

Environmentality Reconsidered: Indigenous To Lindu Conservation Strategies and the Reclaiming of the Commons in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia

Greg Acciaioli / Anthropology & Sociology
University of Western Australia
Email: acciaiol@cyllene.uwa.edu.au

Introduction

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,' Arun Agrawal (2005) 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 NGO projects of conservation result in more profound inculcation of custodial attitudes or conservationist sensibility. What this essay seeks to explore is the formation of other sorts 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 organisations 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 but a rationalization for the assertion of the prerogatives of categorical indigeneity, seeking dominance for one specific party within the continuing operation of conflicting agendas among the parties involved. 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 of the Lindu plain, which they are attempting to re-appropriate as inalienable village land that can be allocated for use to other inhabitants of the plain only by the local customary council, whose membership is exclusively To Lindu.¹

Indigeneity and National Parks

Since the 1970s, as a result of a confluence of interests between the interests of the international lobby for better management of natural resources and the indigenous people's movement (Clad 1988, p. 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, whether having long resided there, and thus claiming the warrant of indigeneity in the region, or having been resettled or spontaneously migrated to the region. Agencies such as the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) have sought to incorporate 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 utilising 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 Kakadu National Park and 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 *Salvaging* section 4, p. 7).^{iv} In order to surmount the first problem of surrounding land degradation, park managers have fostered development projects and land use plans for peoples living in areas surrounding such parks and reserves to enhance the quality of their lands and thus prevent, or at least minimise, destructive incursions of such peoples into the reserve land.

However, such efforts have been focussed almost exclusively on cooperation with peoples deemed indigenous. As the IUCN 'Task Force on Traditional Lifestyles' defined their object of attention:

The ways of life (cultures) of indigenous people which have evolved locally and are based on sustainable use of local ecosystems; such lifestyles are often at subsistence levels of production and are seldom a part of the mainstream culture of their country, although they do contribute to its cultural wealth (Clad 1988, p 322).

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, and in similar occupations). Even among those organisations urging such cooperation with indigenous peoples, there has been a divergence of opinion as to the limits of considering their work. Some organisations, 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, reconceptualised 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, since 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; in addition, it would be unethical to institutionalize 'enforced primitivism', as the World Bank terms it in its rejection of such practices, on such peoples in the interest of nature conservation. Such enforcement would simply lead to the production of human zoos, as was unfortunately exemplified during WWII with the Japanese conversion of island of Lan Yu into private botanical/anthropological museum with access only to government officials and anthropologists up to 1945. Although the creation of multi-purpose conservation areas, as in case of New Zealand's 'multiple use reserves', has accommodated aspects of the former outlook, the latter 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: TNC and The Biosphere Reserve

A prominent proponent of the biosphere reserve concept, under its own term of 'eco-region', is the Nature Conservancy (TNC), one of the most active players in the world of park preservation. Headquartered in Arlington, Virginia, and owning over 1,300 preserves in the USA, it operates the largest private system of nature sanctuaries in the world. 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. TNC 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', and hence complete custodianship by local peoples, whether indigenous or not, as sufficient 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, differently elaborated in different contexts, with some park areas subject to human use, including the creation of enclaves, while others are designated as out of bounds.

TNC's Parks in Peril (PiP) program has become its flagship program to implement such a strategy (Brandon, Redford and Sanderson 1998: Foreword). The largest single program supporting parks in the western hemisphere, it encompasses 60 parks in 18 countries throughout Latin and South America, covering over 30 million ha. 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
- 4) (introduced in 1995) use experiences of PiP site-based activities to influence conservation in other sites in the region's most imperiled ecosystems

In contrast to orientations based on the presumed adequacy of 'sustained use' to protect the diversity of plants, animals and natural communities, shared by approaches labelled by such terms as 'parks for people', sustainable development and use, conservation for development, grassroots community-based conservation, etc., the PiP program retains the notion of protected areas excluding human uses (i.e. core zones), arguing that the use of any technique of forest product harvesting or cultivation, modern or traditional, imposed or indigenous, is scale-dependent. 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* or TNLL), 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^v (Sangaji et al. 2004: 17). Indeed, TNC'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. TNC'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*, vol. 1, p.2).

Compared to earlier policies, the emphasis of TNC upon a collaborative management strategy with indigenous stakeholders 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 claims rights as a 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.^{xvi} 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 AMASUTA, the provincial umbrella organisation erected in the wake of the general AMAN congress originally to facilitate organisation of the campaigns of 'indigenous societies' in Central Sulawesi, the focus is now on 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 in general was the problem; gaining control of land was

only one aspect of addressing this wider economic issue, and it was a need for farmers in general. He now regarded AMASUTA as an 'organisation for the people' (*organisasi rakyat*) rather than just a forum for such local customary societies as the To Lindu, although much of the work in which it engaged tended still to be in the area of facilitating the formation of 'customary councils' for peoples considered to be 'indigenous'.

