Lampung, the first governor’s proposition regarding the province’s forestry zones took place in 1977. The second proposition, with similar content (reclassification of former BW land) was in 1980. Through this process, it appears that the governor was the one who proposed the new forest land use. In reality it was the Provincial Representative Office of the Ministry of Forestry who did most of the work. Following this, field delineation was conducted, new boundary poles were installed and the old ones reconstructed.

Meanwhile, massive logging activities were conducted throughout Lampung. Beginning in the 1960s, it became the main forestry works in the province until the end of the 1980s—when there no more forests left for commercial logging. Included in logging concession areas were portions of lands that were later designated as Way Kambas and Bukit Barisan Selatan national parks in the mid-1980s. In addition to former BW lands, the forestry authorities also granted forests on adat lands to logging companies. After the logging many of these lands were either designated as state forest zones or granted to estate plantation companies.

When the Lampung forest land use was proposed in the 1980s, a considerable portion of the proposed state forestry zones were no longer forested due to (legal and illegal) logging and, with the flow of migrants to the province, the conversion into village settlements and the expansion of smallholding fields. These facts were ignored. The justification to include

---

2 During the Gus Dur presidency in 2000, as part of the process of decentralization and regional autonomy, all the central ministries’ representative offices (kantor wilayah) in the provinces were dismantled.

3 An example of this inclusion was over 40,000 hectares of damar (Shorea javanica) gardens in Krui. Granted to a logging company in 1980s, it was later gazetted as production forest zones. In 1997 the Minister of Forestry signed a decree declaring the zone as ‘zone with distinct purpose’ (KDTI kawasan dengan tujuan istimewa) and granted the usufruct right of this zone to Krui adat communities.
these non-forested lands as state forest zones was said to be in accord with the Basic Forestry Law of 1967, which stipulated that 30% of land must be gazetted as state forest zones. Hence, 1.2 million ha of the province’s territory was officially designated as state forest zones. These zones were further sub-classified into conservation forest (kawasan konservasi), designed for conservation of the flora and fauna in its natural habitat; protection forest (hutan lindung), with watershed conservation as its primary function; and production forest (hutan produksi) for timber production.

In the conservation forest zones (Bukit Barisan Selatan and Way Kambas national parks), more regular patrols have been the primary mechanism to limit further encroachments. But this has not prevented illegal hunting, poaching, and expansion of smallholder fields.

In the 1980s, following the process of the designation of state forestry zones, and with little forest left to log, the eviction of forest squatters and reforestation became the main forestry policies on protection forest zones. From the early 1980s to the mid 1990s, through a series of military operations, thousands of families were evicted from protection forest zones in various upper watershed regions in the province such as Gunung Balak in the east; Gunung Betung, Pulau Panggung, and Wonosobo in the south; and Sumber Jaya and neighbouring subdistricts in the north. Between 1979 and 1996, through local transmigration programmes (translok, transmigrasi lokal), 65,000 families (over a quarter of million people) were resettled to several sites in the northern lowland of the province (e.g. Pakuan Ratu, Tulang Bawang, Mesuji).

It is public knowledge that those who joined the transmigration programmes constituted only a fraction of those who actually settled and farmed the state
forest zones. Those who farmed in the state forest zones but did not live there were excluded from the local transmigration program. From the 1970s to the mid-1990s, it was stated in official reports that 180,272 hectares of protection forest zones had been reforested. But evidence in the field indicates otherwise; most reforestation projects failed to transform ‘degraded’ forest into plantation forests.

Plantation forestry was conducted both in protection forest zones and production forest zones. Various government forestry units were made responsible for reforestation on protection forest zones, while in the production forest zones the state-owned (PT Inhutani) and private companies were involved through the industrial forest plantation scheme (HTI, hutan tanaman industri). From the mid-1980s to the mid-1990s it was reported that PT Inhutani and other companies controlling 239,000 hectares of the production forest zones had planted 54,907 hectares of fast-growing trees and rubber, but actual successful planting was limited.

Not only did the government fail to clear the state forest zones of settlers and reforest the ‘degraded’ land, the eviction of the forest settlers and attempts at reforestation resulted in prolonged conflicts between smallholders, the forestry authority and HTI companies. Meanwhile, conversion into smallholder fields and illegal logging of the remaining forests continued. In the mid-1990s, at least 41.4% of some 316,570 ha of conservation forest was no longer forested, with 5,676 households living within its various boundaries; 83.5% of some 318,513 ha of protection forest, contained 36,349 households; and 81.5% of 401,910 ha of production forest, contained 54,000 households.
Map 3. Forest Land Use Plan (TGHK) of Lampung Province 1990
Land appropriation and reappropriation in Sumber Jaya and Way Tenong

In the region of Sumber Jaya and Way Tenong, the state forest zones included all the former BW land that comprised a large portion of the region, excluding the relatively flat land along the banks of Way Besai river encircling Bukit Rigis mountain. Located on the banks of Way Besai, most villages in the region have state forest zone boundaries as their village borders. The former BW land to the east and north of the region was classified as protection forest. The hilly and mountain land to the west and north of the region was gazetted as part of Bukit Barisan Selatan national park.

The opening of the BW forests began a few years after independence and continued before, during, and after the process of proposition and designation of the province’s forest land use. On the border of the then subdistricts of Way Tenong and Bukit Kemuning, as early as 1946, the forests were cleared for upland rice swidden, housing and, later, coffee gardens by a small group of Ogan and Semendo people from the neighbouring regions. Bedeng Kerbau, as this hamlet was named, supplied rice for Indonesian soldiers who used Bukit Kemuning town as their post during the revolutionary war in 1946-47 against the return of the Dutch. In 1965-66 the forestry service gave official permission for 489 farmers to use 1,294 ha of the BW land for housing compounds and farming, each person receiving 0.3 ha to 17 ha. Finally in 1969 the governor officially recognised this territory as the administrative village of Dwikora.

From the early 1950s, more BW forests were transformed as settlements and farms for the incoming transmigrants from Java. The region was selected as
the receiving area for the transmigration of veterans from Java. The transmigration program was organised by a central government unit called BRN (Biro Rekonstruksi Nasional). The first BRN transmigration village of Sukapura included 224 ha of BW land, while Tribudi Sukur took 127 ha. Elders in Simpang Sari remember that in the late 1960s there were already warnings from village officials directed at the incoming transmigrants to stop further opening of the BW land.

In the following decades, more and more people migrated to the region. Hence more BW land was cleared and transformed into hamlets and smallholder fields. As more people led to more ‘development’ in the region, with the creation of more administrative villages and the construction of roads, schools, and health clinics, even more people were attracted into the region. Other factors were the improved coffee prices and trade. The enforcement of the forest zone boundaries was not an issue until the 1980s. Elders in Gunung Terang and Muara Jaya still remember that during the Dutch period, forestry officers regularly patrolled the BW boundary and advised village heads to deter their fellow villagers from clearing and farming land within the BW boundary. However, after independence the village head had no authority to prohibit the outsiders from clearing BW land; the BW land was not part of the village territory and the incoming migrants were not ‘citizens’ of any village. Instead, many village heads profited from these situations. They charged the incoming migrants fees such as land tax and permission to farm (izin garap). The new migrants then became the ‘citizens’ of that village.

