

Social Exchange Network in Peasant Movement of Kalibakar, South Malang

Wahyudi*

University of Muhammadiyah Malang
 wahyudiwinarjo641223@gmail.com

Abstract. This article was written based on the research results on social exchange networks in the peasant movement of Kalibakar, South of Malang. The Kalibakar peasant movement took place since the post-Japanese occupation, and to this day, the movement has not been finished. The Kalibakar peasant movement's main objective is the reclaiming of former PTPN XII plantation land of Kalibakar covering $\pm 2,050$ Ha, which is believed by farmers as the land of his ancestors. At present, de facto, more than 95% of the former plantation areas have been controlled by farmers. However, de jure, there is no evidence of farmers' ownership over the land because the government is still considered it in the status of the dispute. The Kalibakar peasant movement is fluctuating, sometimes ups and downs. One of the factors that influence it is the absence of social networks that support the peasant movement. This case study aims to describe the dynamics of the social exchange network. The results showed that the Kalibakar peasant movement did not occur entirely in social exchange because what happened was a network of opportunity-taking or a network of opportunity-seeking. So, in the movement arena, there were no more scarce resources that could be contested, and the peasant movement became stagnant.

Keywords: *social exchange network, farmer movement, actor motive*

INTRODUCTION

The Kalibakar peasant movement has taken place since the post-Japanese occupation until now. However, the movement aimed to reclaim the land of the former PTPN. XII plantation of Kalibakar still leaves problems in the form of stagnation in the process of land certification being the property of farmers. The government has not given the title of ownership (SHM) to the land that has been cultivated by farmers since 1998 because it is still considered to be in a dispute status. Kalibakar farmers have utilized de facto, more than 95% of ex-plantation land, but de jure, the farmers do not have an SHM on the land they claim as their ancestral heritage.

Since 2001 until now, the Kalibakar peasant movement has declined [1]. The stagnation of the peasant movement is influenced by political situations and conditions that do not support it and the loss of social network to support South Malang Farmers Communication Forum (Forum Komunikasi Petani Malang Selatan or FORKOTMAS). The support function of social networks in the peasant movement is very vital. Without the support of social networks, the peasant movement will die [2]–[4].

Banten peasant uprising was examined by Kartodirdjo [5]. It was also a battle between Islamic religious leaders who succeeded in forming networks with peasants (rich and poor) through the *kadiriah tarekat* organization against lower-level Dutch government officials who also had networked with several traditional aristocrats.

Aiko Kurasawa-Shiraishi, in her study of the Japanese Occupation and Social Change: Forced Submission of Rice and Peasant Rebellion [6], found that rebellion occurred between two opposing parties. The first party was farmers who collaborated with religious leaders against the Japanese occupation government, who borrowed the hands of lower-level village government officials assisted by Japanese government security tools (army), as well as certain religious leaders (kyai) who could be "bought."

Kurasawa's study explained that the uprising began in a small area, spread throughout the Indramayu Residency area. The expansion of the rebellion was due to several rebel actors' success in networking with farmers in other regions whom he considered to have the same fate. The network can be built on the principle of struggle: "it is better to fight against the government rather than starve to death."

Other research that strengthens the assumption that the peasant movement is highly dependent on social network support was carried out by Bachriadi and Lucas, as he wrote in the book titled *Seizing the Land of the People: The Case of Tapos and Cimaan*. The results showed that peasant resistance reached its peak after the Suharto regime's crimes (Thursday, May 21, 1998). The resistance has involved various components of society, such as student activists, farmers, Legal Aid of Jakarta, Legal Aid of Ampera Bogor, Indonesian Solidarity (SI), Indonesian Peasant

Solidarity (STI), Front Indonesia, National Commission on Human Rights, Alliance of People's Lawsuit (ALARM), Solidarity Committee for Victims of Development Cimacan Golf Course (KSKPLGC), Global Anti-Golf Movement (GAG'M), and other action units [7].

