



Indonesian Peasants' Union in The Struggle of Agrarian Reform in Indonesia, Period 1998-2011

Heri Purwanto^{1*}, Faiz Albar Nasution²

¹Serikat Petani Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

²Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

Abstract

A This study discusses the struggle for Agrarian Reform carried out by the Indonesian Peasants' Union in 1998-2011. The purpose of this study is to explain the strategy of the peasant movement in fighting for agrarian reform in Indonesia. More deeply, this research will describe the strategy of the Indonesian Peasants' Union (SPI) in fighting for agrarian reform. This study uses a qualitative approach, and uses a descriptive analytical method to analyze the data obtained. Data collection techniques were carried out through library research, document collection and in-depth interviews with five informants, Synthesis activists, the General Chair and members of the Indonesian Peasants' Union, agrarian experts, and CNDS activists. The results of this study indicate that the SPI's agrarian struggle at the local level is carried out by prioritizing the power of the masses to occupy land and carry out mass actions. In 1998-2011, SPI has succeeded in controlling and reclaiming 47,270 hectares of land for peasants', and hasn become productive land that supports and improves the economy of farming families. To garner support at the local level, SPI builds alliances with peasant, labor, fisherman, student and NGO organizations. At the national level, SPI's struggle was aimed at urging the state to implement Law No. 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Agrarian Regulations. The Indonesian Peasants' Union strategy to oppose oppressive power relations was carried out to deal with various forms of power in various spaces and levels.

Keywords: Agrarian reform; Land reform

How to Cite: Purwanto, H., & Nasution, F.A. (2022). Indonesian Peasants' Union in The Struggle of Agrarian Reform in Indonesia, Period, 1998-2011. *Journal of Peasants' Right's*, Vol. 1 No. 1: 7-19

*Corresponding author: Heri Purwanto

E-mail: maspur@gmail.com; faiz@usu.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

The discourse of agrarian reform disappeared from the national political scene along with the change of power from the Old Order regime to the New Order. The paradigm of political economic development of the New Order, which relies on *developmentalism*, has buried Law No. 5 of 1960 on the Basic Rules of Agrarian Trees for a long time. The transfer of power also influenced the change in national political development strategies, from populism to authoritarianism. The populism character of the Old Order regime was characterized by the mobilization of popular power in every national policy, one of which was agrarian policy. Conflict and political violence throughout the end of Sukarno's reign left a deep trauma for the New Order rulers under the Suharto regime. So the right choice for Suharto is to implement a strict policy of political stability (Budiman, 1996).

According to Gunawan Wiradi, agrarian policy since the beginning of the New Order was implemented *by passing approach*, namely implementing the green revolution policy without being preceded by agrarian reform. As a result of that

approach agrarian conflict is not subsiding, instead it is increasing and spreading in various sectors through out the region (Wiradi, 2009). The Agrarian Constitution was manipulated as a tool to legitimize the take over of people's land in the name of development. Behind the development program carried out, there is the interest of the owners of capital that relies on the accumulation of agrarian sources. The agrarian resources in question not only cover land, but also include the wealth of mines, water and other natural resources. Peasants in the countryside are separated from their land ownership, to be made workers in the production of growing capitalism (Akbar, 2016).

According to Fauzi, the New Order regime's efforts to dissinate agrarian policies from power were carried out in five ways. *First*, make the problem of land *reform* as a mere technical problem. The status of the position of the Agrarian Department was lowered to the level of the director general. *Second*, the Agrarian Basic Law is not used as an umbrella for the formulation of sectoral laws, such as mining, forestry, and water. Even the sectoral laws issued are contrary to the mandate of the PA Law. *Third*, the application of *floating mass* (floating mass policy). This policy is an effort to depoliticize the village community by prohibiting political parties from having branch and branch structures. *Fourth*, the uniformization of village government through Law No. 5 of 1979 on Village Government, as well as the implementation of Dwi Function ABRI. Efforts are made to monitor and control the lives of rural communities.

Thus it can be said that the transfer of power from the Old Order to the New Order is followed by the transition of the national development strategy in contrast. During the Old Order, national economic development strategies were put on priority in implementing agrarian reform. On the contrary, the New Order regime laid down a development strategy by providing free space for the development of agrarian capitalism. The transition of development strategy was instantly a step backwards for the struggle for agrarian reform pioneered by the founders of the nation.