Illegal logging was another important factor leading to the deforestation of the region. In most villages the elites were, and a few still are, involved in this lucrative yet illegal business. In the village, their responsibility was to
organize felling, cutting, and local transport. To avoid being targeted by
forest ranger patrols and raids during the process of felling and cutting, and
to protect the trucks from the police and forestry checkpoints along the
highway when transporting the timber out of the region, protection was
provided by local policemen, military personnel, and/or forest rangers. Most
often the three elements worked together. It is a widely held view that
timber is the main additional source of cash for local state agencies and their
apparatus. Such a situation is seen as normal for regions in Indonesia where
alternative sources of additional cash such as large industry or plantations
are absent, like in Sumber Jaya and Way Tenong. Without the backing of
either police, military, or forest rangers, any local villager cutting and taking
lumber, even from a naturally-felled tree in the forest, will become the target
of a local forest rangers raid. The timber will be seized and the possessor will
be sent to jail, to be released after a sum of ‘peace money’ (*uang damai*) is
paid.

Since the late 1970s the region has been constantly targeted as a site for the
sporadic implementation of forestry policies. Until recently, eviction of
smallholder farmers from state forest zones and reforestation of their farms
has been the main policy. Like the neighbouring regions of Tanjung Raja and
Pulau Panggung, the selection of this hilly region of Sumber Jaya and Way
Tenong has been justified because of its strategic location as the source of
water for big river systems feeding large dams and irrigation schemes in the
lowland. Sumber Jaya and Way Tenong region is the catchment area of Way
Besai watershed, which forms part of the larger Tulang Bawang watershed.
The neighbouring regions of Tanjung Raja and Pulau Panggung are the
upper parts of Way Rarem, Way Seputih, and Way Sekampung watersheds.
While Way Besai hydropower is an important source of electricity for the
province, the Way Rarem dam supplies water for irrigation networks in the
district of North Lampung, the Way Seputih irrigates rice bowls in central Lampung lowland, and the Way Sekampung feeds Batu Tegi hydropower in Pulau Panggung and irrigation networks in the southern lowlands of the province. For the forestry officers, the removal of natural cover and the planting of smallholder coffee on sloping land causes erosion, damaging the quality (siltation) and quantity (debit) of water flowing downstream. Thus, smallholders were accused of environmental destruction (*merusak lingkungan*) and were said to deserve harsh measures.

In the region, reforestation projects began in the late 1970s. They began with the planting of a few hundreds of hectares of pine and sungkai trees (*Peronema canescens*). A few stands of these trees can still be seen today between Dwikora and Sukapura. During the 1980s and the early 1990s sonokeling (*Dalbergia latifolia*), caliandra (*Calliandra calothyrsus*), and mahogany (*Swietenia mahogony*) were used in reforestation projects. There was a contrast in the way these projects were implemented. Prior to the 1980s, a project was carried out by the office forestry service. After that, the project involved other parties; private companies, PT Inhutani (state-owned forestry company), and the army (through the *AMR* program [*ABRI Manunggal Reboisasi*]). Previously concentrated only on the sites between the villages of Sukapura and Dwikora, in the 1980s to the early 1990s the reforestation projects spread throughout the region. Thus, most villages in the region experienced a reforestation project.

In 1995-1997, the reforestation project concentrated on Dwikora and a few villages on the eastern part of Sumber Jaya such as Sukapura, Simpang Sari, and Tribudi Sukur, close to the site of the Besai dam. *Gmelina arborea*⁴ was the

---

⁴ While pine, sungkai, sonokeling, and mahogony produce premium-class timbers, caliandra, a fast-growing bush, could quickly outgrow other plants (e.g. coffee, *imperata imperialis*).
main type of tree planted, along with a few other tree crops. Private
companies and the army were no longer involved in these projects, leaving
the implementation of the projects to PT Inhutani and the forestry service. In
addition to labourers recruited from outside the region, the projects often
involved local men and women as paid workers.

Bush (belukar) and coffee gardens were the main targets of the reforestation
project. It is reported that between 1978 to 1985 the reforestation projects
have planted 20,000 hectares of forestry zones in the region, and between
1995 to 1998, over 8,000 hectares. After planting the reforestation trees on a
particular site for a year or two, the project moved to other sites. The newly
planted trees were left without care. In belukar, the trees soon died. In coffee
gardens, most trees were uprooted and a few were kept alive alongside the
coffee stands.

The eviction of farmers living inside the state forest zones started in the early
1980s. Of the families whose coffee farms were demolished and planted with
pine trees in Dwikora, a few hundred were involuntarily resettled in a new
transmigration site in Mesuji, near Menggala in northern Lampung.
Hundreds of another families from the BRN transmigration villages of
Purajaya, Purawiwitan, Pura Mekar were among the over 8,000 people
targeted by a military operation to evict small farmers from state forest in
Sumber Jaya and Pulau Panggung in 1990-91. They were also forced to
resettle in Mesuji. In July 1994, in a joint operation of the forestry service and
the police force, houses and coffee gardens in 86 hamlets of over 1,200
families in Purajaya, Purawiwitan, and Muara Jaya were destroyed. Some of
the families were resettled in Mesuji, the rest moved elsewhere.

---

grass). Gmelina, a fast-growing timber tree, produces soft wood for lumber and pulp
industry.
To avoid the demolition of their houses and gardens through these military operations, elsewhere the farmers dismantled their hamlets on their own. Those who moved outside the region simply abandoned their gardens, those who lived nearby continued to care and harvest their coffee gardens. Living in a nearby village territory but outside the state forest boundaries, while continuing to care for and harvest the coffee gardens inside the state forest zones became a common response to such military operations. Since this involved the pruning, pollarding, or felling of the reforestation trees, this had to be done carefully to avoid being caught in the act by patrolling officers. Such a practice was called kucing-kucingan (hide and seek). During the harvest seasons, hide and seek was obviously more difficult. The patrolling forestry, military, and/or police personnel used the opportunity to confiscate the harvests. Later, this became a regular practice. Every harvest season the farmers would be asked to set aside a portion of their harvest to be collected by the patrolling personnel who threatened to destroy their gardens.

On the southern slopes of Bukit Rigis there were six hamlets, all located within the state forest. The population of three of these hamlets were registered in the transmigration village of Fajar Bulan. The other three hamlets belonged to another transmigration village of Puralaksana. In the 1970s, migrants, mainly from Java, had moved in and by the end of the 1980s there were over 500 families. Soon they were preparing to create a separate village administration. Sinar Harapan, literally meaning ‘the light of hope’, was chosen as the name of the village. The village community managed to have a small market, an elementary school, and mosques, just as in neighbouring administrative villages. But the plan to have a separate administrative village never materialised. In the early 1990s the forestry and
military personnel informed the villagers about an incoming military operation to evict those living and farming in state forest. Not wanting their houses and gardens destroyed, they vacated the village; some moved elsewhere, but most moved to neighbouring villages. Their coffee gardens were soon planted with sonokeling and mahogany. Only on coffee gardens that continued to be managed have these reforestation trees survived; on the abandoned gardens and bushes they died.

