to avoid being resettled as a result of a planned hydroelectric scheme involving damming the Gumbasa River flowing from Lake Lindu and consequently raising the level of the lake by seven metres, thus inundating all villages and wet-rice lands and forcing the 'local transmigration' of all inhabitants of the plain.
4. WALHI – Sulteng, along with other NGOs in Palu, such as YTM, has disputed that the floods were indeed caused or exacerbated by the deforestation of Dongi-Dongi, noting that, historically, flooding has been periodic in the Palolo Valley. However, the scale of the December 2003 flood far exceeded these earlier floods, and I am inclined to accept TNC's argument and evidence that the occupation of the DongiDongi watershed area did indeed account for the scale of that flooding. See the interchange between Sangadji and Acciaioli in the October 2004 issue of *Inside Indonesia* (Acciaioli 2004:7).
5. Throughout all his speeches during this visit, including to individual farmers at their gardens, he included the refrain that the people whose lands were devastated in Dongi-Dongi and the Palolo Valley were now just bodies (*badan saja*), without souls (*jiwa*) any longer, as their lives had been used up (*kehabisan hidup*).

References

- Abbas, M.N., Siera, T. & Awang, S.A., eds. (2002). *Interaksionisme Simbolik Dongi-Dongi*. Jogjakarta, Indonesia: Debut Press.
- Acciaioli, G. (2001). Grounds of conflict, idioms of harmony: custom, religion, and nationalism in violence avoidance at the Lindu Plain, Central Sulawesi. *Indonesia*, **72**, 81–112.
- Acciaioli, G. (2002). Re-empowering the 'art of the elders': the revitalization of adat among the To Lindu people of Central Sulawesi. In M. Sakai, ed. *Beyond Java: Regional Autonomy and Local Societies in Indonesia*. Adelaide, Australia: Crawford House Publishing, pp.217–244.
- Acciaioli, G. (2004). The occupation of Dongi-Dongi: do resettlement program failures justify parkland deforestation? *Inside Indonesia*, **80**, 7.
- Agrawal, A. (2005a). Environmentality: community, intimate government, and the making of environmental subjects in Kumaon, India. *Current Anthropology*, **46**, 161–190.
- Agrawal, A. (2005b). *Environmentality: Technologies of Government and the Making of Subjects*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology 16. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brandon, K., Redford, K.H. & Sanderson, S.E., eds. (1998). *Parks in Peril: People, Politics, and Protected Areas*. Washington, DC: The Nature Conservancy and Island Press.

- Clad, J.C. (1988). Conservation and indigenous peoples: a study of convergent interests. In J.H. Bodley, ed. *Tribal Peoples and Development Issues: A Global Overview*. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company, pp.320-334.
- Colchester, M. (1994). Salvaging nature: indigenous peoples, protected areas and biodiversity conservation. World Rainforest Movement website: <http://www.wrm.org.uy/subjects/nature.html> (accessed 19 April 2005).
- Depagri, D.B. (1992). Untitled document. Jakarta: Depagri, Dirjen Bangdes/Departemen Dalam Negeri/Direktur Jendral Pembangunan Desa.
- Desa Puroo, Langko, Tomado dan Anca (2005). *Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat Dataran Lindu, Kecamatan Kulawi, Kabupaten Donggala*.
- Draft Management Plan (2001) Lore Lindu National Park. 4 volumes. Palu, Indonesia: TNC office.
- Foster, D. (1997). *Gurig National Park: The First Ten Years of Joint Management*. Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Report Series. Canberra, Australia: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Haba, J. (1999). Resettlement and sociocultural change among the 'Isolated Peoples' in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia: a study of three resettlement sites. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Department of Anthropology, The University of Western Australia.
- Khaeruiddin, I. (2002). *Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat di Lima Desa sekitar Taman Nasional Lore Lindu Sulawesi Tengah: Laporan Hasil Kegiatan*. Palu, Indonesia: The Nature Conservancy.
- KMAN [Kongres Masyarakat Adat Nusantara] (1999). Fact Sheet (II).
- Mappatoba, M. & Birner, R. (2004). *Co-management of Protected Areas: the Case of Community Agreements on Conservation in the Lore Lindu National Park, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia*. Eschborn, Germany: Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH (Tropical Ecology Support Programme (TOEB), F-VI/7e).
- Sangaji, A. (2002a). *Menuju Pengelolaan TNLL Berbasis Masyarakat (Kertas Posisi 01/WALHI/2002)*. Palu, Indonesia: WALHI Sulteng.
- Sangaji, A. (2002b). *Politik Konservasi: Orang Katu di Behoa Kakau*. Bogor, Indonesia: Penerbit KpSHK.
- Sangaji, A., Hamdin, M., Sugiharto, et al. (2004). *Masyarakat dan Taman Nasional Lore Lindu*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Yayasan Kemala and Yayasan Tanah Merdeka.
- Scott, J.C. (1998). *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Severin, T. (1997). *The Spice Islands Voyage: The Quest for Alfred Wallace, the Man Who Shared Darwin's Discovery of Evolution*. New York, NY: Carroll & Graf Publishers.
- Stevens, S. (1997). The legacy of Yellowstone. In S. Stevens, ed. *Conservation through Cultural Survival: Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas*. Washington, DC: Island Press, pp.13-32.