

Peasants' Resistance to State-Owned Enterprises: Learning from an Indonesian Social Movement

Wahyudi¹

Abstract

This study analyzes factors that triggered the land-ownership struggle for the Titi Tsoro forest area, the Rights for Cultivation Use and to analyze the various differences in interests related to the land's ownership as a major community resource or a production asset for national plantation company named as PTPN XII. This research is qualitative in nature and applies social movement theory. The informants for this research were the conflicting parties. Data were collected using observations, interviews, and documentation. The analysis went through four steps, namely data collection, data filtering, data classification, and conclusions. Results show The settlement of this agrarian conflict has pursued both legal and non-legal means. Various efforts have been made by both parties to arrive at a mutually beneficial solution for both parties, but these efforts have so far failed to find a suitable mutual agreement. Over time, this agrarian conflict has received encouragement and support from various political organizations, such as political parties, legislative institutions, and the ruling elite, who may support the community in order to gain public popularity and secure votes. The more parties that are involved in a conflict, the more difficult it is to resolve it. Negotiations and legal efforts have not been able to overcome this difficulty in this case. A new approach is needed that incorporates customary arbitration that has power over the law.

Keywords: social conflict, movement, peasant, cultivation us of right ownership

Introduction

Issues of land grabbing and related activities—such as violence, discrimination, and the criminalization of farmers—often are the focus of this study. In Indonesia land and agrarian problems continue unabated despite efforts for years from journalists, government agencies, NGOs (Non-government Organizations), farmers, and society. Indeed, agrarian problems come and go one after another. The energy, time, and money that have been devoted has failed to effect any significant changes to resolve the agrarian problems of Indonesia (Sasongko, 2006). Agribusiness, banks, legislation with a strong urban bent,

¹ Dr., Muhammadiyah University of Malang, Indonesia email: wahyudiwinarjo64@umm.ac.id

and/or corporate agriculture have been the principal threats to peasant agriculture so far (Ploeg, 2017).

In Indonesia, inequality in the land-ownership distribution is the major trigger of land conflicts and disputes where resistance often arises. In social movements in Java, for example, the farming communities most likely to be involved in conflicts over land rights are peasant societies that have not risen much from the lowest levels of social stratification (Amin, 2010). In Papua, movements have arisen to fight against extractive companies that operate in various areas, such as the resistance of the Amung people to the Freeport mining operation, the resistance of the Nagari Koto community in West Sumatra to the Batubasi Hill mine plan (Fringka, 2017), and the people's fight against mining in Manggarai in the East Nusa Tenggara province (Regus, 2011), to name but a few.

In addition, the Kalibakar farmer social movement is driven by farmers from six villages—Simojayan, Tlogosari, Tirtoyudo, Kepatihan, Baturetno, and Bumirejo—with the aim of disputing the HGU (the right to work on state-controlled land) rights for a former Dutch plantation and redistributing the land to the community. After a long and fruitless struggle, the farmers added further pressure by initiating a strategy that was referred to as “reclamation” by the farmers and “looting” by the plantation company. This social movement has been ongoing since the post-Japanese occupation, persisting through the fight for independence from Dutch colonialism, the Old Order (Orla), the New Order (Orba), and the Reformation Era, thus continuing to this day. The focus of this research, however, is the peasant movement, as it has existed since the New Order.

The conflict began with the nationalization of former Dutch plantations, including the Kalibakar plantation. A decree of the Ministry of Home Affairs dated June 18 then transferred the HGU to the state-owned plantation company PTPN XII. The HGU covered an area of 2,050 hectares and was valid until 2013. In the process of taking over this land, which was “controlled” by the people, there was a conflict of interest and a difference in opinion between the farmers as land owners and PTPN XII, as well as by extension the government. This conflict of interest led to various forms of resistance movements because the interests of the community were often ignored (Astawa, 2016).

In addition, conflicts arose because of differences in the opinions of the two parties. PTPN XII, based on the HGU, believed that the land did not belong to the community, while the people believed they had an ancestral right to the land. The low legal awareness among the community and systematic acts of provocation coincided with a period of reform where the authority of the law and government had weakened. This situation provided the momentum for the community to take action, namely through reclamation. An extensive harvesting of Java cacao was carried out systematically between 1993 to 1998, leaving only 10.5 hectares of the total 2,050 hectares.

This 17-year conflict resurfaced in 2013 when PTPN's HGU expired. However, the community still controlled the land under the HGU, yet PTPN XII was in the process of extending its rights. The extension of the expired HGU was actually not PTPN's reason for prohibiting the community from working the land, considering that the land was previously state land. However, PTPN was obliged to prevent the land from being controlled by another party (Rediale, 2016). This conflict never reached a resolution due to the failure of the mediation team formed by the government. This mediation team was limited to meeting organizers, and no agreements were reached by the conflicting parties, nor were these efforts followed up by the authorities (Kusbianto, 2016). Using qualitative research methods, this study seeks to uncover the roots of this conflict between PTPN XII and the Kalibakar community, as well as the efforts at conflict resolution made by each party.

Social movements through collective action are actively pursued by farmers, and these are often spearheaded by outside figures who, according to Gramsci (1971), can be classed as organic intellectuals. Such actors are often urban agrarian activists from academia and NGOs who try to help rural farming leaders to promote their movement's demands through demonstrations, media campaigns, lobbying, and political advocacy (Reyes & Dueñas, 2021).

According to Tauchid (2009), the agrarian problem is a concern for human life and livelihoods, because land is a source of nutrition for humans. The struggle for land is effectively a struggle for food, so people are willing to risk injury to defend it. According to Rachman (2017), agrarian conflicts involving farmers have been recorded since the colonial era, when plantation businesses expanded and there was great tax pressures and

the annexation of farmers' lands. The resistance from peasants varied, with it including demonstrations, rebellions, and individual and collective actions. It also varied in scale from local to regional, with some of it occurring spontaneously and some of it being more organized.

Social movement in the form of collective resistance by farmers is certainly based on an awareness of the actors involved. According to Ife and Tesoriero (2008), collective action is needed to deal with problems that cannot be solved by the individuals acting alone. Indeed, it can be a much more powerful and effective way to raise public awareness about an issue and achieve change (Asia et al., 2018). Critical awareness is something that all conflict-affected farmers need. According to Freire (2008), awareness is not a technique, form of information transfer, or skills training but rather a dialogical process that brings individuals together to solve their existential problems.