The most recent government attempt to evict small farmers and turn coffee gardens and bush in state forests zones into plantation forests took place in 1995-97. It began with what villagers in the region remember as ‘the elephant operation’ (operasi gajah) at the beginning of 1995. Unlike earlier, in this military operation a troop of elephants was involved. The villages of Dwikora, in Bukit Kemuning subdistrict, and Sukapura, Simpang Sari, and Tribudi Sukur, in Sumber Jaya subdistrict were selected for the showdown. The opening of the operation was aired nationally on the government television station (TVRI), and covered by local and national press.

In a couple of months, the operation managed to demolish hundreds of huts and houses and thousands of hectares of coffee gardens. Unlike in previous operations, this time the villagers were more open in expressing their disagreement. Hundreds of Dwikora villagers organised a demonstration in the capital of the province. Delegates from this village also managed to engage in a series of dialogues with high-level provincial government officers and members of the House of Representatives. Petitions were signed and sent to key institutions in Jakarta, such as the ministry of forestry, the human rights commission, and the House of Representatives. One of the results was that in Dwikora it was decided that the houses located 300 m from a stretch of the main road, over a kilometre long, would not be
destroyed in the operation. But the villagers were expected to dismantle their houses on their own. The demand for the cancellation or delay of the demolition of coffee gardens was not accepted. In 1996, through a decree by the governor, the administrative village of Dwikora was declared to no longer exist. At the end of 1996 a smaller troop of military, police, and forestry personnel was again set up to conduct a follow-up operation in Dwikora. But this time, when the troop wanted to start destroying the coffee gardens, hundreds of men, each with machetes in their hands rushed out and were ready to attack them. To avoid bloodshed, the troop cancelled the demolition of houses and coffee gardens. The villagers only allowed the troop to demolish government facilities such as the village hall, water tank, and elementary school.

As earlier, resettlement and further chopping down of smallholders’ coffee gardens and the planting of reforestation trees followed the demolition. In 1996, through a local transmigration program, nearly 300 families from Dwikora and other villages in Sumber Jaya moved to Mesuji. PT Inhutani and various forestry units organised the reforestation projects. Dwikora was chosen as the site of base camp and nurseries. By the beginning of 1998, it was reported that the reforestation project had planted at least 6,000 hectares.

Although the re-opening of coffee gardens, previously destroyed and planted with reforestation trees or just simply abandoned, has been occurring for some time, a massive re-opening began in mid 1998. This was linked with the krismon, El Nino drought, and reformasi. In the early years of the monetary crisis, the price of export crops such as coffee and pepper increased sharply following the decline of the rupiah vis a vis the US dollar. Coffee prices rose fivefold, from Rp 3,000 to nearly Rp 15,000. Hence,
abandoned and demolished coffee gardens were reopened. Dried bush and dying reforestation trees were burned, making felling and clearing of bush and trees less arduous. The overthrow of Suharto and his New Order regime in May 1998, marking the beginning of reformasi, was interpreted as the abrogation of the New Order's repressive forestry policies. The reformasi thus justified land reclaiming and reappropriation. There was no more fear of forestry and military personnel. Along with reclaiming fields, throughout the province a series of protests and demonstrations were staged, resulting in some forestry policy changes. The news spread among villagers that there would be no more evictions and crops destructions, and that farming in state forest zones was no longer prohibited. This was also the main theme of the PDIP campaign for the 1999 general election in the region. The PDIP's win in the region then further justified the reclaiming and reopening of state forest zones.

When talking about their interactions with the forestry authority, villagers in the region often speak of a series of periods: buka kawasan (opening of [state forest] zones), tutup kawasan (the closing of [state forest] zones), and bebas kawasan (free [to occupy state forest] zones). The first refers to the period prior to the enforcement of forestry policies, the second to the closing down of state forest zones in the late 1980s to the mid 1990s, and the latter to post reformasi. Some villagers said that had the coffee price not declined from 1999, the few patches of natural forest that now still remain would be gone and completely transformed into coffee gardens. This is the case for the reforested lands: most were cleared and returned to coffee gardens.
From Conflict to Collaboration?

The traditional social/community forestry

The early model for reforestation projects in the 1980s can be seen as a form of social forestry. ‘Forest farmers’ were treated as free (unpaid) labourers in the establishment of plantation forests. Although the sonokeling trees were planted in coffee gardens, the coffee trees were not cut down. Often the farmers worked as labourers on these reforestation projects to plant sonokeling on their own gardens. The farmers were allowed to continue caring for and harvesting their coffee but advised strongly to care for and not to fell the reforestation trees, and to abandon the gardens when the sonokeling trees outgrew the coffee trees. Although some farmers followed this advice, most did otherwise. They uprooted or felled the sonokeling or kept only a few of them. Today coffee gardens with a few sonokeling trees can still be encountered in the region. Most coffee gardens that were outgrown by sonokeling and abandoned, however, were soon taken over and transformed back into coffee gardens by other farmers.

The late 1980s and 1990s reforestation projects used harsher measures. Coffee trees were chopped down and planted with caliandra, gmelina and other trees. Up until 1997-98, thousands of hectares of caliandra bush covered state forest throughout the region and gmelina trees was common on the eastern part of Sumber Jaya. By 2000, except for a few caliandra groves planted on bushland not suitable for coffee cultivation, most of this reforestation cover had been cleared.

Outside the state forest zones, the forestry offices implemented people’s forestry (hutan rakyat) programs, which provided training, materials, and
financial incentives for farmers’ groups. The program included re-greening (penghijauan) through which fruit tree and fast-growing timber tree seedlings were distributed free. Financial incentives for the introduction of farming techniques for soil conservation (terraces, ridges, pits) and the construction of small dams on creeks to reduce eroded soils flowing into the river were also included in the program.

In the mid 1990s, a different kind of ‘social forestry’ approach, still very limited in scope, was put in place. It was concentrated in a few villages on the eastern part of Sumber Jaya, the village of Simpang Sari being the main site. Villagers farming blocks of state forest zones were grouped and employed, as paid labourers, to plant the reforestation trees on their coffee gardens. Apart from exotic timber trees, a small number of non-timber trees were also planted. These non-timber trees, including petai (Parkia speciosa), aren (Arenga pinnata), jengkol (Archidendron pauciflorum), damar (Shorea javanica), durian (Durio zibethinus), are officially called MPTS (multi-purposes tree species). The project was then officially labelled as hutan kemasyarakatan (community forestry). The farmers, it was envisaged by forestry officials, in the long run would care for the reforestation trees, would be able to benefit from these ‘minor’ forest products, and would give up cultivating coffee. In 2002, the farmers still cared for the young MPTS trees, but the timber trees were uprooted, felled or pruned regularly to prevent them shading the coffee trees.