However, the wider scope of concern of such NGOs is revealed in such cases as 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 2002) is the 'non-indigenous' status of the occupiers of DongiDongi. These occupiers hail from the four villages of Kadidia, Rahmat, Kamarora A and Kamarora B, located further to the southwest from the DongiDongi site of occupation off the road leading through the Palolo upland plain down to Biromaru in the Palu Valley near the northern boundary of TNLL. As the designations A and B betray for two of them, these are not long-settled villages; rather they are largely inhabited by resettlers from various montane regions surrounding the Palu Valley, prominent among them TopoDa'a from Marawola subdistrict, mainly (70% by one estimate) the Pakawa region, in the mountains to the west of Palu, To Winatu and To Pipikoro from what has just been founded as a new subdistrict, Pipikoro, formerly comprising the southernmost region of Kulawi subdistrict. These peoples had been moved to Palolo as part of the programs for the the Resettlement of the 'Isolated Peoples' (*Pemukiman Kembali Masyarakat Terasing* [I] or PKMT), where a remote or 'isolated people' is officially defined as a 'people or a group of people whose habitats/residences are located 24 hours or more in traveling time from a provincial capital city measured by using public transportation' (Depagri, Dirjen Bangdes 1992) Following in the tradition of Dutch programs to move mountain peoples, including the To Lindu, in the first decades of the twentieth century, this program had begun in independent Indonesia in the 1950s, but had only intensified in the 1970s under the direction of the Department of Social Affairs (*Departemen Sosial* or Depsos) after the imposition of the New Order (Haba 1999). The seventies and eighties witnessed the efflorescence of this program in Central Sulawesi, with the majority of the populations of these municipal villages (*desa*) in the Palolo upland valley, formerly an area under the control of Biromaru but now a subdistrict on its own, being populated under the auspices of this program.

Given their transposition from their homelands by this program, such resettlers would have difficulty being classified as customary societies according to even the criteria definition put forth as a working definition 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)

And, certainly, the land they are occupying in DongiDongi cannot 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 2002). In fact, they justify their

occupation, in part, on other grounds, noting that although this land is now part of TNLL, it was formerly part of the logging concession (*Hak Pengelolaan Hutan* or HPH) of PT Kebun Sari, a joint venture with a Japanese logging firm, and is primarily covered by secondary forest; this coverage by 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 ha 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 underwritten by these NGOs, the resettlers had only received between .5 and .8 ha 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 2002, p. 15). In addition, land that they had used for gathering rattan and for hunting to supplement their diet, given their inability to subsist on the land actually allotted to them under the PKMT program, 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 recognised 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 materialised.

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 very name of that forum 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 programs, 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.

To date their claims have gained little sympathy from either the government or the TNLL park managers, although some officials from the Department of Forestry and from the provincial government, which has no authority in national park areas, have endorsed their claim. Despite the demonstration in front of this office, the Governor of Central Sulawesi issued on 18 August 2001 an order for DongiDongi to be vacated, while, not to be undone, the Bupati of Donggala Regency gave the police three days to

empty DongiDongi of these 'squatters', another order which failed in implementation. The park director also requested a police investigation of another NGO working with the Free Farmers' Forum, the People's Legal Aid Society (Yayasan Bantuan Hukum Rakyat or YBHK). 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, noting the lack of any true settlement in the Dongi-Dongi area and the unregulated cutting down of the forest in which the occupants, including Bugis chain-saw operators who had followed in the wake of the original Da'a and Pipikoro settlers from the resettlement villages in Palolo, were involved. The occupiers themselves had labelled their settlement with the traditional name *Ngata Katupua* (Settlement of Hope or *Tanah Harapan*) and allocated land in blocks corresponding to each of the four villages in Palolo providing occupants. The continuing opposition of the park management and its partner TNC has prompted the director of one opposing NGO to label these resource management organisations as engaged in program of 'eco-fascism' (Sangaji 2002, p. 16).

In the wake of past controversies and especially given 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 development projects that have stripped customary societies of their land and rights. What they see as real conservation is the indigenous systems land use that have maintained a balance with sylvan environments throughout the centuries preceding government incursions into their lands through such channels as development projects, (Sangaji 2002, p. 14, 2002b, p. 16), including transmigration, and the granting of concessions for logging, plantations, and other concerns. 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, it was simply unjust to consider the cutting down of trees by people like the DongiDongi occupants as illegal, since it was just another instance of blaming local societies (what Sangaji has also labelled the mechanism of 'scapegoating' such societies as *kambing hitam*). Why have firms supplying Palu's 124 sawmills with logs from throughout the surrounding forests, many of them illegally obtained, not been prosecuted, while such stringent actions are urged upon the impoverished occupants of DongiDongi? To them it is an issue not of conservation, but of agrarian social justice, tired as they are of seeing only the 'small people' blamed for such issues as deforestation. As advocates from local NGOs such as WALHI Sulteng and Yayasan Tanah Merdeka agree, authority to monitor resource use must be given to local societies, as they are the ones whose systems of forest use have never been 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

Although still viewing such arguments for the sufficiency of sustainable use along customary grounds as insufficient to carry through the project of sustaining biodiversity, such organizations as TNC have responded with their own innovations to increase the commitment of surrounding stakeholders to the conservation regulations of TNLL, including the continuing commitment to a model of zonation requiring strict exclusion from core zones (*zona inti*), limited exploitation of materials in forest zones (*zona rimba*), and limited production in use zones (*zona pemanfaatan*). New forms of co-management agreements with local society members have constituted one form of such response, a response that has sought to encompass a greater number of inhabitants than just the 'indigenous peoples' that had been the target of earlier overtures. But such steps require a brief overview of the history of such agreements in the region.