The supporting networks for the sustainability of a social movement are vital not only for the peasant movement but also for all fields of social movements, including environmental, mass media, politics, and any other social movements. Without network support, there will never be a social movement[3], [8]–[13].

Based on the empirical facts of the Kalibakar farmers' movement and some of the results of the research as quoted above, the researcher was encouraged to study the dynamics of social networks that also support the farmers' movement from time to time so that a comprehensive explanation is obtained. Data on social networks in the Kalibakar peasant movement will also provide information about the motives of the actors who come and go in the peasant movement network.

METHOD

This research uses the constructivist paradigm to understand the social world as constructed by subjects [14]. The research approach is qualitative with the type of case studies [15] that explore data about social networks from FORKOTMAS through in-depth interviews with the organizers of the farmers' movement organization.

The location of this research is in the Kalibakar area of South Malang. The focus of this research is the network of social exchanges between actors in the Kalibakar peasant movement. Data analysis is done through an interactive model [16] with data validity testing through the triangulation of research subjects.

RESULT & DISCUSSION

Reclaiming or looting began on April 13, 1993, of the 22,25 Ha "TT" forest (titi soro forest). The "TT" forest area is within the Afdeling Petungombo area. At present, the area is located in Simojayan Village, Ampelgading District, Malang Regency. The reclaiming was carried out by approximately 100 peasants led by a charismatic peasant who also held the position of village head and figure of a social organization affiliated with the most influential political party of the era. The reason for the reclaiming is that the land belongs to the village, not Perhutani. The area was the basis of the people's guerrilla fight against the Dutch.

The network structure of the peasant movement, as mentioned above, is a central figure of the peasant movement, and an influential chairperson of community organizations, then supported by

farmers of Simojayan Village. This movement era is called the era of limited networks (The year 1992 - 1993) because it was only led by two main actors. The success of the TT forest's reclamation was a milestone that further pumped the spirit of farmers to demand the return of land rights held by PTPN XII plantations of Kalibakar.

The second reclaiming occurred on December 23-25, 1997, towards Afdeling Petungombo with 240 hectares. The number of farmers who made reclaiming/ looting was around 400-500 people. The peasant movement's central leadership from the beginning to the end in the reform era remains the same, namely the Head of the Village of Simojayan, who has now passed away. The reason for this reclaiming movement is because, in the farmers' social history records, the land had become the property of the farmers' ancestors. The land had been given by the Japanese colonial government to the farmers, and the land had been abandoned, so it was taken care of and managed by the Kalibakar farmers.

The actors involved in the phase-2 reclaiming movement are a charismatic leader as the central figure of the movement, a leader of influential social organizations, a guerrilla army figure whose base of struggle was in Kalibakar who could later bring his network, namely several key figures in the local government of Malang and a second-tier leader from the Central Agriaria Ministry. This movement phase is called the network expansion phase (1996 - 1997) because many actors have begun to join in supporting the Kalibakar peasant movement's mission.

The 3rd reclaiming was carried out on June 13-16, while the fourth was on July 23, 1998. The target of reclaiming/looting in the post-Soeharto regime's fall was Afdeling Sumber Tlogo, with an area of 167.01 Ha. This time, the Kalibakar peasant movement is becoming more solid. "The farmers are getting bolder, the political atmosphere was loose for the emergence of the peasant movement, we estimate 1,000 Kalibakar farmers are participating in clearing the cocoa farms," said the leader of the Kalibakar peasant movement.

The reclaiming movement is even more powerful when farmers do not face significant security threats or threats from government security forces. This is reflected in the 5th reclaiming movement that took place on August 23-24, 1998 of the 436.06 Ha plantation area in Afdeling Kalibakar; the 6th reclaiming conducted on August 25, 1998, of the 601.33 Ha plantation estate in Afdeling Lebakarjo; and the 7th reclaiming of the 473.55 Ha Afdeling Sumbergesing plantation area carried out by farmers in the period from July 17 to September 19, 1998. The farmers' movement was generally carried out by around 1,000 - 1,500 people. "Farmers in different villages help one another," said the leader of the farmers' movement.