A few villages in the region are able to protect patches of natural cover adjacent to the village settlements. In the transmigration villages of Simpang Sari, Tribudi Sukur, and Cipta Waras in Sumber Jaya, and in the Semendo village of Sukaraja in Way Tenong, a few hundred hectares of forest groves were prevented from being cleared and converted into farms. The forest
grove in Sukaraja is an exception because, unlike others that are located within the state forest zone, it is located outside the state forest zone boundary. This village forest is known as Kalpataru forest, after the national environmental award given to Sukaraja community in 1987. Securing the water supply for rice fields and domestic use is said to be the primary reason for the villagers’ commitment to protect the forest. In all villages, the role of elders in reminding villagers to continue protecting groves is of importance. Farmers, either from within or outside the village, need land for farms, and this together with illegal logging by village elites backed by military, police, and/or forestry officers are the greatest challenge for the villagers to keep protecting their forest. Hence, these village forests were not primary forest, and gradually reduced in size. It is the illegal logging and expansion of smallholder farms that has caused the failure of village forest protection in some other transmigrant and Semendo villages in the region, who claim to have had such village forests in the old days.

After the reformasi

As far as relations between smallholders and forestry authorities are concerned, after the reformasi, ‘agroforestation’ and the protection of the remaining forest by local communities has become a major theme in the region. Community forestry (HKm, hutan kemasyarakatan) was adopted as a program policy that, it is hoped, will resolve the prolonged conflict over forest and land resources. The new policy marks the beginning of collaboration between forestry officers and village communities. The development of such collaboration is, however, problematic. The general perception of the new policy among the villagers is that there will be no more evictions and destruction of their farms. For the forestry officers, the new policy offers a different strategy to gain greater control not only over the
resource, but also over people. Such divergent views are manifested in the politics of resource control in the implementation of the community forestry program.

At the provincial level, besides community forestry, the reformasi in the forestry sector was also marked by a minor change in forest land use (TGHK), and the introduction of a regulation to take a levy on all non-timber products (IIHBK: iuran hasil hutan bukan kayu) from all state forest zones in the province. The new TGHK 2000 excludes 145,000 hectares of production forest, mostly in the plains and lowlands of the province, that have long been converted into established village settlements, smallholder upland fields, wet rice fields, and, on the coast, brackish shrimp ponds. The levy on non-timber forest products was designed to extract revenues from timber plantation companies that planted crops other than timber, and smallholders farming state forest zones. For the smallholders, the exaction of the levy is linked with the granting of the community forestry permission contracts (izin HKm).

Under the community forestry scheme, smallholder farmers are required to form a farmers’ group or, preferably, cooperative. The farmers’ community group (kelompok) or cooperative is obliged to submit a ‘management plan’ for a particular block of state forest areas managed by its members. The planting of trees, with a caution that coffee is not considered a tree, and protection of the remaining natural cover, if there is any, are the main ingredients of the plan. The official contract of usufruct right will be given to the group by the head of the district (bupati). The temporary permission lasts for the first five years. After that, it is promised that an evaluation will be conducted. The result of the evaluation, it was said, will be used as the basis for the granting of permanent permission that is valid for 25 years.
By the end of 2002 five community groups had been granted temporary permission. In the process of obtaining temporary permission, granted in 2001, the farmers’ group in Tribudi Sukur, consisting of 15 smaller groups with 248 members managing 360 ha of land, received substantial assistance from forestry office staff. For the other three groups assistance was also provided by field staff of WATALA (Friends of Nature and Environment) and ICRAF (the International Centre for Research in Agroforestry). They assisted the groups in processes from group formation, mapping and inventory, formulation of a management plan, to the granting of the temporary permission. Two of the farmers’ groups were from two hamlets in Simpang Sari: one from Abung Marga Laksana, consisting of four smaller groups with 73 members managing over 260 ha of land, half of which is over-logged forest; and the other one from Gunung Sari, with 145 members managing 259 ha land, including 90 ha of over-logged forest. The third group was from Rigis Atas, a hamlet in Gunung Terang village, with three smaller groups managing 203 ha of land, more than half of which is natural forest cover. The size of land per member for these three groups, and perhaps for other groups as well, is similar to the pattern of land control on margal (non-state forest land), that is from 0.25 to 4 hectares with 1 hectare being the average. The last farmers’ group to receive temporary permission in 2002 was from the village of Tambak Jaya. Unlike the other groups, this particular farmers’ group did not received much assistance from external institutions.

The groups with temporary permission are responsible for the protection of the remaining forest from illegal logging. In addition, in each village with a HKm group, the district government also gives a small monthly allowance for the appointment of persons, nominated by the groups and village
leaders, as civilian forest rangers (petugas keamanan [pam] swakarsa). This gives the authority in these villages for both the HKm group and the appointed pam swakarsa to stop illegal logging and the clearing of the remaining forest in the villages. After some initial raids, tree felling in the forests nearby villages with a HKm group ceased. As some of villagers involved in the illegal business said “We can no longer cut trees from the forest in some villages. It is now forbidden, not by officials (petugas) but by the community (masyarakat).” But the protection of forest by the village community has created yet another problem. Timber now needs to be imported so the cost for house construction is becoming much more expensive.

There are similarities among the various groups that have led to the granting of temporary permission. All the groups are located on sites that were frequently targeted for evictions and crop destruction. In the last two decades, they have experienced such actions at least twice. With the official permission, the villagers now have a more secure tenure to farm in state forest zones. As they often put it “We are safe (aman) now. We will no longer be the target of eviction and crop demolition.” This gives a strong motivation to join the HKm scheme. Among villagers themselves, there were sometimes cases of conflict over ‘ownership’ of gardens on BW land where there were competing claims over a piece of land. Being registered officially with izin HKm ownership, the land is secured against any claim by fellow farmers. Another similarity the groups share is that a large number of members of each group live in the same hamlet. As neighbours and friends, sometimes relatives, it is easier for them to form a group and to reach agreement or reconcile disagreements on various issues. Strong leadership is another key issue. All the groups granted permission have energetic, smart, and articulate leaders. The groups are therefore not only excellent in reaching
group consensus to work together, but also successful in getting the much-needed assistance from external organizations.

Being granted only a temporary permission means that the groups still need to work to obtain a permanent one. This is a complicated issue, since it is not yet clear how permanent permission can be granted. One thing that the villagers have heard is that there is a reluctance by the forestry authority to continue the implementation of the HKm scheme. As is often stated by high ranking forestry officers at the provincial level, there were reports that in many parts of the province farmers have been clearing more forests in anticipation of HKm permission; in other words, the farmers have misinterpreted the policy as legal permission to convert more forest into farms. Unsuccessful attempts to collect revenue from non-timber forest products levy from smallholders farming state forest lands, not surprisingly, due to technical difficulties and villagers resistance, was another reason for a moratorium on the HKm policy.

Another problem, more technical but equally complicated, is the issue of the planting of trees. Questions relate to how many trees need to be planted, what species, and who should supply the seedlings. Smallholders who want to transform their coffee gardens into tree-based gardens would be happy to plant as many trees as possible, but many are keen to keep coffee or other export crops so they are inclined to minimise the number of tall trees. Others, instead, want to plant more annual crops, such as vegetables, in their gardens. Trees producing ‘minor’ forest products such as fruits, sugar palm, and resin are strongly recommended for planting on HKm plots. Good quality seedlings need to be imported from outside the region and are expensive, which is another constraint. Some farmers also reported that based on their previous experiments in planting commercial fruit trees (such
as durian and longan), the production was disappointing: too irregular and too few. Fruit trees that produce well such as guava, jackfruit, and avocado fetch a low price. It is the fast growing timber trees, the story goes, that grow well and there is a market demand, but the planting of the timber trees is discouraged since under the HKm scheme on protection forest farmers are obliged to plant but are prohibited from cutting trees, let alone selling timber.