The problems arising from agrarian inequality are increasingly complex and widespread. The inequality of the agrarian structure of colonial heritage continues to grow even deeper. In contrast to the land tenure of peasants, land tenure by plantation companies actually increased rapidly. Land tenure by privately owned oil palm plantations increased from 3.3 million ha in 2006, to 3.8 million hectares in 2010. According to records issued by BPN, HGU land area of 3.3 million hectares is only controlled by 1,887 entrepreneurs 13. In aggregate, land tenure by plantation entrepreneur averages 1700 hectares per entrepreneur. The history of plantations in Indonesia has always been associated with the development of land conflicts around plantations. Plantation companies that have grown rapidly since the New Order annexed many land owned by peasants (Pelzer, 1991). The land grab sparked a land conflict that lasted since the 80s. The opening of political opportunities after the end of the New Order regime encouraged the courage of peasants in various regions to demand the rights to their seized land. According to BPN records to date there are 7,491 unresolved land conflicts. The number does not include land cases that are latent and are likely to surface into conflict.

The Indonesian Peasants' Union said in 2011, 18 peasants were killed as victims of clashes from 120 agrarian conflicts (SPI, 2012). Land tenure inequality in the countryside, pushing peasants into a deeper poverty trap. BPS data shows that poverty rates are greater in rural areas than in cities. In 2010 there were 31.2 million poor people, 19.93 million of whom were in villages and 11.1 million were in urban areas. The percentage of poor people living in the countryside increased from 63.35% in 2009, to 64.23% in 2010 (BPS, 2011).

Departing from the national economic-political reality, especially rural communities, agrarian reform becomes an important agenda that must continue to be carried by various circles. The re-appointment of agrarian reform to the national political agenda became an interesting phenomenon to study. Because the agrarian reform agenda for decades has previously been marginalized from the national political agenda. As it emerged in the colonial era, the agenda of agrarian reform was born out of the inequality of agrarian structures in rural communities. Such inequality triggers social unrest that incarnates in forms of chaos, social protests, to organized peasant movements. Organized peasant movements have the power to push for an agrarian reform agenda in the long run. In the context of economic-political dynamics in Indonesia, the existence of the peasant movement became one of the important factors towards the revival of the agrarian reform movement (White, 2019).

The dynamics of agrarian politics that took place in the reform era, are very different when compared to the New Order era. The agrarian conflicts that erupted during the New Order received no attention from the executive or legislative. Instead of resolving agrarian conflicts, every protest movement that emerged was responded to by repressive measures by the new order rulers (Fidro, 1998). The protests against land grabs that took place at the grassroots, had no effect in raising the issue of land grabs to the political agenda in the policy-making of the New Order regime.

The social movements the voice agrarian reform today are the continuation of the movements against land grabs that emerged in the New Order Era. The involvement of activists and students was instrumental in igniting resistance in areas of agrarian conflict towards the end of the 80s (Purba, 2017). In the next development of the resistance movement gave birth to many organizations in the form of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and mass organizations of peasants. Both groups continued their demands for agrarian reform.

This study took a case study of the Indonesian Peasants' Union. There are at least four reasons that cause me to make a choice against the Indonesian Peasants' Union (SPI). *First*, SPI is a national-level peasant mass organization in the form of unitaries, with a wide distribution and large number of members. *Second*, put agrarian reform as the main issue being fought for. *Third*, agrarian conflict becomes the main feature of the problems faced by its members. *Fourth*, actively engage in the International Peasants Movement *La via Campesina* and the struggle for agrarian reform at the international level (SPI, 2010). The Indonesian Peasants' Union is a mass organization of peasants declared in federative form, in 1998 in North Sumatra, under the name of the Federation of Indonesian Peasants' Unions (FSPI). At the third Congress in Wonosobo in 2007, FSPI decided to change the format of the organization to unitary and name change to the Indonesian Peasants' Union (SPI). The Indonesian Peasants' Union consists of small and landless peasants, as well as garden workers. In its struggle SPI raised the issue of agrarian reform based on Law No. 5 of 1960 on the Basic Rules of Agrarian Subjects, better known as the PA Law. Land conflict is the main character of the problems faced by the majority of SPI members. As of 2012, there were 74 cases of land conflicts fought by SPI members (Purwanto, 2013). Therefore the main issue championed by SPI is agrarian reform, especially *land reform*. Some other SPI members consist of bases that develop sustainable agricultural practices, cooperative practices, processing of production and marketing, and livestock cultivation.

This research aims to explain the strategy of the peasant movement in fighting for agrarian reform in Indonesia. This research seeks to explain the link between the struggle for agrarian reform carried out by the peasant movement and the re-

appointment of the agrarian reform agenda in the national political stage. Furthermore, this study will explain the strategy of the Indonesian Peasants' Union (SPI) in fighting for agrarian reform.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses descriptive qualitative methods with a case study approach (Creswell, 2016). The focus of this study explains the strategy of the peasant movement in fighting for agrarian reform in Indonesia. Data collection was conducted through *indepth interviews* to the Chairman of the Central Board of the Indonesian Peasants' Union (DPP SPI) Henry Saragih, Activist of The Sintesa Foundation M. Haris Putra Sinaga, as well as members of SPI in North Sumatra Wagimin region. Figures outside the SPI who serve as informants are Agrarian expert academics, Gunawan Wiradi, who also serves as the KPA Expert Council and Idham Samudra Bey as the leader of the National Congress on Agrarian Reform and chairman of the Centre for *National-Democracy Studies* (CNDS).