A number of nongovernmental organizations have been involved in the setting up of conservation agreements in the region of TNLL, and each has taken a different approach. One of the very first was the Palu-based NGO YTM, which brokered a conservation agreement between the Katu society and the TNLL management as part of the granting of enclave status to the Katu people, allowing them to maintain their stable swidden regimen within the boundaries of TNLL (Mappatoba and Birner 2004, p. 26; Sangaji 2002b). Following that model, YTM has also facilitated conservation agreements with a two other villages surrounding the park, and in each case the emphasis has been upon the recognition of indigenous rights in regard to land and other resources in return for the community carrying out such activities as patrolling for rattan theft from parkland. In contrast, a second organization facilitating such agreements has been the international relief and development organization CARE. In contrast to YTM's focus, CARE's emphasis has been upon the provision of rural development, including agricultural extension and infrastructure provision. Rules pertaining to conservation practices were developed only as a part of a general set of procedural rules for the village as an implicit prerequisite for the provision of development services facilitated by CARE. Given this focus on community development, CARE has tended to work with the formal village government, the *kepala desa* and the *aparatus desa*, rather following YTM's practice of dealing primarily with customary institutions, such as the customary council (*Lembaga (H)Adat*). However, after having overseen some dozen such agreements, CARE ceased to be involved in such transactions, instead providing funds to a local sister organisation Yayasan Yambata, which began the process of overseeing contracts in five villages where the protection of the Maleo bird and its eggs constituted a major challenge. In contrast to CARE's focus, Yambata has followed lines more similar to YTM in focussing upon customary institutions to oversee such contracts.

More recent have been the efforts of the Central Sulawesi Integrated Area Development and Conservation Project (CSIADCP), a long-term plan of rural development and conservation initiatives funded by the Asian Development Bank, to oversee the drawing up of such agreements. Initially, under conditions set by the Asian Development Bank, CSIADCP had supported plans to resettle indigenous groups like the Katu out of conservation areas, but after the Park Director's according of enclave status to the Katu community it was forced to re-orient its policies. Beginning soon after the turn of the millennium, CSIADCP began a process of arranging conservation agreements

with 60 villages in the vicinity of TNLL, though most of those agreements were not formalised until May 2004. And even given the lengthy development period, CSIADCP officials admit that these agreements constitute only an ‘entry point’, having been based only on consultations and workshops of one day’s length in each village. The agreements have a standard title – *Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat Adat Desa X Kecamatan A* or Conservation Agreement of the Customary Village X in Subdistrict A) and follow a standard format, giving the laws and regulations that form its legal basis, listing its aims – which in most cases are oriented primarily to ensuring the free flow of watercourses and continuous provisioning of fresh water – listing the contracting parties – members of the customary community (*masyarakat adat*), customary functionaries (*tokoh adat*), religious functionaries, social functionaries (i.e. the governmental apparatus) – with perhaps a map showing the location of the village relative to TNLL attached, and then listing the contents of the agreement, which merely re-specify in slightly greater detail the aims, and then finally listing the signatories. To take but one example, the contents of the specific agreement with the customary community of Pilimakujawa in Kulawi subdistrict were as follows:

III The Content of the Agreement

- A. To maintain the conservation of the ecosystem of the river basin area and not to cut trees in the vicinity of the Water intake or the rivers’ flood plains.
- B. To maintain and raise the level of sanitation of the sources of clean water in the vicinity of the intake so that there does not occur any contamination of the clean water
- C. To put into effect customary sanctions against transgressions
- D. This conservation agreement is made by the people of the village in their respective capacities and is signed by a representative of adat functionaries, society functionaries, religious functionaries, a youth representative, a women’s representative, the head of the village customary council, the head of the village representative body (BPD).

(Fasilitas FWP-TNLL, CSIADCP [Central Sulawesi Integrated Area Development and Conservation Program] Lore Lindu. *Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat Adat Desa Pilimakujawa, Kecamatan Kulawi*. Pilimakujawa, Mei 2004)

The following page of the agreement lists the categories of customary sanctions and the cash equivalents decided upon to substitute for fines that traditionally were paid in sets of water buffalo, brass plates (*dulang*), and traditional cloths (*mbesa*), reiterating that the decision of the level of fines to be paid by transgressors are to be set by local customary council (*lembaga adat*). The final page before the signatures constitutes a specification of customary transgressions and the customary sanctions applied to them, in the case of the Pilimakujawa agreement an expansion of point C. of the contents as follows:

The Management System of the River Basin as Local Wisdom:

Prohibition on cutting down trees along 23 listed river courses, noting especially their upriver sections (*hulu sungai*):

Types of regulations and Adat Prohibitions

- a. Replanting with annual plants that have an economic value
- b. Cannot open or add new fields

- c. Prohibited to use electric currents or potassium [cyanide]
- d. Prohibited to cut down trees
- e. Prohibited to use traps for wild animals
- f. Prohibited to use air rifles
- g. Using wood for construction can only be with the permission of the Adat Council/Government
- h. Undertaking research has to be with permission of the Adat Council/Government and the results of the research have to be reported to the village.
- i. Prohibited to take wood or anything else from the locations of others without permission.