Farmers from a few other villages also formed groups in order to obtain the temporary permission. A lack of skilful and trusted leaders and group cohesion was often cited as a problem. There were cases where the leaders’ indicated their intention to secure personal gains, which made members reluctant to continue to form HKm groups. In other cases, groups faced difficulties in reaching agreement, simply because each faction insisted on its own opinion. In the worst cases, a group meeting was already difficult to organise, let alone make a collective decision.

Given the large number of smallholders farming state forest zones in the region, the number of villagers engaged in the HKm scheme is relatively small. Many villagers said “The majority of people here in the region are forest settlers (perambah hutan). And most of the state forest zones in the region have been cleared and farmed.” This may be an exaggeration; however, a large proportion of smallholders farming state forest lands in the region currently do not bother to get official permission contracts. For forestry officers, villagers who refuse to join HKm and/or pay the levy “lack of awareness” (belum sadar) of environmental conservation, “need education” (perlu penyuluhan), and are “blind to the law” (buta hukum). The villagers, on the other hand, give equally interesting points. The destruction of coffee gardens and, in return, uprooting of reforestation trees has became a routine,
so frequent that, as they put it “We now are getting used to it (sudah biasa). It is a matter of who gets exhausted (capek) and gives up (menyerah) first. If we give up first, then they can plant timber trees. If they give up first, we continue cultivating the land”. Many villagers see the conflict as a conflict over access to wealth. Illegal logging, reforestation projects, and premium-class or fast-growing timber trees are lucrative sources of income for state apparatus (petugas). As some villagers put it “If all state forest lands are to be managed by the community, then how can those officers feed themselves (bagaimana petugas bisa makan)?”

The village of Simpang Sari is an interesting case that can perhaps represent the population in the entire region with regard to HKm. It has villagers who have successfully secured temporary permission contracts; villagers who have formed groups but are still struggling over whether to proceed or quit; and villagers who do not want to be bothered with official, administrative processes such as HKm. Those with permission were struggling to obtain tree seedlings, protect the remaining forest, and were confused over the additional burden of paying the levy. Other groups agreed to pay the levy but proposed that, in return they be granted permission but be freed from the obligation to plant trees and/or protect the remaining forests. Given such confusion, in addition to internal leadership and cohesion problems, other villagers dissolved the groups and abandoned the HKm scheme. Other villagers, because they have been paying land tax (PBB) to the village administration for years, felt that there was no need to join the HKm scheme and pay the levy.

The state of collaboration in forest land and resource management between villagers and forestry authorities is problematic, both in scale and substance. The protection forest zone of Bukit Rigis, for example, has a total size of 8,289
ha. Heavily forested until 1970s, in 2002 about 2,000 hectares (less than 20%) of Bukit Rigis’ upper slope remained forested. The rest has mostly been transformed into smallholder coffee gardens. Four years after the community forestry policy, only a few hundred hectares of Bukit Rigis protection forest were granted permits. In other words, for the other thousands of hectare, such collaboration is yet to develop. At a technical level of scaling-up community forestry permissions, the process of obtaining the permits required a strong community cohesion, exceptional village leaders, and/or external assistance, which more often than is not unavailable. With regard to farming decision the matters are more problematic. Individual households organize their agricultural production independently. Under the community forestry scheme, in contrast, smallholder households were required to form groups or cooperatives and make collective land use decisions instead. Household farming decisions are made in response to availability of farming inputs, market signals, and natural resources potentials and limitations, while the community forestry scheme demands a management plan similar to the scientific forestry for the development of the plantation forests.

Many villagers, and a few forestry and government officers, believe that the remaining forests will soon vanish unless the nearby village communities

---

5 The Minister of Forestry decree on community forestry (HKm, hutan kemasyarakatan) was first promulgated in 1995, and revised in 1998 and 2000—after the reformasi. All the decrees stipulated that only in ‘degraded’ protection and production forests (i.e. not on national park) permission would be granted. Production forests granted to companies are not eligible for HKm. The earlier decrees allowed only harvesting of forest products, the later decree allows cultivation. In production forest timber planting and harvesting was permitted, but in protection forest zones the farmers were only permitted to harvest non-timber forest products. The 2000 decree delegates the authority to grant HKm permission form Ministry of Forestry to the head of the district (bupati). In Lampung, the problem was that in production forests in the lowlands, apart from that these zones have been granted to plantation companies, small farmers cultivated annual food and cash crops (e.g. soybean, maize, cassava) instead of trees, while in protection forests in the highlands farmers plant perennial export crops such as coffee, which is not considered as a forestry tree.
protect them, and efforts to convert existing smallholder fields into
plantation forests are unlikely to be successful. But they also well know that,
in the near future, the possibility for those in power to hand over their
authority to control land and forest resources to local people is slim.
CHAPTER SIX

Gunung Terang:
Social Organization of A Migrants’ Village

In Indonesia, legally, each person (and each parcel of land) has to be integrated within an administrative village. This requirement was imposed by colonial administrations in Java (Breman 1982; Tjondronegoro 1984) and further strengthened in the post-colonial era. This nationwide integration was achieved by the introduction of the National Village Law 1979, imposing the adoption of a Javanese style administrative village (desa) throughout the archipelago. Within this context, then, ordinary Indonesian villagers can be seen as members of an administrative community.

After discussing the region of Sumber Jaya and Way Tenong in the previous chapters, this chapter and the next chapter discuss a single village in the region. Gunung Terang is an administrative village created by Semendo migrants in colonial times and later, after independence, by migrants from Java. This chapter explores elements of village social organisation in relation to village formation, leadership, and community cohesion.

In Sumber Jaya and Way Tenong the administrative village functioned primarily as a vehicle to attract state resources into the villages. This fits the conceptual framework that situates local social organisations as intermediaries in rural development (Esman and Uphoff 1984; Tjondronegoro 1984; Quarles van Ufford ed. 1987; Warren 1993). Along this line, Antlov (1995) suggests that under the New Order rural leaders in Java...
based their power on administrative authority as state clients and/or on their ability to meet villagers’ aspirations.

On the issue of villagers’ cohesion, Tjondronegoro (1984) notes that many communal tasks carried out by the rural communities in Java took place at sub-village/hamlet/neighbourhood level. Carol Warren (1993) has also noted the flexibility of Balinese villagers in organizing themselves, depending on the nature of the tasks to be completed. Tjondronegoro (1984) and Warren (1993) further note that villagers’ communal tasks range from planned development, religious matters, to the household economy. It is in these ways that the residents of Gunung Terang socially organise their village life.