Literature studies by tracing and reviewing written materials that suit research needs, such as books, journals, papers and articles. The main information to be obtained is mainly regarding peasants' movements and agricultural policies relevant to research objectives and issues. Data analysis techniques include data reduction, data display and drawing conclusions (Miles, Huberman & Saldana, 2014).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The formation of the Indonesian Peasants' Union was initiated by the similarity of issues faced by peasants' victims of land grabs. At first they moved based on practical demands alone, regaining the lands they once owned. The involvement of activists in the advocacy of land cases that spread in various regions at that time, raised new awareness among peasants. The issues they voiced were no longer limited to practical demands, but demanded the implementation of agrarian reform. Departing from the new awareness, peasants and activists collaborate to build local farming organizations and build networks at the regional and national levels.

The short-term agenda that will be achieved is the establishment of agricultural organizations at the regional and national levels, to strengthen the peasant movement and increase pressure on the government to press for an agrarian reform agenda. The long process of establishment of the Indonesian Peasants' Union began from the establishment of local / village farming organizations, increased to a peasant organization at the regional / provincial level, and in 1998 declared the Indonesian Peasants' Union (when declared until the third congress of SPI was still federative). The network of movements built by *Sintesa* activists brought the introduction of SPI to an international peasant organization called *La Via Campesina*. In 1996 the relationship with *La via campesina* was actually started by SPSU (North Sumatra Peasants' Union) which co-founded SPI. After the establishment of SPI, SPSU membership in *La via campesina* was submitted to SPI.

In carrying out the agenda of the struggle for agrarian reform, SPI emphasizes the power of the masses to occupy land and carry out mass actions (*land reform by leverage*). The struggle in this way will accelerate and urge the implementation of agrarian reform by the state or land reform by *grace*. By strengthening the organization and utilizing existing political loopholes, the SPI Struggle is carried out from the local, national to global levels simultaneously.

Agrarian Struggle Of SPI Members At The Local Level

Social movements will be more successful if they have a strong mass base at the grassroots level. Political struggle in the realm of policy will not be enough to guarantee a fundamental change to the inequality of the current agrarian structure. By expecting *political will* from the government to carry out agrarian reform (*landreform by grace*) is not enough to guarantee the implementation of changes in the structure of land tenure. The power of the peasant movement in the agrarian struggle based on the power of the people itself (*land reform by leverage*) is an important condition for such change to be carried out. To run *land reform by leverage*, strength at the mass base level becomes the main focus of SPI power.

Departing from awareness to run *land reform by leverage*, the steps of the SPI struggle towards agrarian reform are directed at strengthening the mass base while implementing the practice of agrarian reform at the local level. In the view of SPI, the struggle for agrarian reform in the long term must be done by building strong organizations, carrying out direct actions of land occupation, building sustainable agricultural systems and fair distribution models, and building economic and organizational logistics independence.

Building Critical Awareness Through Education

Strengthening of the organization at the base level is done through education and strengthening the organizational structure. The education conducted by SPI is divided into four types, mass education, organizational introduction education, cadre education and technical skills /expertise education (Spi, 2010). The importance of education for SPI has been reiterated repeatedly in the Articles of Association, Household Budget, as well as in the GBHO SPI. In the management structure of SPI from the DPP (Central Board of Management) level to the lowest level in the DPB (Base Board of Management), there are departments, bureaus or special divisions that deal specifically with the education. In GBHO SPI it is affirmed that SPI education should be directed to (SPI, 2010):

- a. Giving birth to cadres of peasants who are reliable, resilient and militant, and able to give birth to leaders of peasants who are democratic, politically capable according to the principle of SPI, and rooted in the masses. Increase the knowledge and understanding of cadres and peasant masses to the organizational structure and various policies issued by SPI, resulting in equalization of understanding and perception for members. Increase the knowledge and understanding of cadres and peasant masses on various problems faced ranging from the base level, national, to international. Improve skills in strengthening peasant organizations as unitary Movement organizations.
- b. Improve skills in carrying out various struggles for democratic rights and constitutional rights of the peasantry.
- c. Improve skills on sustainable farming techniques that are able to spur the development of the peasant's economy.
- d. Provide opportunities and encourage the growth and strength of the role of women peasants in the organization, so that organizational decisions can be taken optimally and in an emancipatory perspective.