What is most apparent from such an example, besides the conservation focus on water quality issues, is the social focus on local 'indigenous people' (*masyarakat adat* or 'customary community'). This focus aligns these agreements with those facilitated by YTM and Yambata, all of which presume 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 contestations of park authority like DongiDongi, where settlers in the area have been those most active in transgressing park regulations.

The Nature Conservancy has taken a very different tack in drawing up its conservation agreements in the vicinity of TNLL. Beginning at about the same time as CSIADCP, as of 2004 TNC has managed to initiate 14 conservation agreements, with 5 of them completed and approved by the TNLL management office (Mappatoba and Birner 2004, p. 18). These first agreements were transacted in Lore Utara on the eastern side of the park, and have already been the subject of review (Khaeruddin 2002). What I want to concentrate on here is the more recent (i.e. March 2005) agreement entered into with the four villages of the Lindu plain, whose surrounding lands constitute an enclave within TNLL (Desa Puroo, Langko, Tomado dan Anca 2005 *Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat Dataran Lindu, Kecamatan Kulawi, Kabupaten Donggala*). As Mappatoba and Birner (2004, p. 28) have noted, TNC has taken a very different tack from other organizations facilitating such agreements. While working with both customary functionaries and administrative village officials, it 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 forest products, not only timber, but such non-timber products as rattan. But there have been transitions in its orientation as well, as it has moved away from a position of brokering between communities and other organisations and projects providing development services and infrastructure for community development in the periphery of the park, insisting on commitment to observing conservation rules in exchange for provision of such services as drinking water and marketing assistance for organically grown coffee. More recently, in accordance with its interpretation of Forest Act No. 41/1999 on community participation in forestry, it has linked community commitment to conservation to Park management recognition of customary rights, including accessing products from customary land (*tanah adat*) now claimed as part of the national park.

The 2005 ‘conservation agreement with the society of the Lindu plain’, while similar in basic format to those transacted by 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: ‘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*], p. 1). While asserting the setting up of national parks as a measure to combat the increasing rate of extinctions in this chain, 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 programs 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*, p. 1), signalling respect for these, but also the need to balance these 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 project 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, and list the meetings and consultations that have led to the agreement.

The actual chapters (*bab*) 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 those of the 4 respective villages and the assertion of the authority of the national park institutions. The document proclaims its commitment to a ‘participatory management planning’ (*perencanaan pengelolaan partisipatif*) 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, blancing both ecological and social considerations. Besides these basic principles and general stipulations, specific paragraphs determine the limitations on felling trees (e.g. for house decorations, customary rituals, etc.) , taking rattan, hunting, gathering damar, 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 – opening up land for gardens, grazing livestock, and dealing with water courses – in park land, opening the possibility for further development of these stipulations in accord with the basic principles.

However, what is perhaps most important in this regard is the specification of institutions for the carrying out of this agreement. Even in its early specification of contributing discussions to the formation of the agreement, it made no differentiation

between the *adat* councils of Anca, Langko, and Tomado, villages all dominated by indigeneous 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 focussed only on the indigenous groups (*masyarakat adat*) of the area, the TNC agreement is meant to encompass settlers as well. This encompassment is made clearer in the specification of the ‘village conservation organisations’ (*lembaga konservasi desa* or LKD) in Chapter 6, paragraphs 21 and 22, of the agreement. The LKD are labelled as ‘the institutions that represent society in conservation efforts in TNLL at the village level’, and function 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 Conservations 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

The LKD are formed ‘on the basis of the Decision of the Village Head in accordance with the results of village consultations that have been attended by the Park Management of Lore Lindu National Park, the Village Government, the Village Representative Body, the Adat Council and other members of the society’ ((*Kesepakatan Lindu*, p. 7) with members serving for three years.^{xvii} However, much like the other agreements reviewed earlier, responsibility for adjudicating transgressions and administering punishments – in traditional terms – is allocated to the *adat* councils of the plain, though to be transacted in the presence of park management staff, the village government apparatus, the village representative body (BPD), and the LKD. Disputes among village members that are related to the conservation agreement are also to be settled by the customary councils. In the final paragraph devoted to ‘miscellaneous matters’ (*lain-lain*), the aim of the agreement is clearly stated as constituting an endeavour to ‘obtain acknowledgement of its [the local society’s] management of natural resources in the customary territory that is located within the region of the Lore Lindu National Park’ – a clear statement, at least on paper, that the notion of customary territory is to be respected, with practical consequences of management flowing from this recognition, and is not superseded by the imposition of National Park status upon such territory.^{xviii}