Critical thinking happens when there is dialogue between communities. Without dialogue, there can be no communication, and without communication, there can be no true education. Building farmers' awareness through dialogical communication is not an easy step, however, because conditions in agrarian conflicts create a pattern for oppression, such as when farmers live in fear of losing their freedom. When building a social movement for collective action, there needs to be an awareness of all the roles within in the movement. Awareness in social movements has actually been discussed in the sociological conception of Durkheim (1951), and this can be understood in two forms, namely a mechanical society and an organic society. A mechanical society has a general awareness (i.e., collective knowledge) that underlies collective action.

Public awareness can also act as a coercive shared moral for each of society's members. The organic consciousness, however, is more complex in that individuals are connected to each other based on a function of need. This organic consciousness is at the basis of a developed modern society. Durkheim also proposed two types of social solidarity, namely mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity (Susan, 2014).

Klandermans (1984) posited that the resource mobilization theory emphasizes the importance of structural factors, such as the availability of resources for collective and individual positions in social networks, thus highlighting the rationality for participating in

a social movement. Thus, Klandersmans believes that individuals decide to engage in social movements not because of psychological traits but rather a rational decision that a person makes after considering the advantages and disadvantages of participating.

A study conducted by Sarwoprasodjo (2007) found that activist farmers carried out awareness-raising exercises by conducting training for farmers, holding public discussion meetings, and taking several social actions. This is supported by the results of the research of Wijanarko (2014), who conducted a study of the Al-Barakah Farmers Association in Ketapang Village, Susukan District, Semarang Regency, Central Java. This farmers association raised the awareness of farmers as a way to resist the marginalization of farmers' communication at the local level, which had been dominated by the state.

The forms of resistance carried out by activists include studies, seminars, and festivals. Ramdloni (2005) found that farmer activism was carried out through several types of action, such as protests, occupations, and demonstrations, as well as submissions to the courts. Some of these actions are often followed by acts of violence. In addition, a number of articles, books, and various discussions have made a very valuable contribution to public knowledge about the plight and resistance of Indonesian farmers.

In the modern era, closed forms of resistance have begun to be abandoned. Several studies explain that most peasant resistance is open, such as the *Zapatista* movement in Mexico, the *Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais sem Terra* (Landless Rural Workers Movement) in Brazil, the *Foderasi der indigenen Organisationen des Napo* (Indigenous Peoples Movement of Napo), and the radical peasant movements in rural Vietnam. This active resistance usually results from the lives of farmers being disturbed by the state or foreign parties within the capitalist framework (Azhima, 2011; Wager & Schulz, 1995).

Family farming refers to legal relations. On a family farm, the family owns the resources, makes the decisions, and provides the majority of the labor. This definition distinguishes family farming from corporate farming by focusing on the institutional side. That is, it does not explain how resources are mobilized, merged, and developed, nor how production is organized and developed. It does not specify how the farm interacts with nature or society. A new paradigm is needed to handle these issues: farming style. A farming style defines how production and development are organized. It is a way of relating to the farmer's

cultural repertoire and the set of linkages between markets, technology, and state regulations, with a rich tradition in farming style research. This legacy has helped us grasp the wide range of farming practices, from peasant to entrepreneurial. New divides are forming at the intersections of the two.

Entrepreneurial farming threatens peasant farming (which comprises the vast majority of farmers and farms) and conflicts with the growing scarcities facing society (climate, water, employment, food). Agricultural policies are increasingly constructed in such a way that the advantages go to the enterprising pole, while the expenses are spread across all farms or even covered by the peasant pole. Various rationales are used in mainstream discourse (Ploeg, 2017).

The adherents of capitalism consider farmers an obstacle to development (McMichael, 2010). Big businesses gain an advantage by colluding with state authorities to exploit natural resources and displace farmers in the process. Neoliberal policies prioritize international trade and industrialization at the expense of damaging the environment and forcing farmers to leave their land to capitalist entrepreneurs rather than providing for their fellow citizens (Wibowo, 2010). The state's adoption of neoliberal practices has supported multinational and transnational companies that then exploit natural resources in way that harms environments and marginalizes local people, leading to resistance movements emerging in various countries.

The theory of awareness cannot be separated from Paulo Freire's concept of education as a liberator, where consciousness is the result of a liberating education. Indeed, Freire (2008) divided human consciousness into magical, naive, and critical consciousnesses. Magical consciousness reflects the awareness, or rather the lack of it, of people who are unable to see the relationship between one factor and another, so they regard factors outside of humans (i.e., the natural and supernatural) as the causes of their powerlessness. The naive consciousness, meanwhile, sees the human aspect as the root of problems in society. In this awareness, ethical issues, creativity, and the need for achievement are considered determinants of social change. Human development can therefore be expected to act as a trigger for change. The third and most important awareness is critical awareness, because this sees aspects of the system and structure as the source of problems.

The process of conscientization generates critical awareness (or a critical consciousness) of political and social conditions, and according to Goldbard (2006), an awareness-raising process is rooted in pedagogy, education, and teaching, especially adult education. Freire's conscientization, however, is different from that of the women's rights movement because that could involve the transmission of preselected knowledge, with this in turn raising awareness (Moenawar et al., 2019). Syawaludin (2014) stated that the emergence of awareness sustains resistance movements and builds the identity of a popular resistance movement. It therefore acts as a means for maintaining the strength of resistance in the face of stronger opposing parties.

Building awareness among farmers is not easily achieved, however, because as Freire (2008) mentioned, the conditions in agrarian settings are often conducive to oppression. More specifically, farmers feel fearful of losing their freedom, so in this social movement, the critical awareness of farmers is a factor in forming a social movement and taking collective action.

Social movements have been studied in the Indonesian context, although not for agrarian conflicts. Such studies include that of Setyadi (2016), which found that the emergence of social movements was influenced by a lack of communication between the government and the community as a form of risk management. Social movement communication was also studied by Hapsari (2016), who examined how communication networks play a role in encouraging people to participate in environmental conservation movements.

Research Questions

To guide the research process in this study, the following two research questions were sought to answer.

- 1) What factors are identified to cause conflicts between the farmer community and the company in Kalibabar?
- 2) What conflict resolutions are anticipated to find the win-win permanent solution between the farmer community and the company in Kalibabar?