The direction of education shows that the function of education is the spirit for the agrarian struggle carried out by SPI. A strong organization must be supported by cadres who have critical awareness and have the ability to carry out actions to fight for

agrarian reform, in various spaces and levels. Education to build critical awareness aims to oppose hegemonic forms of power that lead to helplessness and peasantry.

The participation of peasants to engage in political action directly in claiming their rights would not have happened if it had not been preceded by the emergence of critical awareness. Building critical awareness becomes the starting point for the marginalized peasants, to move from a state of helplessness to a condition against the dominating power group (Gaventa, 1980). Education conducted by SPI within the framework of Gaventa's 'power cube' analysis, is a strategy to oppose *invisible power* that causes the helplessness of peasants (Gaventa, 2006).

According to Wagimin, Chairman of DPW SPI North Sumatra period 2008-2013, building critical awareness of peasants is the initial requirement to fight for peasants' rights. Wagimin is an SPI cadre from Bukit Kijang village, Asahan and has been involved in land case struggles since 1992. Through the process of education and active involvement in the struggle of the organization, he realized that the peasant must have the ability to defend his own rights. The importance of direct involvement of peasants to voice their rights is stated by Wagimin as follows:

"We think that the problem of peasants must be peasants who solve. It is impossible for the peasant's problem to be solved by others. That's where it takes an attachment to other peasants. Here I guess the most important point why SPI was established. And we assume yes only peasants will know the problems faced by peasants. There fore there is a strong bond, there is a togetherness that is tied in an organization."

Education is a means for strengthening the mass bases of peasants as well as the process of sustainability of cadre regeneration that will fill leadership in the organization. Education is a series of processes to build awareness through the transfer of knowledge and the involvement of cadres in organizational activities and struggles. Education is not limited to classroom education, but includes mass action and daily practice in the field, as stated by Wagimin:

"Education is very important, whatever the story education should be a priority in the organization. Because without education, radicalization, militancy and the running of the organization will not be able to run on bail. Because the administrators at SPI must begin to be educated from the education carried out. Cadreization must be made through existing education. There are two forms of education that are done. The first is classroom education, how about insight, about skills, technical problems and so on. Then it is non-classroom education, is field education. How do they practice classroom education in the field? Mass actions are also part of education."

Ideally SPI has put education as the main condition in strengthening the struggle and organization. Although it has been emphasized the importance of education for organizational sustainability and agrarian struggle, in practice there are still various shortcomings, as recognized by Wagimin:

"Education on how to instill the values of organizational struggle in members, this is still very little, still very weak. Education not only provides students, but there must also be a good teacher or facilitator. When talking about this, there needs to be strong facilitators, then those who understand the struggle of the organization, the struggle of peasants. Then there must also be cadres prepared for it. This in the future will be the priority of the organization."

The education system of the Indonesian Peasants' Union began to be systematized since the change of FSPI to SPI in 2007. At the time of SPI is still federative, there is no systematic education system. From 2007 to 2012, an education system has been built that is structured from the base to the center level. The preparation of curriculum and the formation of cadre teachers become priorities to build a system of systematic education.

Land Occupation Action

The Indonesian Peasants' Union has confidence that effective ways to immediately realize agrarian reform are to take direct action on land occupation by peasants. The non-implementation of the Basic Agrarian Law and the agrarian conflict that dissolved, became the fundamental reason that the right struggle for peasants is to implement *land reform by leverage*. The victory of peasants over land tenure can only be done through direct actions of land occupation. In the Organizational Outlines (GBHO) of the SPI set out at the THIRD Congress, it is stated that the struggle for agrarian reform should be directed at (SPI, 2008):

"Focusing on the redistribution of agrarian resources—especially land, water and seeds—to landless peasants, smallholders, local indigenous communities and women is accompanied by certainty of rights. The struggle for agrarian reform in this case the organization actively seizes the natural wealth, controlling, cultivating, owning, and utilizing the results for the benefit of the people as a form of implementation of the social function of agrarian sources. For this reason, it is expected that the national program of agrarian struggle is expected to have managed to control a minimum of 200,000 ha of land"

The struggle for agrarian reform by choosing the way *of land reform by leverage* means that the agrarian struggle is based on the power of the peasant masses, not waiting for the arrival of political *wiil* and the policies of the ruling government. *Land reform by leverage* is done by practicing the agrarian struggle directly in the field. SPI member peasants mobilized to occupy the land and reclaim the land that had been seized by the opposing party. Through direct actions of land occupation, known as '*reclaiming*' action, forcing the government to respond to peasants' demands or negotiate with opponents to restore land that is the right of peasants. Reclaiming SPI members became a strategy to open up political spaces, and reclaim the rights of peasants as citizens.