Institutionalising (and Undermining?) the Village Conservation Organisations

This Lindu conservation agreement is notable for its potential encompassment of all the ethnic groups within the Lindu plain in regard to issues of conservation enforcement, though still relying on the customary mechanisms of the dominant ‘indigenous society’ (the To Lindu, strictly speaking) in the adjudication of cases of infractions. It is thus both located beyond and within the customary framework. Certain contradictions ensue from this double positioning. These same contradictions characterize the operation of the village conservation organisations, as the main local agents of 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. Indeed, the membership from Puroo is composed of Kulawi settlers, while representatives from Kanawu – the hamlet of the village Tomado on the eastern side of the lake with a large part of its population composed of Bugis settlers from South Sulawesi, Pipikoro resettlers (local transmigrants) from the mountainous regions of southern Kulawi, as well as, more recently, Toraja farmers from the northern highlands of South Sulawesi – include members from these migrant ethnic groups. Yet, the most significant portion 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, as they both promote the LKD as an organisation to uphold conservation regulations for the whole Lindu enclave, as prescribed by park directives, and also use it as an instrument to declare their precedential rights to land and resources as indigenous *To Lindu* in the Lindu plain, as conceptualised in indigenous notions of ancestral territory.

Such claims have been evident in the activities of the LKD to date. The Lindu village conservation organisations 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.^{xix} 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 (there was no representation from Anca, for external reasons) journeyed with a TNC representative, a forestry policeman (PPA/Polhut), and the village secretary of Tomado to this village's hamlet of Kanawu, on the eastern shore of the lake, where numerous incursions had been noted, encroachments of gardens moving up the slopes of Mt Nokilalaki into national parkland beyond the boundaries of the Lindu enclave, especially among the Toraja settlers of Sangali, but also the longer term Pipikoro residents and others in Katiboli, the two most remote subhamlets of Kanawu. The team's activities commenced on the evening of 17 May 2004 with a meeting with selected representatives of Kanawu, setting out the motivations of the stay and planning the survey of the regions of encroachment in parkland the next day, followed by the undertaking of the survey to Sangali and to various gardens in parkland above the Lombosa River, whose opening higher on the slopes had been blamed for the flooding of the river and the inadequacy of water in the dry season for the wet rice fields which had long been established by Bugis migrants and indigenous Lindu farmers in the lower reaches of Kanawu extending down to within a couple hundred meters of the shore of Lake Lindu. The team's visit ended with a public meeting on the evening of that second day, 18 May, in which the purpose and results of the day's survey were announced and the possibility of actions against those whose gardens encroached national parkland were discussed.

What was most interesting perhaps were the ways in which the need to deal with such transgressions was framed by various team members, revealing 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 members who also represented the *adat* councils of the plain. The TNC facilitator began the first night's meeting by emphasising the need to ensure the sustainability (*keberlanjutan*) of the natural resources of the Lindu plain, and the role of the LKD in their management, a theme he sustained in his encounters with transgressing farmers during the day and with the general assembly on the second night. Constantly, he tried to maintain focus on the development potential of the area, and the need for assuring a constant water supply to realize this potential, a supply which depended crucially on the preservation of the surrounding forest. And in this enunciation he was constantly supported by the government representative, 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 (*menjaga*) it, let us carry out our activities, both in our gardens and our wet rice fields in ways that are environmentally friendly [*ramah lingkungan*]. That's all, that's our hope which I convey from the village government at this time...

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

We are looking out for the coming generation we want to preserve, to conserve this environment for the coming generation, so that our generations which will be coming do not revile us, do not blame us...Where else can we go? (*Mau ke mana lagi kita?*)

Such general consideration of the importance of the local society conserving the environment provided the constant refrain interspersed among the more specific discussions of the need for a coordinator of the separate LKD of the four villages, for clear procedures to deal with encroachments into parkland, and other practical matters.

However, the head of the LKD from Langko, whose prominent role in the *adat* council of that village was also referred to when his representative capacities were invoked upon his being 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^{xx}, he also used this example to argue strongly that Kanawu should not be formalised as a separate administrative village (*desa*) – long a project of the Bugis settlers there, with considerable support from some Pipikoro local transmigrants, wishing to get out from under the authority of the *adat* council in Tomado – but 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, in Kanawu, Lindu's most vulnerable illegal entry point: 'Let this not be like a roll of string that has unraveled 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 Lindu people in the conservation endeavour remained, despite the appeal to the unity of all inhabitants of the Lindu plain. The TNC facilitator attempted to emphasise the ‘synergy’ of customary and park management interests:

‘That’s my opinion, thus for the future, if nothing else, for our conservaton agreement, if nothing else, we have to unify the conservaton 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 naional 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.

While overtly in agreement with such assertions by the TNC facilitator, who later also spoke of the need to align the indigenous Lindu customary ‘zoning’ according to *suaka* with the national park zonation scheme, the head of the Langko LKD was also capable of expanding 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, the To Lindu elder adroitly moves from an assertion of prior rights to the land on his part 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 noted at a later point) and he could still recite the real, the original, names of all the customary territories on the eastern side of the lake, to an acceptance of all those now settled in the Lindu plain, indigenous and migrant, as equally Lindu people. But this assertion of equality is used then to support the demand of the indigenous Lindu adat council of the Lindu plain that no Lindu inhabitant may cultivate more than 2 hectares of land, a measure aimed squarely at the Bugis and Kulawi settlers, some of whom had opened up to 12 hectares if all their plots devoted to coffee, cacao and other crops were counted (Acciaioli 2001b). So, even in his assertion of contemporary equality,

as innocently proclaimed by the TNC facilitator, this wily Lindu elder is 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 manages 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 hey had been given indications by the Lord so that they acted in a way to preserve Lindu'.