Literature Review

Peasant Social Movements

For thousands of years, peasant agriculture, or land-labour farming, has been around. The agricultural style is so unusual in that it bonds land and labor together in a certain way and has the ability to perpetuate itself regardless of the changing periods or contrasting ecological and socio-economic conditions. Many different stories about its death have been spread. Though this is the case, the globe is still heavily dependent on peasant-farmers; this is mostly because they produce over 70% of the world's food (Samberg et al, 2016).

Peasant agriculture is marked by the use of one's own resources. To paraphrase, the agricultural industry is rich in the raw materials needed to create many types of food and fiber. These resources are a legacy that passes from one generation to the next and has to do with the farming family. Farmers have the skill to be able to govern the living nature in their region (in the form of crops, animals, and local eco-systems) and turn it into food. Control over production and development is possible with access to this type of resource. Long (2001) contends that a self-controlled resource base (i.e., a space for maneuver) is the resource of primary importance to peasant producers. A closed cycle (such as using manure produced by cattle as fertilizer, and in doing so, the soil and land, to generate a surplus crop, livestock, and food) is important, as it can assist farmers to diversify their livelihoods. The high quality manure does not have to or needs very little fertilizer to be bought. The enjoyment of being able to purchase a concentrate or two for luxury lawn-and-garden use is offered by the ability to work with decent topsoil production. Eating a well-organized diet helps reduce stress and promotes a longer life. A key advantage of having your own herd is that it helps prevent disease problems by allowing the farm to select and breed the animals. Farming is "gently farming" (Zuiderwijk, 1998), yet is highly productive (Larson et al., 2012). Peasant farming helps protect the environment and it shows concern for society by keeping its ties strong.

Freeman (1979), in an article entitled "A Model for Analyzing the Strategic Options of Social Movement Organizations," argued that strategic decisions in a movement are not always made by a movement leader or an elite group within the movement because most

movements are not subject to hierarchical control. In addition, the structure of a social movement also plays an important role in its success.

According to Harper (1998), structure means having a well-established network of social relations in which interactions between the various social roles, groups, organizations, and institutions that make up society become routine and repetitive. Although we cannot use it as a benchmark, Harper's (1998) definition of structure may help us to understand the structure of peasant movement organizations like the Pasundan Farmers Union in East Priangan, the Customary Institutions in the Tanah Lot case, the BPRPI in East Sumatra, and the KAAPLAG in Cimacan, West Java.

There are two models for the organizational structure of a movement, namely a centralized structure and a decentralized or segmented structure. Centralized structures tend to require fewer resources than decentralized ones to maintain the continuity of the movement. There are also two types of activist farmer organizations, namely (1) those that emerge from within farming groups themselves and (2) those that emerge due to outside forces (Mustain, 2007).

A peasant movement is a social movement, generally a reformative one because farmers merely want some changes to some of the existing values and norms (Aberle in Sunarto, 2000; Kornlum, 1988). Such movements can be categorized into old and new with a movement being classed as "old" if it is related to economic factors and material needs (Keun, 2000; Larana, 1994; Sing, 2001). A movement is "new," however, if it relates to modern values and issues, such as human rights, justice, equal rights, environmental protection, peace, and so on (Jaeyol, 2000; Sing, 2001; Tilly, 1998).

A peasant movement is usually rooted in issues surrounding commodity production and a perceived conflict with the state (Lindberg in Omvedt, 1994). The conduciveness of the political climate is also relevant (Martin & Halpin, 1998; Haber, 1997; Tilly, 1998), because a movement can join a network of organizations with similar missions (Rosenthal et al., 1985) with the aim of achieving common goals (Molyneux, 1998). Farmer movements often also occur due to personal and cognitive mobilization (Keun, 2000).

In terms of social movements, it is not uncommon to dramatize social issues in order to publicize them. This in turn opens up opportunities for social change and increased

structural access for participants and other community members (Harper, 1989). Social movements have a positive impact, both at the personal level of the movement's participants and members of the community and at the macro level of society's structure (Cable & Degutis, 1997).

According to Smelser (1962), humans engage in collective behavior because something is wrong in their social environment. Several elements of the social environment are positioned as important determinants of collective behavior, namely structural conduciveness, structural tension, the growth and spread of "common trust," accelerating factors, participant mobilization, and social control. Smelser (1962) developed a concept he called "value added" to explain the process in which these various elements contribute to each other to trigger collective behavior.

The current researcher notes that although Smelser's (1962) theory is rather old and has received a lot of criticism, it is still appropriate for analyzing the phenomenon of the reclaiming/looting movement in Kalibakar, especially when related to the phenomenon of norm-oriented actors.

While Smelser's (1962) theory of norm-oriented movements emphasizes the important role of norms, Tilly (1978), on the other hand, discussed the collective action mobilization model, which emphasizes the interest aspect. According to Tilly (1978), an analysis of collective action has five major components: interest; organization (i.e., a well-defined group); mobilization, which relates to factors of production such as land, labor, capital, and technology; opportunities (e.g., politics, coalitions, competition); and the collective action itself, which also has internal conflicts of interest.

Tilly's (1978) mobilization analysis model can complement the one of Smelser (1962) in explaining how the peasant social movement arose in the case of Kalibakar. The reason for this is that Smelser (1962) did not emphasize interest, while Tilly (1978) does not pay attention to the belief aspect. In reality, both these were very decisive in the Kalibakar incident.

Regarding the formation of social networks, Roger Gould (2000) highlights this matter from a structuralist and rationalist perspective. From the structuralist perspective, it is said that social networks form under the influence of contextual local patterns or social

structures. Social actors are bound to specific roles or limited to the framework of certain institutions. Social behavior is not only influenced by economic positions, attitudes, and considerations of profit and loss but also by “strong social attachments” to other people. From the rationalist perspective, in contrast, it is said that network formation is influenced by self-interest.

The network theory used in this study may explain the process for creating a network structure in terms of the considerations or motives of actors to join, remain in, or leave a movement’s network. Several considerations and motives have been identified in previous studies, for example: the role of actor commitment (Cook & Kollock, Lawler & Yoon in Turner, 1998), rational calculations of cost and benefit in exchange theory (Turner, 1991), considerations of self-interest (Gould, 2000), and emotional glue (Markovsky & Lawlers in Ritzer, 2003).

Studies conducted by various researchers (Agustang et al., 2021; Asrawijaya, 2021; Djawa & Jacob, 2021; Putra et al., 2021; Septi, 2021; Wadu et al., 2021; Zulfan, 2021) have also discussed the social movements of farmers, with the results showing that the motive for the community’s rejection was based on news intersections being less valid, thus causing misunderstandings for farmers. Reasons included a lack of socialization, not involving the community in the decision-making process, the loss of culture, and damage to the surrounding natural environment.