Although often subjected to criminalization and arrests for land *reclaiming* actions carried out, SPI states that the act is legal and has legal pay. Before *reclaiming* by occupying the land, SPI gathered evidence that the land had been seized from peasants. The evidence collected is not limited to formal evidence, because in many cases formal evidence of land ownership letters is also seized and destroyed. Historical evidence and the gathering of facts on the ground, considered sufficient to be the basis of land occupation. Legally, *the reclaiming* action carried out by SPI is based on the Constitutional Rights of the 1945 Constitution, the Basic Law of Agrarian Affairs, and PP Number 224 of 1961 (SPI, 2008).

The strategy of agrarian struggle at the local level through land occupation, will affect the process of further struggle in the decision-making spaces. After occupying the land the next struggle is to force the government to get involved in resolving the land conflict. The occupation of SPI member land until 2011, has succeeded in returning

47,270 ha to SPI member peasants. The rest there are still 247,477 hectares of member land that are still being fought for recapture.

Luas Lahan Yang Di-reclaiming Anggota SPI Per-wilayah Tahun 2007-2011

NO	Wilayah	Luas Lahan yang diduduki/reclaiming (Ha)	
		Sudah Berhasil	Masih Diperjuangkan
1	Sumatera Utara	3.354	25.965
2	Sumatera Barat	1.485	24.551
3	Riau	-	15.111
4	Jambi	35.800	107.830
5	Sumatera Selatan	3.529	3.529
6	Lampung	-	13.220
7	Banten	1.552	8.100
8	Jawa Barat	600	700
9	Jawa Tengah	40	25.270
10	Yogyakarta	-	4.434
11	Jawa Timur	-	3.065
12	NTB	80	14.822
13	NTT	830	880
JUMLAH		47.270	247.477

Figure 1. Land Area Di-relaming SPI Members Per-region Year 20017-1998-2011

Source: (Indonesian Peasants' Union, 2011)

The act of land occupation to reclaim land that is the right of SPI member peasants, is carried out with strict rules. There are three stages in the action of agrarian reform struggle at the base level. *First*, pre-claimant preparation consisting of mass education, strengthening of organizations, network formation and strengthening, skills training and data collection. *Second*, the billboard action, which includes land occupation activities, rallying public opinion and support, and giving notification to the local government before carrying out the occupation action along with juridical and historical arguments (*legal opinion*). *Third*, post-billboard management, which includes structuring production, building alternative models of distribution, continuing the struggle for legal certainty (SPI, 2008).

In carrying out the practice of agrarian struggle at the local level, the SPI struggle is carried out on the principle of 'nonviolence'. Although in reality the action of SPI members' billboards is faced with acts of violence from the opposite party, as well as arrests and detentions by the police. The threat is a consequence that has been taken into account from the beginning, so it has been prepared anticipation to avoid or face these threats. The ability of cadres in terms of skills to design strategies and negotiate with opponents, security forces and the government is needed in this regard (Saragih, 2012).

Mass Action and Building Alliances

Land occupation was followed by mobilization and mass action to strengthen bargaining positions and urge local governments to take action in resolving land conflicts. Mass action of SPI members at the district level, is more likely as a reaction to the pressures faced by SPI members who are occupying land. Land occupation always faces the risk of intimidation, acts of violence, and arrest by the police. To deal with these pressures, this form of mass action is a way to strengthen the bargaining position and urge the police not to take sides with plantation companies, or release their partners who were arrested for occupying land. Mass actions at the local level were also carried out to urge the government at the district level to immediately respond and resolve the demands of SPI members to resolve land conflicts.

These actions at the local level are carried out by SPI member bases from various villages located in one region. In areas where SPI members have high escalation of conflict, mass action carried out at the local level tends to be high. However, one of the weaknesses of local actions that exist is that these actions are still limited to reactionary from the pressure faced by the opposing party. Local actions of the land case struggle will be followed by greater mass action at the provincial level. When local actions carried out do not get a response from the district government, the mass action will continue to the provincial level by involving SPI members from all over the regency.

In addition to mobilizing members, the mass action also involved a network of alliances that supported the SPI struggle. To fight for agrarian reform, SPI needs broader support and alliances. Social change in the long run must be fought together with other popular movements. The local-level movement alliance built by SPI in North Sumatra, described by Wagimin as follows:

"It must be realized that the problem of peasants is also related to other problems, workers, poor cities and so on. Because most of the workers and poor of the city also came from the village peasants who went to the city. In SPI North Sumatra, to equalize views on people's issues, there is an alliance to discuss issues in every sector. That's where you will find the root of the problem, why the people's problems occur and do not look at the problems of peasants, workers and other sectors separately. So there is a system that is a problem and a common enemy. From the strategic side, we see the majority of this nation as poor. These poor are mostly peasants, laborers, fishermen and urban poor. Well, when we can build this power, we can use it for the strategic interests of the organization to be a pressure force against policy makers. For practical purposes, it can help to urgently address the issues of each sector that each sector needs."