The Creation of An Administrative Village

The village of Gunung Terang took its name from the oldest hamlet in the village. In this hamlet, the Semendo population is dominant; with roughly a quarter non-Semendonese, namely Javanese and Sundanese. Most houses and fields in Gunung Terang hamlet are tunggu tubang properties passed down from parents to the eldest daughter. All the Semendonese in the hamlet are the descendants of puyang Tendak, a founding ancestress, plus in-marrying wo/men (jeme masuk, incoming persons). Four generations ago puyang Tendak’s parents brought her and two other brothers from Ulu Nasal in Bengkulu, first to Mutar Alam and then to the new hamlet (susukan) of Gedung Surian. The new hamlet soon developed into a populous settlement (dusun) under the administration of Mutar Alam village. In the early 1940s, puyang Tendak and her husband Kemuli took their children and grandchildren and left Gedung Surian to open a new settlement at the present location of Gunung Terang. Their kin soon followed. The decision to
migrate from Gedung Surian was largely driven by the need to find more land for rice fields, since there were not enough rice fields for all the families, and no more land could be transformed into rice fields in Gedung Surian. In Gunung Terang hamlet, the riverbanks of Way Besai were transformed into rice fields and settlement. Families from neighbouring Gedung Surian and Mutar Alam and from Ulu Nasal (Bengkulu) also came to settle in Gunung Terang.

According to a few elders, *puyang* Tendak was not supposed to leave Gedung Surian. As the only daughter she was the *tunggu tubang* and entitled to inherit her parents’ house and rice field. Her brothers’ reluctance to observe the *tunggu tubang* rule, however, forced *puyang* Tendak to find new land elsewhere. Some Semendonese in Gunung Terang hamlet believed that it was due to this mistake in not observing the *tunggu tubang* rule that the Gedung Surian population suffered from illnesses and harvest failures so frequently that eventually Gedung Surian was abandoned. In the 1960s there were only five Semendo families left in Gedung Surian, the rest of the population moved to Gunung Terang and elsewhere to survive. Some people in Gunung Terang use the case of Gedung Surian’s misfortune as an example of the punishment that comes for not observing the *tunggu tubang* rule.

Today, in the Islamic month Muharam each year, the Semendo community in Gunung Terang hold a *sedekah pusaka* ceremony. In the ritual, descendants (*keturunan*) of *puyang* Tendak gather in the house where the dagger heirloom (*keris pusaka*) is kept. The heirloom has continuously passed from *puyang* Tendak to her eldest daughter and then to her eldest daughter’s daughter and so on. Now the *pusaka* is kept by her great-great grand daughter (DDDD). The *sedekah pusaka* ritual involves the reciting Qur’an verses and
the cleaning of the *pusaka* dagger. Each family that joins the *sedekah* brings meals to be shared and served to conclude the *sedekah*. The main purpose of the *sedekah*, according to some of the elders, is to remember their origin (*asal usul*) and to ask God’s blessing (*berkah*) and well being (*selamat*) for the community.

Like the Gumai, another Pasemah speaking group in highland Palembang (Sakai 1996), the ritual and orientation toward *puyang* among Semendo in Gunung Terang hamlet stressed the important of origins that situates a person and a place as points of reference. Throughout the year the Gumai performed many types of *sedekah*. The ritual specialists possessed spiritual power and are highly respected in the ritual realm. This differs from the Semendo in Gunung Terang hamlet. The *sedekah pusaka* was held once a year over the last couple of years. Before it was only occasionally held in difficult years such as during the Warman insurgency, harvest failures due to severe drought, or epidemics of life-threatening diseases. The misfortunes of the post-*krismon* drop in coffee prices and production since 1999 as well as post-*reformasi* political turmoils have encouraged Gunung Terang residents to perform *sedekah pusaka* every year. The man who was in charge of the cleaning of the dagger (*keris*) was regarded as one who knew how to do the cleansing properly. But unlike the ritual specialist in Gumai, he neither possessed spiritual power nor was highly respected. The gathering on *sedekah pusaka*, arguably, is a way *puyang* Tendak’s descendants maintain their social ties. Since most of them live in Gunung Terang, the ritual served to strengthened community ties among the Semendo who live in Gunung Terang hamlet.
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Other hamlets in Gunung Terang village (Table 6.1) were created between the 1960s and 1980s, mainly by migrants from Java. In Talang Jaya, the second oldest hamlet, there were initially less than half a dozen families from different parts of Java (Serang, Bantul, Nganjuk), who arrived in the late 1950s and early 1960s. They approached the Semendo in Gunung Terang and were allocated forest land which they transformed into housing lots and coffee gardens. Creeks were transformed into rice fields. More and more friends and relatives from Java then arrived and settled there. Today Talang Jaya has a fairly equal number of Javanese and Sundanese inhabitants. Both languages are spoken in Talang Jaya. A few Semendo have also moved in there.

Table 6.1 Population and hamlets in Gunung Terang village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hamlet</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gunung Terang</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bedeng Sari (and Talang Buluh Kapur)</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sinar Jaya (Talang Jaya)</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sukakarya (Petay Paya)</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Simpang Tiga</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rigis Jaya I (Rigis Bawah)</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rigis Jaya II (Rigis Atas)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Temiangan and Talang Selingkut</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Village profile of Gunung Terang 2001

The hamlet of Bedeng Sari has a rather different story. In the mid-1960s a group of more than a dozen Javanese families arrived in Gunung Terang. Pak Kono was one of them, carried by his parents to Tegineneng/Hajimena (near Bandar Lampung) when he was 12 in 1962. A native Lampung family sponsored their migration. Pak Kono’s parents were assigned to take care of a citrus garden in Tegineneng. While taking care of this garden his parents also cultivated vegetables and raised goats. Despite good harvests, the situation in Tegineneng was difficult, cash and goods were frequently stolen from their house. Five Javanese families in Tegineneng, plus another ten
families from different parts of Central Lampung district, soon decided to migrate to Way Tenong. When they first arrived in Mutar Alam, they were advised to proceed to Gunung Terang. The village head of Gunung Terang organized housing lots for these new comers. He managed to persuade other Semendonese families to give the newly arrived Javanese land for housing lots (kapling). A bunkhouse (bedeng) made of bamboo walls and an imperata roof was built as a temporary communal house for them. From the bedeng each family subsequently built huts in the allocated housing lots. The current hamlet took its name from this communal bunkhouse.

Labouring in the Semendonese coffee gardens and being paid in cash or in food (cassava, maize, rice, bananas), was the main mode of survival for all of the newly arrived migrants. Access to land was also obtained through clearing the forest or the fallow plots of the Semendonese in exchange for a portion of the newly cleared fields. Sharecropping was another way to accumulate enough money to buy a coffee garden. Of the dozen Javanese families who arrived from Hajimena/Tegineneng in 1962 only five remain in Bedeng Sari now, the rest have moved elsewhere.

When the Javanese groups from Hajimena/Tegineneng arrived, there were already labourers and sharecroppers from Java living in scattered huts in the coffee gardens. The building of the bunkhouse (bedeng) and subsequent housing lots initiated further creation of hamlets. More Semendonese lands along the path were sold at low prices to be transformed into housing lots for these sharecroppers and labourers. Subsequent numbers of migrants further extended the Bedeng Sari housing lots. Initially part of Talang Jaya administrative hamlet, Bedeng Sari then separated and formed a single administrative hamlet. Later, Petai Paya and Simpang Tiga split from Bedeng Sari. In the late 1960s Petai Paya was settled by two or three families
who previously lived in BRN transmigration villages in Sumber Jaya before moving to Gunung Terang to work as labourers and sharecroppers in the Semendonese gardens. As in Bedeng Sari, Javanese are dominant in Petay Paya, while Simpang Tiga is shared by both the Javanese and Semendonese.