Farmers and Land

For farmers, land is not just an economic commodity but also a sort of social and security commodity. Economically speaking, land is somewhere to carry out agricultural-production activities, thus providing the income to improve the quality of life for farming families. Socially speaking, land means self-existence, a feeling of being whole, so even the ground is a symbol of social status in society. In a security sense, owning their own land brings a certain sense of security to farmers, so land also has a psychological effect on farmers. Overall, land occupies a strategic position in the life of farmers, because it is their main capital and the source of their very culture. When land can be owned by farmers

and passed down to their children, it has great value. In some cultures, land is even seen as a second spouse (Bachri, 1999).

Bachri (1999) stated that if you emphasize a peasant movement's relationship to the land, it will naturally reflect the ways in which farmers regard the land. The meaning of land for farmers is reflected in the values they profess to believe in. In the case of the peasant movement that took place in the 1980s, the peasants attributed an ideological meaning to land. They defended their land not just because of its commodity value but the accumulated ideological values that shaped their perceptions of it. Farmers without land felt like they were no longer farmers. It is a sacred legacy from their ancestors that must be preserved, and land as a whole is associated with the very existence of the farmers themselves.

Farmer Organization

In general, farmers have no desire to fight unless some crisis really presses them into action, especially if outsiders encourage them to do so (Wolf, 1969). The view that farmers are unable to organize themselves was posited by Marx (1850) in *Peasantry as a Class* by saying that peasants could not fight for their class interests on their own behalf. As they are unable to represent themselves as a class, they must therefore be represented. These representatives must act as leaders, regulators, and institutional forces that protect this class from the pressures of other classes.

Structural and cultural pressures that reduce the subsistence conditions of farmers beyond their tolerance limit, according to Scott (1976), are enough to trigger farmers into venting their anger against the existing social order. Farmers are considered as always acting on behalf of the group when producing, engaging in politics, or fighting. Observers often take the view that poor farmers cannot escape their plights or do not have the tactical resources to fight back.

Methods

Design

This study applies a qualitative approach, which is a process of research for achieving an understanding of social phenomena or human problems. In this approach, the researcher painted a complex picture by examining texts, reporting the detailed views of respondents, and observing natural situations (Creswell, 2009). This study uses an intrinsic case study research design, which emphasizes a deep understanding of a single case because it is interesting. Its purpose is not to understand abstract constructs or phenomena that can then be generalized but rather emphasize the intrinsic importance over generalizations, because it is not intended to help form new theories (Idrus, 2009).

Informants

There were 18 informants selected from 6 villages. The informants were the head of villages 6, village secretary 6, and farmer leaders in the villages 6 persons. They were selected because of their authorities and roles in the villages. Their knowledge and experience in the problems of conflicts between farmers and the company were considered rich and depth (Yin, 2015; Creswell, 2009). The informants and research subjects were selected using purposive sampling. This sampling technique employed certain considerations that made it easier for the researchers to explore the social situation under study, and the snowball method was also applied (Sugiyono, 2014). In qualitative research, according to Creswell (2009), researchers can conduct sampling at the location, event, or process level, as well as at the participant level.

Data Collection

The data-collection method, according to Yin (2015) is an advice, comprising sources of evidence that could be used as the focus for collecting case study data. The sources of evidence, apart from the documents and interviews, are archival records, participant observation, and physical devices. Data collection in this study took the form of in-depth interviews with informants. Information of interest—such as the number of farmers participating in the social movement, both in the initial phase and during the research

period—were also obtained through interviews with farmers and other actors involved in the movement. Further data collection took place through observation by visiting conflict locations and observing several events directly, following the conflict resolution agenda, and applying documentary methods by examining several conflict-related documents. Visual materials were also obtained from archives that were maintained by several prominent farmers.

Data Analysis

Consistent to a case study design and qualitative approach used in this study, we adapt data analysis from Yin (2015) and Cresswell (2009). In general, the analysis included (1) converting numeric and texts into narrative data, (2) identifying themes and unit of analysis to confirm to the research questions, (3) determining coding system sample of relevant themes, (4) applying coding system to the entire narrative data, and (5) verifying the data and selecting proper data for further analysis.

Results and Discussion

Factors Causing Land Conflict

In the conflict between the farming community and PTPN XII, several factors lie at the source of the tension. Results of observation and interview to the informants and farmers reveal six concerns causing the conflict between farmers and the company. The factors are as follows:

- Opposing views about the status of the disputed land
- Ownership status of the forest to become the community and the company
- Implementation of Law No. 56 PRP 1960 article 8 saying that every farmer and his family owns a minimum of two hectares of agricultural land
- Expired HGU for the farmers
- Sense of hatred directed at the behaviors, attitudes, and policies of plantations
- Farmers were reported to have a crime conduct by the company

First, the conflicting parties—namely the people of the Simojayan, Tirtoyudo, and Bumirejo villages and PTPN XII—have opposing views about the status of the disputed land. The disparity in these perceptions has been growing larger since 1942. PTPN XII argues that it adheres to the Decree of the Minister of Agriculture No. 49/UM/1953: 17-4-1958s, which was the basis for issuing the HGU to PTPN XII in 1988. The farmers, meanwhile, although their claim is weak in the eyes of the law, believe that the land belonged to their ancestors, so it is theirs by ancestral right.

Second, there is some debate about the status of the Titi Tsoro (or TT) forest. The community claims that the forest belonged to the villages and was borrowed by PTPN XII to be used for cocoa farming. The plantation company, meanwhile, believes the forest is part of the HGU plantation area, specifically the “T” plot. TT forest itself is located in north Kalirejo and has an area of 22.50 hectares (Wahyudi, 2005). The desire of the community to reclaim the TT forest land is pursued in various ways, from peaceful means to aggressive reclamation.

Third, there is also the implementation of the government’s land-reform program, which aims to make sure that every farmer and his family owns a minimum of two hectares of agricultural land, as stated in Law no. 56 PRP 1960 Article 8. The implementation of this government program started in 1964 in order to overcome land scarcity, but it has invited a latent conflict that until now had not flared up. In addition, the idea of land reform among farmers has become a guiding principle that has been passed down from generation to generation, and it has become the strongest motivator for the community to engage in movements.