The alliance built by SPI in North Sumatra involves mass organizations of laborers, fishermen and the urban informal sector. The alliance built at the provincial level calls itself the People's Sovereignty Alliance. In this alliance involved the organization of labor movement (North Sumatra Trade Union), poor city (Free Rickshaw Union), fishermen (Indonesian Fishermen's Union), youth and student organizations and Non-governmental organizations that support the people's movement organization (Sintesa, Lantern Medan). The alliance is a traditional alliance of SPI North Sumatra that has been built since the time of SPSU (North Sumatra Peasants' Union) (saragih, 2012).

In addition to strategic alliances, SPI also involves itself in tactical alliances initiated by other movement organizations as well as by the SPSU itself. In addition to maintaining patterns of relationships and communication with other organs of movement, it is intended to attract support to the organization at certain moments. In some moments, the relationship is called to a form of tactical alliance that tends to be spontaneous and short-term.

SPI Political Movement At The Local Level

At the local level, action to urge change accompanied by political action to seize village-level power carried out by some SPI bases. The political act of seizing the power of the village government agency aims to strengthen the struggle of the land cases faced. In the mass bases that are fighting for land cases, controlling the village

government is aimed at strengthening support and legitimizing the action of the struggle on land. While on the bases of the masses who have won the struggle over land or in the bases of the masses that do not carry the struggle of the land case, seizing the village government institutions aims to urge the wider issues of struggle and build alternative practices to build independent and prosperous villages.

SPI strategy at the local level to submit its best cadres in contestation of village-level power as practiced by SPI members in Sirna Jaya Village, Warung Kiara, Sukabumi. The land case struggle has succeeded in expelling PT. Sugih Mukti, which had displaced 600 hectares of land in 1997. The land is planted with food crops and has boosted the economy of about 1,060 peasants in four villages, Sirna Jaya, Bojong Kerta, Warung Kiara and Hegar Manah. Although it has controlled the land *de facto*, the status of the land is still considered in conflict status by the BPN. The struggle to insist on formal legal recognition of land ownership to the government, was met with obstacles from the head of Sirna Jaya village who did not support the struggle of SPI members (Putra, 2012).

Ahead of the implementation of pilkades in 2011, SPI members in Sirna Jaya Village submitted the chairman of SPI Warung Kiara Branch, 'Pak Uloh' as a candidate for Village Head. In the Contestation, SPI members in Sirna Jaya faced *incumbent* village heads who were considered not to support the peasants' struggle. The number of SPI members in Sirna Jaya is only 30% of the number of voters. But the cadres submitted by the SPI have the support of other citizens who support the SPI struggle. In the vote count, SPI cadres managed to win pilkades with the support of 65% of the votes among the three contestants (Bey, 2012).

The seizure of the village head's position is not solely for the sake of the land case struggle carried out by SPI members. More broadly, the political action has the aim to carry out alternative practices of building independent villages, improving village facilities, opening access to various programs from local and central governments, and so on. This is recognized by Wagimin as follows:

"If we look at peasants' issues, that's a lot of things. Such as the issue of access to capital, markets and access to resources and so forth. By us seizing the political position of the village government, the hope is that accesses that were once closed, can be opened through the position of control of village government institutions. If this position is not captured, it will be difficult for us to access it. The most important land case issue is the recognition of the village. Recognition from the village is the most important evidence for the land case problem. It is expected that by seizing the position of village head, peasants who have land case problems will get legitimacy from the village that the land fought for is community-owned land."

At the district and provincial levels, political action is carried out by building political causes with political parties and factions in the legislature. As SPI does in NorthSumatra, the political causes is built to attract support and open political channels to urgently address the issues being fought by SPI at the district and provincial levels. The political caucus does not have strong and permanent ties, because it was formed only to follow up practical and temporary problems. It is not clear the direction of the political caucus that the SPI built with the political party party is recognized by Wagimin:

"This caucus is actually expected to be able to help the work of the organization in terms of problems, especially the resolution of problems in SPI North

Sumatra. Well, to this day the effectiveness of this built political caucus is not so clear, whether it is about influencing policy and others. Still only limited, if there are problems faced by SPI members and will be brought to a higher level such as the DPRD, at least it is only easy to meet with some officials that we want to meet. But until how this caucus has the understanding and is able to solve the problems faced by peasants, until now it has not been seen for real."