Until the 1980s, Rigis Bawah, Rigis Atas, and Talang Buluh Kapur were the location of scattered gardens and fallow plots, many of which belonged to those living in Bedengsari and Gunung Terang, and patches of remaining over-logged forest. Javanese migrants previously living elsewhere in Lampung came to buy the land or to work as labourers or sharecroppers. Until recently, illegal logging has been an important economic activity in Rigis Bawah and Rigis Atas.

The hamlets of Rigis Atas and Temiangan have only recently been integrated into Gunung Terang village administration. Rigis Atas residents previously lived in a hamlet within the state forest zone, now abandoned. Arriving in the late 1970s and early 1980s they were part of the BRN transmigrant village of Puralaksana. When in 1994-95 they were told to leave their homes and gardens, which were to be replaced by plantation forest, some of them moved down to the present Rigis Atas. After not receiving any ‘attention’ from Puralaksana administration for years, in 2000 the hamlet was integrated into Gunung Terang administration. Like Rigis Bawah, in Rigis Atas Javanese are the dominant group with Sundanese and Semendonese being the minority. The hamlet of Temiangan used to be part of the neighbouring administrative village of Sumber Alam. Feeling abandoned by the Sumber Alam administration, the Javanese community in Temiangan has decided to become part of Gunung Terang village.
Recently there have been more attempts to mark the membership and territorial boundary of the administrative hamlets in the village. A few Javanese houses on the edge of Bedeng Sari, for example, are administratively within the boundary of the hamlet of Gunung Terang. However, they maintain day-to-day relations with their neighbours who are the residents of Bedeng Sari. A suggestion to include these Javanese in Bedeng Sari was rejected by the village council. Buluh Kapur, on the other hand, is administratively eligible to form an administrative hamlet separate from Bedeng Sari—just as Rigis Atas separated from Rigis Bawah. Yet the residents there were inclined to continue as part of Bedeng Sari.

A hamlet is socially and territorially divided into several neighbourhoods. Both hamlet and neighbourhood bear a communal responsibility/role. *Gotong royong* for paths, roads, small bridges, running water tanks and pipes sometimes are carried by all the residents of the hamlet but other times only by the neighbourhood men. Most hamlets have a mosque (*masjid, mushalla*) that is constructed and communally maintained. The residents gather in the mosque for regular Qur’an reciting (*pengajian, yasinan*), Friday prayers, and to celebrate Islam’s holy days. Some neighbourhoods have smaller praying houses (*surau*).

Adults in Gunung Terang village are keen to be seen as devoted (*taat*) Muslims. Before sunset men wear a sarong and cap (*peci*) and prepare for evening prayers. Most of them do the daily prayers in their house, leaving the *surau* and mosques empty. Friday is the weekend in village. On this day villagers stay at home. The villagers come to the mosque for Friday prayer and speech (*khutbah*) at midday. The Friday speech (*khutbah*) is delivered with the *imam* reading a section from a book containing a collection of Friday
speeches (*buku kumpulan khutbah Jum’an*)\(^1\). School age children in Bedeng Sari and Petai Paya go to a small *pesantren* to learn Al Qur’an reading, writing Arab scripts, and learn Islam teachings (*ajaran*). In other hamlets this is done in the *surau* and the mosque in the afternoon or evening. Women form *pengajian* groups and meet once or twice a week in the *surau* or the mosque to recite Al Qur’an and hear preaching on Islamic teachings.

In cases of religious and emergency matters, community cohesion at neighbourhood level is stronger than at the hamlet level. The Javanese in the village admit that with regard to helping a member of the hamlet experiencing hard times (e.g., death, illness, accidents, and personal conflicts with outsiders), cohesion (*kekompakan*) among the Semendo community in Gunung Terang is exceptionally strong. For religious feasts (*sedekah* and *ruwahan* among the Semendo, and *selametan* or *syukuran* among the Javanese and Sundanese) it is the neighbours’ obligation to give *sumbangan* of raw food (e.g., rice, sugar, chicken, coconut) and snacks such as biscuits. Close neighbours also need to help in the preparation of the feast. Women who are close neighbours and kin usually help with the cooking of the meals. In the case of a death, the burial and the subsequent prayer rituals would be the neighbourhood’s responsibility. It is quite common for a villager to have close neighbours (*tetangga dekat*) who are also good friends (*kawan baik, akrab*). They will frequently visit each other in their gardens and gather to chat at one another’s houses. Among the poor, the bond between close neighbours is particularly strong. Often their huts or simple wooden houses were constructed communally. They tend to organise reciprocal labour exchange, limiting the need to hire labour. Among themselves they often

---

\(^1\) These books, written by various authors and published by various publishers, are available in bookstores or obtained through the imam’s network.
arrange zero-interest credit relations or form rotational saving groups (arisan).

Like villages elsewhere in the region and rural Indonesia, Gunung Terang has two patterns of housing: nucleated/compacted and dispersed/scattered. In the hamlets of Gunung Terang, Talang Jaya, Bedeng Sari, Petai Paya, and Simpang Tiga the houses are nucleated, aligned in a row along the village’s main road. Except for Talang Jaya, all these hamlets obtained electricity in the late 1990s. In Buluh Kapur, Temiangan, Rigis Bawah, and Rigis Atas, houses are dispersed along the unpaved roads and paths. In Rigis Atas and Rigis Bawah there are a few small compact housing compounds with up to a dozen houses, but most houses are separated by coffee gardens.

Villagers refer to the construction of facilities and the provision of services by the government when discussing the progress (kemajuan) in their village. As far as ‘progress’ in the village is concerned, Suharto’s New Order era of the 1980s is said to have been the turning point. As some villagers put it “Before there was nothing (tidak ada apa-apa) in the village, everything was difficult (payah), and life was hard (susah).”

In Gunung Terang village, facilities and infrastructure are equally distributed among the main hamlets of Gunung Terang, Bedeng Sari, Petai Paya, and Simpang Tiga. The village now has two elementary schools, one in Talang Jaya and one between Bedeng Sari and Gunung Terang. The village’s Islamic school (pesantren, madrasah) is located in Petai Paya. A health clinic, run by a nurse, is also located in Petay Paya. The junior high school (SMP: sekolah menengah pertama) is located in Simpang Tiga. The village hall (balai desa) is located in the hamlet of Gunung Terang. The village weekly market is in Bedeng Sari.
In the 1980s the road network was built to connect the villages on the southern part of Bukit Rigis with the west Sumatra highway, which passes the northern slope of Bukit Rigis. The village paths, previously constructed by village communities through *gotong royong*, were enlarged, gravelled, and asphalted, and the wooden bridges replaced by sturdy concrete bridges. Before the construction of the road network, sacks of coffee beans had to be carried manually to coffee resellers in Fajar Bulan. Travelling the path on foot across the Bukit Rigis hill, the task could take a whole day. To obtain household needs one had to walk to the weekly market in Srimenanti and later to Fajar Bulan. This meant walking to the market the night before market day and sleeping over in the market. Since the construction of the road, Fajar Bulan can be reached in less than an hour by motorbike, pickup, or minibus. The road was further asphalted in the mid-1990s. A weekly market recently opened in the neighbouring village of Sumber Alam, where each Friday over a thousand villagers from neighbouring villages come to do their weekly shopping.