Fourth, the issuance of HGU certificate No.49/HGU/DA/88 to PTPN XII for a land area of 1,936,7330 hectares was valid for 25 years, so it expired on December 31, 2013. Some people posit that there were administrative irregularities in the HGU issuance procedure, while the plantation company insist that the issuance complied with the established procedures. The conflict between PTPN XII and the local community escalated in 2013 when PTPN XII’s HGU expired.

Fifth, there is a sense of hatred directed at the behaviors, attitudes, and policies of plantations. According to the community, the plantations have acted in a very cruel and

painful manner. In addition, the community believes that the actions and policies of the plantations do not agree with the norms and expectations of the communities around the plantations. Indeed, the presence of plantations is not considered to provide any welfare benefits for nearby villages and communities.

However, in contrast to what was conveyed by the community, the plantations assert that they have acted in accordance with the established rules. The difference between the two parties is stark. In the eyes of the community, plantations just take people's land and use the farmers as cheap laborers, while in the eyes of plantations, they are just employers who are obliged to follow the rules that were set for them.

Sixth, the farmers were reported to the authorities by PTPN XII. The conflict, which had been brewing for years, began to boil over again on December 15, 2015 when PTPN XII reported 37 people to the authorities, accusing them of grabbing land and committing criminal acts, such as destroying or using land without PTPN XII's permission. In addition, a report was also made for charges of trespassing and land grabbing in accordance with Article 167 and Article 385 of the Criminal Code and Plantation Law no. 39 of 2014 (Draft Press Release PTPN XII Kalibakar Plantation Year 2018). This intervention by the plantation company provoked a fierce reaction and retaliatory action from the community, and the conflict is still ongoing (Fauziah, 2018).

In terms of research findings for the factors causing the above conflict, Rauf (2001) explains in his book that the conflict was caused by differences in opinions or perceptions. These differences in the perceptions of PTPN XII and the community cover various phenomena, including 1) land status; 2) the logging of trees and occupation of former Dutch plantations; 3) the distribution of land by the village committee to farmers; 4) the status of Titi Tsoro forest; 5) the issuance of the HGU; 6) the commodification of labor; 7) the contribution of plantations to village development; 8) the reporting of farmers to the authorities; and 9) the withdrawal of dues for administering property rights certificates by the committee (Fauziah, 2018).

From the above causes of conflict, it can be seen that generally speaking, the causes of the conflict are differences in perceptions related to the plantation. According to the community, the major differences between the two lie in the following areas: 1) The land

the farmers occupy was the result of their ancestors' struggle to take it from the Dutch colonial government. 2) The HGU issued by the National Land Agency was legally flawed. 3) The HGU has expired and is no longer valid. 4) The plantation company's behavior toward the surrounding communities and their employees is almost colonial in nature. Finally, 5) the presence of plantations does not bring any prosperity to the surrounding community. In contrast, according to PTPN XII, the conflict was caused by misinterpretations by the community in the following areas: 1) The disputed land was not customary (*ulayat*) or privately owned land. 2) The plantation companies obtained a HGU legally based on the rule of law. 3) The company has conducted itself professionally and 4) satisfied its obligations to nearby communities (Fauziah, 2018).

Pruitt and Rubin (2009) state that in addition to differences in the perception of a social conflict, differences in interest exist between two or more parties, so a conflict will become increasingly difficult to resolve if both parties do not quickly reach an agreement that satisfies both parties (i.e., a win-win solution). The difference in interests between the community and PTPN XII concerns the rights to, and status of, the land, with PTPN XII asserting that it is state land that must be managed to generate income for the state, while the community claims the land belonged to their ancestors, so it should also belong to the current community.

Land is the main productive resource for this community, especially farmers, so as a means to provide a livelihood, it should be used by the state for the benefit of the community. From the plantation company's point of view, it is using a state asset to produce goods for generating foreign exchange and improving the welfare of the people around the plantations. Pruitt and Rubin (2009) also explain that there are three variables that determine the causes of a conflict, namely the aspiration level of one party, one party's perception of the aspirations of the other party, and an inability to find alternatives that can benefit both conflicting parties.

Before one party's interests can conflict with another's, those interests must be translated into aspirations. The difference in these two party's aspirations is as follows: The plantation company wants to acquire land that is in practice already being controlled by the community, while the community wants to gain legal ownership rights to the land in the

form of certificates. Between the two parties, the aspiration to acquire the land is so deeply rooted that each makes various efforts to obtain it. Until now, the conflict between PTPN XII and the community has not reached a compromise that can be accepted by both parties. As stated by Karl Marx, conflict must be viewed in terms of unequal ownership of capital, production factors, and the means of production producing two classes, namely the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Marx's analysis of conflict emphasized the ownership of production factors and the means of production, suggesting that a conflict is very economically dependent. The proletariat struggles for resources and economic adequacy against the bourgeoisie who control the means of production, so they have conflicting positions (Rauf, 2001). In this matter, PTPN XII sees the economic view of the plantation land generating foreign exchange for the country, and it has a strong legal umbrella as the legal owner of the right to do so, so it is the party with the greater economic power. This position is also indirectly used as a tool by PTPN XII to commoditize the community, such as by obliging them to work as plantation workers. However, an awareness of this economic imbalance also occurs in a community where land is considered as the source of a livelihood. Another consideration is that people believe that managing their own lands is much more profitable than working on a plantation. These economic considerations motivate each party to fight to achieve their aspirations.

Relations between the Actors and Conflict-Resolution Efforts

Conflicts cannot be separated from the relationship between the actors involved, but this relationship is often not a balanced one. The relationship in the conflict at the Kalibakar plantation involves two actors: Plantation company PTPN XII and the farmers of three villages, namely Simojaya, Tirtoyudo, and Bumirejo (Fauziah, 2018).

Community support came from interest groups, specifically advocacy groups represented by LBH Surabaya Malang (a legal aid institute). Next, there is a group of political organizations, specifically PPP, PDI-P, and Golkar. To this day, support is still being given to the people of Kalibakar by several political parties, but this support is populist in nature to secure votes in the general election. The last group comprises social organizations represented by the South Malang Farmers Communication Forum. Three interest groups

deal directly with the plantation company's side, including the plantation employees, both laborers and managers. In addition, BKBH Unibraw Malang is the legal counsel for the plantation company, and support is given under the pretext of competing with the actions of the community.