Interestingly, in his comments to individual transgressing farmers, this To Lindu elder made ready use of idioms of the New Order government, in particular of the rhetoric of the Department of Social Affairs (*Departemen Sosial* or Depsos). The farmers of Sangali, dispersed in their field huts scattered throughout the forest, 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 noted how they had 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 kilometers 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 kilometers one can see humanity, aaaah! 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') during the New Order, since the Lindu plain was only accessible by horse trail and located far from medical and other 'civilised' facilities. But what is remarkable is that this assertion of the need to render the Sangali populace 'visible', as a concentrated whole, refers not to state projects of rendering a subject population visible, as Scott (1998) has so perspicaciously analysed in such examples as the *ujamaa* resettlement villages of Africa (and the resettlement projects of Depsos in Indonesia, including those moving populations to both the Palolo and Lindu upland plains are comparable), but to the continuing need for surveillance by not just the LKD as agents of conservation interests, but by the Lindu *adat* councils as maintainers of Lindu hegemonic dominance in the area, as the main custodians of the Lindu environment as warranted by precedence of settlement and their conception of immemorial custom.

On the face of it, such assertions could be interpreted as more strictly in the interests of the conservation agenda of the National Park authorities and the village government apparatus working with them. But 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 of the provincial-level indigenous people's organisation, AMASUTA (*Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Sulawesi Tengah*) held 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 spoken in the capacity of representing the LKD chose to speak instead in their capacity as Lindu elders. Most emphasised 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 of another ethnic group. While considerable discussion did centre upon the problems of deciding upon the respective domains of the various *adat* councils of the Lindu village, the ultimate authority within the Lindu plain of this type of institution was not questioned. And in this regard the need to bring all inhabitants into line with the *adat* stipulation of limiting each person's land to 2 ha. was once more emphasized. In fact, the very Lindu elder who had spoken as the head of the Langko LKD emphasised 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 suggested that if necessary for the council's continued functioning, the national park land should just be claimed back. 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 the TNC-organised village conservation organisations seemed rather to evaporate, 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 have been targeted at indigenous peoples living there, such as those negotiated by YTM, Yambata, and CSIADCP, not to mention the early agreements of TNC with the communities (To Pekurehua) of Lore Utara (Khaeruddin 2002). Nonindigenous local peoples have proved to be a different story. It is no accident that the To Rampi migrants of 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 To Besoa, resisted such efforts and were eventually granted enclave status (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 Yayasan Tanah Merdeka, to question the entire enterprise of national park imposition as a colonial enterprise, echoing the critique of Western models of conservation as continuing colonialism that have been voiced elsewhere (Stevens 1997a, p. 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 regarding an appropriate policy of area management that would be community-based (*berbasiskan masyarakat*).

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 be protected from human use. On the other hand, such local NGOs as WALHI Sulteng and Yayasan Tanah Merdeka are committed to a model of ‘sustainable use’, arguing for the adequacy of local community-based resource management for all conservation purposes; they regard the retention of protected areas as a colonial imposition, a miscarriage of agrarian social justice that reproduces 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’ (*‘Tidak ada titik ketemu’*).

Yet, TNC has more recently attempted to provide such a ‘meeting point’. The conservation agreement it has negotiated for the Lindu plain, while certainly privileging indigenous interests in the allocation of sanctioning transgressions to indigenous *adat* councils, does attempt also to accommodate the interests of nonindigenous settlers through the formation of village conservation organisations (LKD) whose recruitment includes all the peoples settled in a park-related region. Certainly, the working together of Bugis, Pipikoro and Kulawi settlers with indigenous Lindu representatives in this context has come about. But the indigenous representatives still feel themselves in an uneasy situation, both accepting the wider ambit of participation in the conservation project and the acknowledgement of settler rights it implies, but also maneuvering to advance the agenda of preference for indigenous rights in the warrants they invoke to justify their position in the multi-ethnic 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 (2005). 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. What he labels

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’ 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, a source which Agrawal 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 very subjectivity-moulding participation. But there is little sense in this model that villagers may choose to participate in councils on the basis of other motivations, and that enunciated concern for the environment – it is significant that Agrawal’s research relied on surveys and interviews, rather than participant-observation of/with the activities of forest councils – may be simply what Bourdieu labels a ‘second order strategy’ (Bourdieu 1977: 42ff.), an official pronouncement that makes action that may derive from quite other ‘first-order strategies’ appear to be nothing but compliance with a valued norm or prescription (such as choosing a particular spouse for one’s child in accord with a ‘rule’ of prescriptive patrilineal parallel-cousin marriage, although the wealth of that spouse’s father and thus the dowry to be bestowed may be a more weighty ‘first-order’ factor in assessing marriage prospects).