Another problem faced in building the political caucus is the lack of cadres who have the ability to communicate politically with political parties. So that communication through the political caucus is directed to obtain reactionary support for cases that struggle SPI members land in districts and provinces. The weakness of this political rigidity built at the local level is recognized by Wagimin:

"Because in SPI North Sumatra itself must be recognized limited resources. So that the political work that must be done is left behind. So SPI North Sumatra does not have enough resources to work on all that. If the members of this caucus, their willingness (political party) is relative to continue to voice the struggle of peasants. Because members of this caucus are people who are from backgrounds and come from political parties. So when no mechanism is created, such as regular meetings and so on, the issues discussed will be forgotten. The orientation of the members of the political caucus remains as a person who represents his party."

The Agrarian reform strategy carried out by SPI at the local level has common ground in terms of fundamental principles. In general, all members of the SPI base their struggle on the power of the masses to carry out land occupation and mass actions. Education is the main requirement that must be done before carrying out the action. The struggle carried out in pressing demands at the District and Provincial levels involves alliances with other organizations that have similar issues. Alliances built in different regions have different patterns. The political act of seizing village-level power was carried out by SPI members in several villages on local initiatives to strengthen the organization's struggle.

The struggle of SPI member land cases at the local level is an attempt to build autonomous spaces to oppose unfair systems. This is done through direct actions by relying on the power of the educated and organized masses, and building the practices of struggle at the local level. Occupying land, distributing fairly, implementing sustainable farming models (organic farming), establishing fair distribution models, building cooperative economic practices, critical and participatory education practices, and gender justice practices, are examples of SPI's efforts to develop alternative models for long-term struggle. As mentioned by Gaventa, that the autonomous space created by the SPI is a counterpoint to the formal space of policy making that is considered not to be running in accordance with its function. Citing Soja's research, Gaventa said that this 'space' is a 'third space' where social actors reject hegemonic space and create their own space. Cornwall refers to this space as 'organic' space, which arises from the general concerns of peasants and can be realized through mass mobilization, or space formed from like-minded people joining the Common goal (Gaventa, 1980).

SPI strategy in agrarian struggle at the local level is seen from gaventa's power cube in the invisible *power* form of actors/ entities; First, the government bureaucracy and state apparatus that has legal authority. Second, educational institutions, customary institutions, religious institutions that have social legitimacy. Third, media institutions

that carry the ideology of the market, form the perception of society through news that favors the interests of the market. Strategies at the Local Level, among others; Education, Member Recruitment, Organizational Strengthening, Reclaiming, Building alternative models, Mass Action, Public Campaigns, Lobby and political caucuses, Legal Advocacy.

Hidden *Power* Forms actors/entities that are; Plantation/mining entrepreneurs, local thugs, local entrepreneurs, foreign investors as for Strategies at the Local Level among others; Media campaigns to raise issues, Mass action to press issues, Builds alliances to raise issues together, seminars and discussions to sharpen issues. Meanwhile, the Form of Hidden *Power* Actor / Entity is The President's Power, Minister, BPN, Regional Head, DPR/MPR/DPD Member, DPRD Member, Komnas Ham Member. Furthermore, Strategies at the Local Level among others; Land Billboards, Mass Action to pressure policy makers, build alliances to gain solidarity support, Lobby and political acus to influence policy-making actors, dialogue with local governments, and legal advocacy.

CONCLUSION

The struggle of SPI at the local level urges agrarian reform to be carried out with a strategy: *first*, conduct education at the base level to build critical awareness and bring out cadres of peasants who have leadership skills and practical expertise in conducting social movements. *Second*, the act of land occupation / billboard / occupation. *Third*, seize village-level power to strengthen the struggle at the local level. *Fourth*, establish sustainable alternative practice practice as a form of resistance to the dominant hegemony of power. *Fifth*, carry out mass action in reaction to the pressure faced and urge demands to influence policy. *Sixth*, build alliances with various popular movements. *Seventh*, build a political caucus with a political party.

SPI's agrarian struggle strategy at the national level is directed at raising the issue of agrarian reform as a political agenda and urging the implementation of Law No. 5 of 1960 on the Basic Rules of Agrarian Trees (PA Law). Strategies carried out by SPI include: *first*, strengthening the education of systematic organizations. *Second*, build counter concepts. *Third*, mass mobilization in the form of mass action and rallies to urge agrarian reform. *Third*, build alliances with various labor movement organizations, fishermen, NGOs and student organizations. *Fourth*, build an alliance with Komnas Ham to support the struggle of land cases and to push for an agrarian reform agenda as part of the Ekosob Rights. *Fifth*, engage in an international peasant movement to challenge international powers such as the World Bank, IMF, WTO and TNC's.