The dynamics of the conflict over the years has resulted in each conflicting party making various efforts to escape the cycle of conflict. Such efforts range from the persuasive to the repressive, but nothing has succeeded in reducing the tension between the two parties. This condition has caused the villages' communities, as well as the village government, to stand idly by rather than immediately resolve the conflict. The community first attempted to use peaceful means by asking PTPN XII to hand the land back in accordance with the oral agreement made in 1951. The community did not get a response, however, until the community and its leading figures decided to take a more aggressive route for reclaiming the land.

The occupation and reclamation of the plantation land was carried out systematically by the community, and it managed to control almost the entire plantation area. However, even though the land was in practice controlled by the community, the community experienced difficulties in establishing legal ownership of the land. In order to overcome the legal difficulties, the farmers and other stakeholders took various routes. The first route was to find weaknesses in the HGU procured by PTPN XII, and the community found many irregularities in the issuance procedure, so they considered PTPN XII's HGU to be legally flawed (Astawa, 2016).

The next effort was to request the support of the Regent and DPRD in fighting for the rights to the Kalibakar plantation land. The next step was to request assistance from LBH to act as the community's legal representative when dealing with PTPN XII. The community then also held a demonstration to BPN and PTPN XII to demand evidence about the procedure for extending PTPN XII's HGU (Astawa, 2016). The village government has tried to resolve the conflict through bureaucratic efforts, thus negotiating with the authorities to find a solution to this conflict. This interaction between the community and the government has had an impact on the conflict-resolution strategies used by the community, namely in the form of a) rejecting all forms of offers submitted by PTPN XII; (b) forming land-

settlement committees in each village; and (c) establishing a social network for farmers through the South Malang Farmers Communication Forum and submitting an application for land rights to the Minister of Agrarian Affairs.

PTPN XII has used a different strategy. On realizing that the farmers were strengthening their struggle, it made several efforts: (a) It took legal action, namely by reporting the farmers as provocateurs to the authorities, so they could be processed in accordance with applicable law, and (b) it approached the community, as well as village officials, in each conflicting village. These efforts took place in several forms, namely by conducting legal counseling with residents, holding several coordination meetings with all relevant parties, and trying to form friendships with local residents. (c) It also made an offer to set up cooperation in the form of a partnership where PTPN XII would plant basic crops, while residents would be given the opportunity to plant intercropping plants. (d) PTPN XII, through its legal representative, sent a letter to the Minister of Agriculture and Agrarian Affairs to confirm the ownership status of the plantation land, seeing as institutionally speaking, the central government is the only party with the authority to settle the Kalibakar plantation land dispute.

In an effort to resolve the conflict, the government of Malang Regency formed a conflict-resolution team called the Malang Regency Land Settlement Working Group. The team was responsible for facilitating a resolution to the conflict between PTPN XII and the community in a neutral and impartial manner. Several conflict-resolution efforts have been carried out by the working group, such as hosting coordination meetings and exploring bureaucratic channels with central government to find a resolution to this conflict. The working group proposed a compromise solution where half the land would be given to the community and the other half returned to the plantation (Fauzaiah, 2018).

Each party involved in this conflict insisted on fulfilling their aspirations for the Kalibakar plantation land, however. A strong desire to acquire the land was clear in their various efforts, which took the form of legal efforts in the courts or attempts to reach out-of-court settlements (Pruitt and Rubin, 2009). The plantation company mostly tried to resolve the conflict through legal channels, such as by reporting several farmers who they believed

were the main actors in the movement for violating the law. However, this action, which started in 1996 and ended in 2015, fail to get the desired results.

Conflict resolution was also carried out through out-of-court channels, namely through negotiation and deliberation. This method requires the conflicting parties to communicate openly and reach an agreement in the form of a compromise (Pruitt & Rubin, 2009). The last effort to hold a meeting with the Ministry of SOEs (state owned enterprises) of the Republic of Indonesia took place on June 6, 2016 in Jakarta, and this resulted in concluding that the authority to release the Kalibakar land was in the hands of the directors of PTPN XII and the SOEs of the Republic of Indonesia, because 90% of the shares in PTPN XII were owned by the state.

In addition to the two efforts above, the plantation company also offered a partnership collaboration to the community. This is in line with what Limbong (2014) conveyed, where such a partnership is an integrated cooperative relationship between smallholders and plantations such that both parties mutually benefit and respect each other's position (Limbong, 2014). The offered was made by the plantation company in 2007 but has always been rejected by the community because it wants a partnership pattern where the community owns the land and the plantation company is the manager. The people of Bumirejo village did establish a partnership with the plantation, but it did not last long because it did not lead to prosperity for the villagers.

In line with what was expressed by Pruitt and Rubin (2009), conflicting parties can use several strategies to escape a cycle of conflict. In the case of land conflicts, a contentious strategy is often adopted that tends to have an aggressive nature in carrying out various forms of contentious aspirational actions (Pruitt & Rubin, 2009). The first technique used in this strategy was to use persuasive arguments, so the community asked for the return of the land based on an oral agreement that the land would be returned to the community. In addition, a bureaucratic route was also taken to find a solution to the Kalibakar plantation land issue.

The highest level actions took the form of threats, however. These threats were made in response to the plantation company not acknowledging the community's efforts. The threats began when the land-acquisition activists were stigmatized as PKI minions if they

refused to hand over plantation land to PTPN XII. Then the next threat was to report several people who were considered major stakeholders to the police (Pruitt & Rubin, 2009). Despite the various efforts that have been made by each party, no middle ground has been found between the two parties, and the relationship between them remains a tense one.

This study finds evidences that tension of conflict in the claim on the ownership status of forest has been compromised by both the community and company through win-win dialogues. Legal aspects are avoided and participatory approach is emphasized. This study therefore has a novelty in that compromise approach to solve the conflict between farmers and company is to let the farmers continue to cultivate the land and the company allocates land for the farmers.

Conclusion

In summary, factors affecting the conflict between farmers and the company in Kalibabar that cause farmer's social movement and involves plantation company PTPN XII and the communities of six villages, were caused by differences perceptions and interests of the conflicting parties. The differences in perception relate to the history of the land's ownership, the status of Titi Tsoro forest, the validity of the HGU, the process for extending the HGU, and PTPN XII's contribution to developing surrounding communities. The differences in interests, meanwhile, relate to whether the land should be a resource for the community or a production asset for PTPN XII. Efforts to resolve this agrarian conflict have gone through legal and non-legal channels. Various methods have been used by both parties to reach a solution that does not overly harm both parties, but such efforts have so far failed to find a suitable mutual agreement. Along the way, such agrarian conflicts receive encouragement and support from various political organizations, such as political parties, legislative institutions, and the ruling elite, who may support the community in order to gain public popularity and secure votes in elections.