In fact, the participation of indigenous Lindu elders in the village conservation organizations (LKD) established by TNC in cooperation with the government park authority through cooperative management agreements with numerous villages surrounding and enclaved in the Lore Lindu National Park can be fruitfully read in just such terms. The pronouncements of Lindu elders when in meetings convened by these organisations reveal 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 – limitation of land of all inhabitants of the Lindu plain to 2 ha. to be enforced by the indigenous Lindu Adat Council, continuing incorporation of migrant-populated hamlets within Lindu-dominated villages, recognition of all alienation of land from To Lindu, even when accompanied by official *ganti-rugi* documents and certificates of land ownership for the new owners from the government land board, as temporary grants of land for purposes of use under ultimate authority of the Lindu Adat Council, etc. – reveals that the environmentalist concern, couched in the idioms of enduring stewardship and the superior custodial function of (their) custom they espouse 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 occupy the Lindu plain as well. Environmentalism is part of the agenda of strengthening the executive force of indigenous Lindu customary institutions and regulations. Indeed, indigeneity as a categorical ascription 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 itself as a practice inducing the emergence of an environmentalist orientation. Agrawal perhaps too naively accepts the Foucauldian dynamic of the power of the State imposing a subjectivity it desires through the medium of intimate government. What the case of the realization of a cooperative management agreement and operation of village conservation organizations in the Lindu plain reveals is that such institutions of intimate government may very well be accepted by some villagers because they function as vehicles for the advancement of nongovernmental agendas from the participants themselves under the guise of the governmentally desired enunciated orientation. Agrawal is thus himself guilty of the very analytical sin of which he accuses others such as Anderson in the latter's lack of analysis of how official nationalism is imposed on populaces: neglecting the political dimension of participation, the pragmatic contextualization of declarations whose semantic content he takes at face value. 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 agendas of re-institutionalisation of common land under customary control and the validation of such categorical ascriptions as indigeneity.

Glossary of Acronyms

AMAN	<i>Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara</i> (Alliance of Archipelagic 'Indigenous Peoples' [literally, 'Customary Communities]))
BTNLL	<i>Balai Taman Nasional Lore Lindu</i> (Management Office of the Lore Lindu National Park)
CSIADCP	Central Sulawesi Integrated Area Development and Conservation Project
Depsos	<i>Departmen Sosial</i> (Department of Social Affairs, which was in charge of resettlement programs)
FPM	<i>Forum Petani Merdeka</i> (Forum for Free Farmers [i.e. in DongiDongi])
FWP	<i>Forum Wilayah Penyangga</i> (Buffer Zone Forum)
HPH	<i>Hak Pengelolaan Hutan</i> (Forest Timber Concession)
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

JapHama	<i>Jaringan Pembelaan Hak-Hak Masyarakat Adat</i> (Network for the Defence of the Rights of 'Indigenous Peoples' [literally, 'Customary Communities])
KMAN	<i>Kongres Masyarakat Adat Nusantara</i> (Congress of Archipelagic 'Indigenous Peoples')
LKD	<i>Lembaga Konservasi Desa</i> (Village Conservation Organization)
PiP	Parks in Peril (A Nature Conservancy program in Latin America)
Polhut	<i>Polisi Hutan</i> (Forest Police) = PPA
PPA	Perlindungan and Pengawetan Alam (Protection and Preservation of the Environment) = Polhut
TNLL	<i>Taman Nasional Lore Lindu</i> (Lore Lindu National Park)
WALHI	<i>Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia</i> (Indonesian Forum for the Environment)
YBHK	<i>Yayasan Bantuan Hukum Rakyat</i> (Foundation for Legal Assistance to the People)
YTM	<i>Yayasan Tanah Merdeka</i> (Foundation for Free Land)

Bibliography

Published Sources

- Abbas, M. Nafsir; Tasrief Siera; San Afri Awang (eds.) 2002 *Interaksionisme Simbolik Dongi-Dongi*. Jogjakarta: Debut Press.
- Acciaioli, Greg 2001 Grounds of Conflict, Idioms of Harmony: Custom, Religion, and Nationalism in Violence Avoidance at the Lindu Plain, Central Sulawesi. *Indonesia* 72: 81-112. (Cornell Southeast Asia Program).
- Acciaioli, Greg 2002 Re-empowering the 'Art of the Elders': The Revitalization of Adat among the To Lindu People of Central Sulawesi. To appear in Minako Sakai (ed.) *Beyond Java: Regional Autonomy and Local Societies in Indonesia*. Adelaide: Crawford House Publishing. Pp. 217-244.
- Acciaioli, Greg 2004 The occupation of Dongi-Dongi: Do resettlement program failures justify parkland deforestation? *Inside Indonesia* 80 (October–December 2004): 7.
- Agrawal, Arun 2005 Environmentality: Community, Intimate Government, and the Making of Environmental Subjects in Kumaon, India. *Current Anthropology* 46(2): 161-190.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology 16). Richard Nice, trans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brandon, Katrina, Kent H. Redford H., Steven E. Sanderson (eds.) 1998 *Parks in Peril: People, Politics, and Protected Areas*. Washington DC: The Nature Conservancy and Island Press.
- Clad, James C. 1988 Conservation and Indigenous Peoples: A Study of Convergent Interests. In John H. Bodley (ed.) *Tribal Peoples and Development Issues: A Global Overview*. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company. Pp. 3210-334.
- Colchester, Marcus Salvaging Nature: Indigenous Peoples, Protected Areas and Biodiversity Conservation. World Rainforest Movement website <http://www.wrm.org.uy/subjects/nature.html> (Accessed 19/4/2005)