Before the construction of the current schools, children in Gunung Terang went to Mutar Alam. The construction of the elementary schools in the village started in the 1960s with the opening of a community school in Gunung Terang hamlet. A few literate adults in the village voluntarily taught the children. This was done first in the basement of a stilted house, later, through *gotong royong*, wooden classrooms were built. After years operating as a school, the government finally developed this informal school into a formal elementary school. The second elementary school in Talang Jaya was built in a similar way. When the subdistrict education office looked for a village willing to grant land for the construction of a secondary school in the early 1990s, the villages of Gunung Terang and Sumber Alam
were quick to agree to grant land on the border between the two villages. Thanks to this assistance today children need to go to Fajar Bulan only for high school education.

Clinic and health programs for women and children are other features which distinguish the difficult (susah) years before the 1980s. Sick pregnant women and infants often died before arriving at the clinic in Fajar Bulan. Today they will be soon taken care of by the nurse in the village, or health clinic (puskesmas) in the neighbouring village Sumber Alam, and, in serious and emergency cases, at the small hospital in Fajar Bulan. The well being of women and infants has been further improved thanks to periodical posyandu (pos pelayanan terpadu: integrated health service post), where subdistrict nurses and village PKK functionaries provided consultations to women on infant health issues, vitamins and immunisations. With regard to health issues, many families in the main hamlets in Gunung Terang once also received sacks of cement from the government to improve their housing.

The extent of progress in the village during the New Order continued into the economic sectors. In the mid 1980s, hundreds of families received generous agricultural extension assistance. Credit was provided in the form of chemical fertiliser and tools. Agriculture extension officers regularly visited the village to advise and supervise the farmers in regard to better farming techniques. Incentives in the form of cash, tree seedlings, and livestock were provided to encourage the application of soil conservation measures on the sloping land. The production of coffee gardens, rice fields, and other annual crops increased dramatically. The agricultural production improvement was followed by a cheap land certification project. Villagers used the certificate as collateral to obtain loans for various needs from the Bank Rakyat Indonesia branch at Fajar Bulan.
Aside from being referred to as the turning point in the history of the village, progress has also been a source of tension between the Semendonese and the Javanese in the village. On the surface such tensions might lead one to see them as an ethnic conflicts. But this is perhaps better seen simply as a manifestation of the desire for progress.

As a Javanese man put it “The Semendonese here are difficult (payah), they don’t want our village to flourish (ramai).” Two cases of the reluctance of the Semendonese to release/handover some of their land for the sake of village progress can be used as illustration. Unlike the condition in some of the neighbouring villages, the main hamlets of Gunung Terang, Bedeng Sari, Petai Paya, Simpang Tiga and Talang Jaya are separated by over a hundred metres of coffee gardens. They are not contiguous, thus preventing the hamlets from being further conjoined to form a larger village settlement. Some of the Javanese villagers suggest that this is largely due to the Semendonese reluctance to allow their gardens to be bought by fellow villagers and new migrants and transformed into house lots. Another Javanese man criticized the Semendonese for not allowing their land to be taken to enlarge the current path from the asphalt road to the hamlet of Rigis Atas. Had the Semendonese agreed, it would have reduced the transportation cost and attracted more new migrants to the remote hamlet of Rigis Atas. This allegation is, of course, denied by the Semendonese. According to them, the reluctance to sell the land in between the hamlets is largely due to the fact that the village is now full of migrants from Java, so if they sell the remaining land it would be difficult to find another plot that they could buy as a replacement. The prohibition on selling tunggu tubang property is another constraint. The Semendo also maintain that the cancellation of the construction of the road to Rigis Atas was due more to
financial problems and the technical difficulty of constructing the bridge crossing the Way Besai river than getting land to enlarge the existing path.

For their part, the Semendo complain that the Javanese are always trying to sideline the Semendonese with regard to progress. In the eyes of some Semendonese, Javanese domination in the village will put the Semendonese in danger. All the government projects go to the Javanese, and the Semendonese are left behind (ditinggalkan). Such tension occurs especially between the dominant Javanese hamlet of Bedeng Sari and the old Semendo hamlet of Gunung Terang. The tension has led to talk about either Bedeng Sari or Gunung Terang splitting to create a separate administrative village.

In the 1960s the administrative village of Gunung Terang included the present neighbouring villages of Tri Mulyo, Cipta Waras, Gedung Surian, and Semarang Jaya (Air Hitam). Tri Mulyo was created first by a group of Javanese whose leader Sumardi had lived in Talang Jaya for a couple of years before moving on and opening Air Dingin, the main hamlet in Trimulyo. Sumardi brought with him 17 families from Central Java in the 1960s. Pak Cik Nawi, the village head of Gunung Terang, gave them permission to clear the forest there. The creation of Air Dingin hamlet was soon followed by others. These hamlets officially became the separate administrative village of Tri Mulyo in the mid-1980s. Pak Cik Nawi also gave permission to two groups of the late BRN transmigrants from West Java. One group of a dozen families from Tasik Malaya, led by Pak Juhana, first came to Tribudisukur, only to find that in this BRN transmigration village there was no more available land. This group then created the hamlet of Waras Sakti. The other group of about 40 families, mainly from Bogor, first came to Puralaksana. This BRN transmigration village also had no more available land for them. With Pak Cik Nawi's consent, this group cleared the
forest and created the hamlet of Ciptalaga. Initially parts of BRN transmigration villages (Waras Sakti being part of Tribudi Sukur and Ciptalaga part of Puralaksana), in the mid 1980s both hamlets and the neighbouring hamlets formed a separate administrative village of Cipta Waras. Pak Juhana was elected as the first village head.

The abandoned hamlet of Gedung Surian soon filled up with Javanese and Sundanese migrants. It also separated from Gunung Terang administration in the 1980s, retaining its old Semendo hamlet name. A portion of Gunung Terang land was also given to hundreds of families from Semarang (Central Java), who arrived in Mutar Alam in the late 1970s and early 1980s. They settled in Air Hitam and later created the village of Semarang Jaya.

**Village Leadership**

When one asks villagers in Gunung Terang about persons that can tell the history of the village, they mostly point to three men: Pak Kasijo in Talang Jaya, Pak Timan in Petai Paya, and Pak Cik Nawi in Gunung Terang. Aged in their 60s and 70s these three men are former village leaders now considered to be village elders (sesepuh, tokoh).

Pak Kasijo is well known for his prominent role in promoting children's education in the village. He arrived in Lampung in the mid-1950s from Bantul, near Jogjakarta. He has relatives who transmigrated during the Dutch administration in the 1920s to Wonosobo in southwestern Lampung. Initially he planned to join his relatives in Wonosobo, but upon arrival in Lampung he took up an offer to work as a foreman (mandor) in a rubber plantation and factory in Kotabumi, which formerly belonged the Dutch, but