The era of the peasant movement during the reform era was called the peak era of the network (1998 - 2000) because it was during this period that the Kalibakar peasant movement was supported by very influential actors: a charismatic leader from Simojayan Village as a central actor, then endorsed by the FORKOTMAS peasant movement organization, the Peasants Association of East Java, Legal Aid of Malang, the NGO's Enlightenment, a former guerrilla soldier who brought networks from the center (the agrarian ministry), the district government of Malang, and the House of Representatives of Malang Regency.

Movement figures acknowledge that the 1998 reform movement culminated in the glorious reclaiming/looting of Kalibakar farmers. "We are sure; if there were no reform movement, the Kalibakar farmers would not be able to control the land of ex-plantations which indeed are all land owned by our ancestors," stressed the leader of FORKOTMAS who now remains a farmer. The leaders of the movement are grateful that there was a 1998 reform movement that opened the space and time for farmers to reclaim/plunder ex-plantation land, which, in total, covers 1,940.2 hectares mentioned above.

Starting in 2001 - 2005, the Kalibakar peasant movement entered the era of the movement's disappearance, which was marked by the removal of supporting actors, as well as the low dynamics of the FORKOTMAS organization. In this period, the network only consisted of FORKOTMAS and LBH Pos Malang. Furthermore, after 2006 until now, the Kalibakar peasant movement entered the era of movement stagnation, where there was no formal support for the existence of FORKOTMAS, even the solidity and integrity of FORKOTMAS members themselves remarkably dropped.

Based on the results of the research above, it was identified that the peasant movement is dynamic, fluctuating, and melting. This reality is influenced by the absence or the strength of the social networks that support it. Whereas, the existence of social networks supporting the peasant movement itself is very dependent on 3 (three) things, namely the conducive situation and political conditions of government, whether or not 'production tools' can be contested, and whether or not opportunities for social exchange are carried out within the network of movements.

The Kalibakar peasant movement's reality above is in line with the general assumptions of the social exchange theory. It states that in social transactions, humans always try to get profit through the calculation of costs and benefits. Human calculations are not always accurate because humans have limited information about the various alternatives being faced. Humans are more likely to pursue material goals in their social transactions, but they also mobilize and exchange

non-material resources, such as sentiments, services, and certain symbols [17], [18]. The material objective of the actors in the Kalibakar peasant movement is to reclaim the land of the former estate and some money for certain actors. On the other hand, non-material sources are pursued in the form of sound political support and achievements as social activists.

Meanwhile, in the social exchange theory from Richard M. Emerson, it is said that humans always take the initiative to get rewards in social interaction. Emerson added that someone would have power over other people if he has the rewards desired by others. The initiative is always carried out by dependent people, not by people who have power. An imbalance will be created in an exchange relationship, but over time, the actors will try to create a new balance [19]. Rewards in this study are the traditional power and authority of the peasant movement's central figure, as well as legal-formal power and authority owned by actors from government agencies and political parties, and legal aid institutions.

The main idea of Emerson's approach to the exchange network, as written in his work: 'Power-Dependency Relations' [20], is related to the concepts of power, balance, and dependence. According to him, a dependency is the primary source of power. Actors who have power tend to exploit those who depend on them. In an exchange relation, there will be an imbalance of exchange, followed by efforts to make a balance. Emerson's thinking is exactly what happened in the Kalibakar peasant movement arena, where farmers are very dependent on the actors who have strong power, or the central character of the charismatic movement.

Exchange on the network [20] has two general types, namely: (1) negotiated exchanges, where the actor negotiates and bids on the distribution of resources. In this case, the exchange occurs at that time, and (2) reciprocal exchanged, i.e., the actor does not negotiate but provides resources in the hope that there will be reciprocal 'rewards,' in which the replies are not known. In the Kalibakar peasant movement, there are two types of carpentry at once, both negotiated and reciprocal exchanges. This second type in field language (forgot) is often represented by the term 'know the same know,' although in some cases, what happens can also be 'tricking' or 'tricked.'