This study is by no means perfect. Intensive observation and involvement of the researcher in the conflict area is limited. Future research is suggested to conduct ethnography approach and data are collected in a multisite approach. Researchers should live together with community in a certain time so that enough data and perception have been clearly defined.

References

- Agustang, A., Quraisy, H., & Asrifan, A. (2021). *Muhammadiyah dalam Gerakan Sosial di Kabupaten Wajo. Osf.Oi*, 1–16. <https://osf.io/dpsg9>
- Amin, S. (2010). Mobilisasi dan Perubahan Sosial di Wilayah Konflik Agraria: Studi Kasus Paseduluran Petani Penggarap PT. Tratak (P4T). *Jurnal Analisis Sosial*, 15(1), 94–134.
- Asia, N., Sarwoprasodjo, S., & Gandasari, D. (2018). Dialog dan Tindakan Kolektif Kelompok Tani dalam Program Sertifikasi Kakao di Provinsi Sulawesi Barat. *Jurnal Komunikasi Pembangunan*, 16(1), 15–29.
- Asrawijaya, E. (2021). Konsep Voluntarisme Dalam Gerakan Samin Tolak Pabrik Semen. *ETNOREFLIKA: Jurnal Sosial dan Budaya*, 10(2), 144–156.
- Astawa, K. D. (2016). *Strategi Penyelesaian Konflik Tanah Perkebunan*. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang
- Azhima, A. F. (2011). *Keberhasilan gerakan Zapatista di Meksiko (19942009): Analisa keterhubungan dengan masyarakat sipil global*. Jakarta: UI Press.
- Bachri, S., & Djaenudin, D. (1999). Iklim sebagai salah satu faktor penentu kesesuaian lahan untuk pengembangan tanaman pangan lahan kering didaerah Pantura Jawa Barat bagian timur. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pertanian*, 18(1), 29-39.
- Cable, S. dan & Degutis, B. (1997). Movements Outcomes and Dimensions of Social Change: the Multiple Effects of Local Mobilizations. *Current Sociology*, 45(3), 121-135.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design, Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2015). *Penelitian Kualitatif dan Desain Riset, Memilih di antara Lima Pendekatan* (S. Z. Qudsy (ed.)). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Djawa, R. M., & Jacob, A. R. P. (2021). Pembangunan Pabrik Tebu Di Kabupaten Sumba Timur (Studi Gerakan Sosial Masyarakat Adat Terkait Penolakan Pembangunan Pabrik Tebu di Desa Wanga, Kecamatan Umalulu, Kabupaten Sumba Timur). *Jurnal Politicon*, 10(1), 9–22.
- Durkheim, E. (1951). *Sociologie et philosophie*. Presses Universitaires de France.

- Fauziah, I. A. R. (2018). *Konflik Pertanahan Lahan Perkebunan Kalibakar Antara PTPN XII dengan Masyarakat di Kabupaten Malang* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Airlangga).
- Freeman, J. (1979). *A Model for Analyzing the Strategic Option of Social Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freire, P. (2008). *Pendidikan Kaum Tertindas*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Fringka, Y. (2017). Resistensi berbasis adat: perlawanan masyarakat Nagari III Koto, Tanah Datar, Sumatera Barat, terhadap rencana Tambang Bukit Batubasi. *MASYARAKAT: Jurnal Sosiologi*, 21(2), 205–231.
- Goldbard, A. (2006). *New creative community: The art of cultural development*. New village press.
- Gould, Roger V., (2000). Why Do Networks Matter? Rationalist and Structuralist Interpretations, paper dalam Workshop tentang “*Social Movement Analysis: The Network Perspective*” di Loch Lomond Skotlandia.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). The modern prince. Selections from the prison notebooks, 123-205.
- Haber, P. L. (1997). Social Movements and Socio-Political Change in Latin America. *Current Sociology*, 45(2), 21–140.
- Hapsari, D. R. (2016). Peran Jaringan Komunikasi Dalam Gerakan Sosial Untuk Pelestarian Lingkungan Hidup. *Jurnal Komunikasi Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia*, 1(1), 25–36.
- Harper, C.L. (1989). *Exploring Sosial Change*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs
- Idrus, M. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Ilmu Sosial Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Penerbit Erlangga.
- Ife, J., & Tesoriero, F. (2008). *Community development: Alternatif pengembangan masyarakat di era globalisasi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 265.
- Keun, Song Ho, (2000). Analysis of Participants in the New Social Movements in Korea: Mobilization and Network. *Korea Journal/autumn*, 2000, halaman 95–130.
- Klandermans, B. (1984). Mobilization and participation: Social-psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory. *American sociological review*, 583-600.

- Kusbianto. (2016). *Penyelesaian Sengketa Tanah Perkebunan Pada Areal Perusahaan Basan Usaha Milik Negara (BUMN) Perkebunan di Sumatera Utara*. Sumatera: Disertasi Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Laporan Hasil Rapat Kerja Pendalaman Pansus Ranperda (2017). di Hotel Savana & Convention Malang pada 13-15 Juli 2017.
- Limbong, Bernhard. (2014). *Politik Pertanahan*. Jakarta: Margareth Pustaka
- Larana, Johnston Gusfield, (1994). *New Social Movements: from Ideology to Identity*. Temple University Press.
- Larson, D. F., Keijiro Otsuka, Tomoya Matsumoto & Talpi K. (2012). Should African Rural Development Strategies Depend on Smallholder Farms? An exploration of the inverse productivity hypothesis, *Policy Research Working Paper 6190*.
- Long, N. (2001). *Development Sociology: Actor Perspectives*, Routledge, London.
- Martin, P. dan & Halpin, D. (1998). Landcare as a Politically Relevant New Social Movement?, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 14(1), 445–457.
- Marx, K. (1850). Dalam Teodor Shanin (ed) 1971, *Peasantry as a Class*, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- McMichael, P. (2010). Petani membuat sejarah sendiri, tapi tidak seperti yang mereka inginkan. In *Gerakan-gerakan agraria transnasional (pp. 75–123)*. Sekolah Tinggi Pertanahan Nasional.
- Moenawar, M. G., Priatna, W. B., & Santoso, H. (2019). Consciousness Raising dan Partisipasi Politik Suku Baduy di Era Digital. *Jurnal Komunikasi Pembangunan*, 17(1), 69–80.
- Molyneux, M. (1998). Analysing Women's Movements, *Development and Change*, 29(2), 219–245.
- Mustain, (2007). *Petani vs Penguasan: Gerakan Sosial Petani Melawan Hegemoni Negara*, Yogyakarta: Ar Ruzz media.
- Omvedt, G. (1994). Peasants, Dalits and Women: Democracy and India's New Social Movement, *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 24(1), 35–48.
- Ploeg, van der D. J. (2017). The importance of peasant agriculture: a neglected truth. Wageningen University & Research: Farewell address upon retiring as Professor of Transition Processes in Europe