The author suggested four important things that must be done or continued by SPI, namely: *first*, SPI must be able to ensure the agrarian reform agenda so as not to be manipulated and carried out in accordance with PA Law No. 5 of 1960. *Second*, SPI must formulate a more tangible strategy to prevent the World Bank's efforts to liberalize the national land system implemented from within policy-making institutions through loan funds. *Third*, SPI must be able to combine various strategies to fight for agrarian reform in various spaces and levels. *Fourth*, SPI must be able to unite views and attitudes to maintain the PA Law, so that there is no division among fellow supporters of the Agrarian Reform Movement.

REFERENCES

Akbar, M.C. (2016). *Theification of the Waning Role of States in Neoliberalism (Free Trade and Conflict Between Countries under the WTO Regime)* [Teifikasi

- Memudarnya Peran Negara dalam Neoliberalisme (Perdagangan Bebas dan Konflik Antar Negara di Bawah Rezim WTO)]. *Global Insight Journal*, 1(1).
- Budiman, A. (1996). Third world development theory.
- Central Bureau of Statistics, March 2011. *Monthly Report on Socio-Economic Data*, Jakarta.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. [Penyelidikan kualitatif dan desain penelitian: Memilih di antara lima pendekatan]. Sage publications.
- Fidro, B., & Fauzi, N. (1998). *Fruitful Development disputes: A collection of land dispute cases throughout the New Order*. [Sengketa Pembangunan yang Berbuah: Kumpulan kasus sengketa tanah sepanjang masa Orde Baru].
- Gaventa, J. (1982). *Power and powerlessness: Quiescence and rebellion in an Appalachian valley* [Kekuasaan dan ketidakberdayaan: Keheningan dan pemberontakan di lembah Appalachian]. University of Illinois Press.
- Gaventa, J. (2006). *Finding the spaces for change: a power analysis* [Menemukan ruang untuk perubahan: analisis kekuatan]. *IDS bulletin*, 37(6), 23-33.
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, M. & Saldana. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* [Analisis Data Kualitatif: Buku Sumber Metode.]. (H. Salmon, Ed.) (3rd ed.). London: SAGE.
- Purwanto, H. (2013). *Local to global; How The Indonesian Peasants' Union has accelerated the movement for agrarian reform* [Lokal ke global; Bagaimana Serikat Tani Indonesia mempercepat gerakan reforma agraria]. *La Via Campesina's Open Book: Celebrating*, 20,1-12.
- Pelzer, K. J. (1991). *Agrarian disputes: plantation entrepreneurs against peasants* [Sengketa agraria: pengusaha perkebunan melawan petani]. Hope Light Library.
- Purba, C.C.M. (2017). *Indigenous Peoples Social Movement: The Study of The Seizure of Frankincense Forest Land in Pandumaan-Sipituhuta Village of Humbang Hasundutan Regency of North Sumatra* [Gerakan Sosial Masyarakat Adat: Kajian Perebutan Lahan Hutan Kemenyan di Desa Panduan-Sipitu Huta Kabupaten Humbang Hasundutan Sumatera Utara]. (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Brawijaya).
- SPI., (2008.). *SPI's Basic Attitude View on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development*, in the Third Congress Document of the Indonesian Peasants' Union [Pandangan Dasar SPI tentang Reforma Agraria dan Pembangunan Pedesaan, dalam Dokumen Kongres Ketiga Serikat Tani Indonesia]. Jakarta: Indonesian Peasants' Union.
- SPI., (2010). Indonesian Peasants' Union, *Stop The Policy of Liberalization and Corporatization of Agriculture: Record of Agricultural Development, Rural and Agrarian Reform 2010* [Serikat Tani Indonesia, Stop Kebijakan Liberalisasi dan Korporatisasi Pertanian: Catatan Pembangunan Pertanian, Reformasi Pedesaan dan Agraria 2010].
- SPI., (2012). *Mesuji Case: The Tip of the Iceberg of Peasants' Rights Violations in Indonesia* [Kasus Mesuji: Puncak Gunung Es Pelanggaran Hak-Hak Petani di Indonesia]. <http://www.spi.or.id/?p=4555>, accessed on March 13, 2012
- White, B. (2019). *Population, involution, and employment in rural Java* [Populasi, involusi, dan lapangan kerja di pedesaan Jawa] (pp. 130-146). Routledge.
- Wiradi, G. (2009). *Ins and outs of agrarian problems: agrarian reform and agrarian research* [Seluk-beluk masalah agraria: reforma agraria dan penelitian agraria]. SCIENCE Press.