- Cordell, John 1993 "Who Owns the Land? Indigenous Involvement in Australian Protected Areas. In Elizabeth Kempf (ed.), *Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas: The Law of Mother Earth*. London: Earthscan. Pp. 104-113.
- Foster, David 1997 *Gurig National Park: The First Ten Years of Joint Management*. (Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Report Series)
- Haba, Johannes 1999 *Resettlement and Sociocultural Change among the 'Isolated Peoples' in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia: A Study of Three Resettlement Sites*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Department of Anthropology, The University of Western Australia.
- Khaeruddin, Ismet 2002 *Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat di Lima desa sekitar Taman Nasional Lore Lindu Sulawesi Tengah: Laporan Hasil Kegiatan*. Palu: The Nature Conservation.
- KMAN [Kongres Masyarakat Adat Nusantara] 1999 FACT SHEET (II).
- Mappatoba, Marhawati and Regina Birner 2004 Co-Management of Protected Areas: The Case of Community Agreements on Conservation in the Lore Lindu National Park, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. Eschborn: Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH (Tropical Ecology Support Programme (TOEB), F-VI/7e)
- Sangaji, Arianto 2002 *Menuju Pengelolaan TNLL Berbasis Masyarakat* (Kertas Posisi 01/WALHI/2002), Palu, WALHI Sulteng.
- Sangaji, Arianto 2002b *Politik Konservasi: Orang Katu di Behoa Kakau*. Bogor: Penerbit KpSHK.
- Sangaji, Arianto; Mohammad Hamdin; Sugiharto; Ferdinand Lumeno; Silas Lahigi; Ferdinand Lumeno; Silas Lahigi 2004 *Masyarakat dan Taman Nasional Lore Lindu*. Jakarta: Yayasan Kemala and Yayasan Tanah Merdeka
- Scott, James C. 1998 *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press. (Yale Agrarian Studies)
- Severin, Tim 1997 *The Spice Islands Voyage: The Quest for Alfred Wallace, the Man Who Shared Darwin's Discovery of Evolution*. New York: Carol & Graf Publishers.
- Stevens, Stan 1997a The Legacy of Yellowstone. In Stan Stevens (ed.) *Conservation through Cultural Survival: Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas*. Washington DC: Island Press. Pp. 13-32.
- Stevens, Stan (ed.) 1997b *Conservation through Cultural Survival: Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas*. Washington DC: Island Press.

Unpublished Documents:

- Depagri... 1992 Untitled written document. Jakarta: Depagri, Dirjen Bangdes/Departemen Dalam Negeri/Direktur Jendral Pembangunan Desa. *Draft Management Plan – Lore Lindu National Park*. 4 volumes. TNC office, Palu.
- Desa Puroo, Langko, Tomado dan Anca 2005 *Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat Dataran Lindu, Kecamatan Kulawi, Kabupaten Donggala*.
- Fasilitasi FWP-TNLL, CSIADCP Lore Lindu. *Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat Adat Desa Moa, Kecamatan Kulawi*. Pilimaku Jawa [sic], Mei 2004.

Fasilitasi FWP-TNLL, CSIADCP [Central Sulawesi Integrated Area Development and Conservation Program] Lore Lindu. *Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat Adat Desa Pilimakujawa, Kecamatan Kulawi*. Pilimakujawa, Mei 2004.

Endnotes

^{iv} Colchester (*Salvaging* section 4, p. 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 ethnic element to running the parks.'

^v A subsequent governmental declaration in 1999 redefined the borders of the park. In its current form, TNLL stretches across 217,991.18 ha. [anon. 2001, p. 2; *Kesepakatan Lindu* 2005, p. 2), stretching from 1° 8' to 1° 20' south latitude and 119° 58' to 120° 15' east longitude (Sangadji et al. 2004. p. 16).

^{xvi} 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 7 meters, thus inundating all villages and wet-rice lands and forcing the 'local transmigration' of all inhabitants of the plain.

^{xvii} The immediately succeeding paragraphs set out in analgous terms the composition and function of the 'Buffer Zone Forum' (*Forum Wilayah Penyangga* or FWP), an institution originally set up under the auspices of CSIADCP to deal with more widely relevant issues at the subdistrict (*kecamatan*) level, such as disputes regarding conservation between villages. As the Lindu participants do not wish to be subject to this subdistrict level institution, these paragraphs are likely to be deleted or amended in subsequent deliberations over revisions to the agreement.

^{xviii} The agreement itself was accompanied by 'decision documents' from each of the four village headmen of the Lindu plain, marking a clear parallel to the need for 'regional implementing regulations' (*peraturan daerah*) for any laws (*undang-undang*) to take effect locally.

^{xix} WALHI – Sulteng, along with other NGOs in Palu such as YTM, has disputed that the floods were indeed caused or exacerbated by the occupation of DongiDongi, 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 DongiDongi 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).

^{xx} 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 DongiDongi and the Palolo Valley were now just bodies (*badan saja*), without souls (*jiwa*) any longer, as their lives had been used up (*kehabisan hidup*)