- Putra, J. I., Alfiandi, B., & Afrizal. (2021). Strategi Pemanfaatan Sumber Daya dalam Gerakan Sosial Perlawanan Komunitas Salingka Gunung Talang terhadap Penetapan Wilayah Kerja Geotermal Gunung Talang-Bukit Kili, Kabupaten Solok , Sumatra Barat. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 5(1), 2109–2117.
- Pruitt, D. G. & Rubbin J. Z. (2009). *Teori Konflik Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar Offset
- Rachman, N. F. (2017). *Petani dan Penguasa, Dinamika Perjalanan Politik Agraria Indonesia*. Insist Press.
- Ramdloni, M. (2005). *Teologi Petani: Analisis Peran Islam dalam Radikalisme Gerakan Petani pada Forum Perjuangan Petani Nelayan Batang Pekalongan (FP2NB) di Kabupaten Batang dan Pekalongan*. [Tesis]. Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Rauf, M. (2001). *Konsensus Politik dan Konflik Politik: Sebuah Penjajagan Teoritis*. Jakarta: Direktorat Jendral Pendidikan Tinggi Departemen Pendidikan Nasional
- Rediale, R. (2016). *Penguasaan Lahan HGU PTPN XII Perkebunan Oleh Masyarakat Penggarap dalam Masa Permohonan Perpanjangan Hak*. Malang: Universitas Brawijaya.
- Regus, M. (2011). Tambang dan perlawanan rakyat: studi kasus tambang di Manggarai, Ntt. *Masyarakat: Jurnal Sosiologi*, 16(1), 1–26
- Reyes, A-E. & Dueñas, J-M. (2021). Medicinal gardens as an educational strategy in the teaching of the natural sciences: A pedagogical proposal. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology (RESSAT)*, 6(1), 25-39. <https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2021.2>
- Ritzer, George dan Goodman, Douglas J., (2003). *Teori Sosiologi Modern (Terjemahan dari Alimandan)*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
- Rosenthal, N. Fingrutd, Meryl; dan Ethier, M. (1985), Social Movements and Network Analysis: A Case Study of Nineteent-Century Women’s Reform in New York State. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90(5), 1022–1054.
- Samberg, L. H., James S G., Navin R., M. Herrero & Paul C. West (2016). Subnational distribution of average farm size and smallholder contributions to global food production, in: *Environmental Research Letters* 11, 124010 doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/12/124010
- Septi, K. H. (2021). Menghadirkan Kemandirian Petani: Studi Kasus Peran Sekolah Tani Muda (Sektimuda) sebagai Civil Society di Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Pemberdayaan*

Masyarakat, 9(1), 98–119.

- Sarwoprasodjo S. (2007). *Penggunaan Ruang Publik Untuk Pemecahan Masalah Sosial di Pedesaan*. [Disertasi]. Depok: Universitas Indonesia.
- Sasongko, T. H. (2006). *Potret Petani: Basis Pembaruan Agraria*. Jakarta: AKATIGA.
- Scott, J. C. (1976). *The Moral Economy of the Peasant*, New Heaven: Yale University Press.
- Setyadi, Y. (2016). *Komunikasi Gerakan Sosial Penolakan Relokasi Kawasan Rawan Bencana Gunung Merapi (Kasus Desa Glagaharjo, Kecamatan Cangkringan, Kabupaten Sleman, DIY)*. IPB University
- Sing, R. (2001). *Social Movement, Old and New: A Post- Modernist Critique*. New Delhi/Thousand Oaks/London: Sage Publications.
- Smelser, N. J., (1962). *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York: The Free Press.
- Sugiyono. (2014). *Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif*. Alfa Beta.
- Sunarto, K. (2000). *Pengantar Sosiologi*, Edisi Kedua, Jakarta: Lembaga Penerbit FE UI.
- Susan, N. (2014). *Pengantar Sosiologi Konflik*. Kencana.
- Syawaludin, M. (2014). Perlawanan Petani Rengas Terhadap PTPN VII di Ogan Ilir Sumatera Selatan. *Jurnal Sosiologi Reflektif*, 9(1), 113–130.
- Tauchid, M. (2009). *Masalah Agraria Sebagai Masalah Penghidupan dan Kemakmuran Rakyat Indonesia*. STPN Press.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Amerika Serikat: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Tilly, C. (1998). Social Movements and (all sors of) other Political Interactions-Local, National, and International-Including Identities. *Theory and Society* 27:453–480, 1998.
- Turner, J. R. H. (1991). *The Structure of Sociological Theory*: First Edition. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Turner, J. R. H. (1998). *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Sixth Edition. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

- Wager, S.J., & Schulz, D. E. (1995). Civil-military relation in Mexico: the Zapatista revolt and its implication. *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, 27(1), 166–251.
- Wibowo, I. (2010). *Negara centeng*. Kanisius.
- Wijanarko, (2014). Komunikasi penyadaran kritis gerakan petani. *Makara Hubs-Asia*, 18 (1), 1-14.
- Wolf, E. R. (1969). dalam Teodor Shanin (ed) 1971, *On Peasant Rebellion*, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Wadu, J., Lake, P., & Pita, C. (2021). Resistensi Masyarakat Adat Dalam Pembangunan Waduk Lambo di Desa Rendubutowe Kecamatan Aesesa Selatan Kabupaten Nagekeo. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 16(2).
- Wahyudi. (2005). *Formasi dan Struktur Gerakan Sosial Petani: Studi Kasus Reklaiming/Penjarahan Atas Tanah PTPN XII (Persero) Kalibakar*. Malang: Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang
- Zulfan. (2021). Pengaruh Elit Pedesaan Terhadap Gerakan Sosial di Indonesia pada Tahun 1818-1935. *Serambi Akademica: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sains, Dan Humaniora*, 9(2), 192–200.