CONCLUSION

Based on the explanation of the results and discussion above, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The Kalibakar peasant social movement is dynamic, fluctuating, and melting because it depends on the presence or absence of strong or weak network support.

2. The support of the Kalibakar peasant movement network is influenced by a) the developing political conditions and conditions of government; b) whether there is a contested 'means of production' or 'rare source'; and c) whether there is an opportunity for social exchange in a network of movements.

3. The motives of the actors in the network of movements are not solely to support the achievement of the goals of the Kalibakar peasant movement but to take 'some' or rent 'means of production' or 'scarce resources' available in the arena of movement, namely a plot of land, or political support, or money, or organizational duties from the place of origin of the actor, or social honor.

4. The social exchange network in the Kalibakar peasant movement is symmetrical and asymmetrical, both related to farmers and non-farmers.

REFERENCES

- [1] Wahyudi, "Formasi dan Struktur Gerakan Sosial Petani [Studi Kasus Gerakan Reklamasi/Penjarahan Atas Tanah PTNP XII (Persero) Kalibakar, Malang Selatan]," *J. Masy. dan Budaya*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 19–42, 2010.
- [2] M. Diani and D. McAdam, *Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action*. 2003.
- [3] C. Saunders, "Using Social Network Analysis to Explore Social Movements: A Relational Approach," *Soc. Mov. Stud.*, 2007.
- [4] J. Krinsky and N. Crossley, "Social Movements and Social Networks: Introduction," *Soc. Mov. Stud.*, 2014.
- [5] S. A. Kamaruddin, "Pemberontakan Petani Unra 1943 (Studi Kasus Mengenai Gerakan Sosial Di Sulawesi Selatan Pada Masa Pendudukan Jepang)," *Hubs-Asia*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 19–35, 2012.
- [6] W. Iryana, "Protes Sosial Petani Indramayu Masa Pendudukan Jepang (1942 - 1945)," *Patanjala*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 285–300, 2016.
- [7] D. Bachriadi and A. E. Lucas, "Merampas tanah rakyat: kasus Tapos dan Cimacan." Gramedia, Jakarta, p. 360, 2001.
- [8] W. B. Stevenson and D. Greenberg, "Agency and social networks: Strategies of action in a social structure of position, opposition, and opportunity," *Adm. Sci. Q.*, 2000.
- [9] D. B. Tindall, J. Cormier, and M. Diani, "Network social capital as an outcome of social movement mobilization: Using the position generator as an indicator of social network diversity," *Soc. Networks*, 2012.
- [10] R. J. Fletcher, M. A. Acevedo, B. E. Reichert, K. E. Pias, and W. M. Kitchens, "Social network models predict movement and connectivity in ecological landscapes," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2011.
- [11] W. S. Chow and L. S. Chan, "Social network, social trust and shared goals in organizational knowledge sharing," *Inf. Manag.*, 2008.
- [12] D. A. Snow, L. A. Zurcher, and S. Eklund-Olson, "Social Networks and Social Movements: A Microstructural Approach to Differential Recruitment," *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, 1980.
- [13] H. Ernstson, S. Sörlin, and T. Elmqvist, "Social movements and ecosystem services - The role of social network structure in protecting and managing urban green areas in Stockholm," *Ecol. Soc.*, 2008.
- [14] N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln, *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2005.
- [15] R. K. Yin, *Case Study Research, Design and Methods*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2003.
- [16] M. B. Miles, A. M. Huberman, and J. Saldana, *Qualitative Data Analysis, A Methods Sourcebook*, 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications, 2014.
- [17] J. H. Turner, *The Structure of Sociological Theory*, 6th ed. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1998.
- [18] J. H. Turner, *Handbook of Sociological Theory*. Riverside, California: Springer, 2006.
- [19] R. M. Emerson, "Social Exchange Theory," *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, pp. 335–362, 1976.
- [20] R. M. Emerson, "Power-Dependence Relations," *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 31–41, 1962.