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Chapter II

WHAT IS COMMUNITY IN COMMUNITY-BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT?

Satyawan Sunito

Abstract

This paper asserts that theoretical assumptions behind the concept of community-based sustainable development have misperceived the nature of village communities living near and inside the forest as homogenous, subsistence-based communities. Instead, processes of incorporation and social differentiation have fundamentally changed the communities in almost all their aspects. This misperception raises the question of whether Community Based Natural Resource Management programs based on a false understanding of the nature of the indigenous communities can succeed in reaching their objectives. Alternatively, this raises questions on better-conceived approaches to avoid misunderstandings of the nature of local communities. This implies the need to change established ideas on forest protection and conservation.

Introduction

The objective of this paper is to highlight the gap between the theoretical assumptions behind the concept of Community-Based Sustainable Development (CBFD) and the reality of the differentiation process of the communities that are the subject of the community programs. To illustrate the standpoint above, the author invites readers to look at the process of establishing community-based forest conservation in a village community which has experienced profound changes in almost all aspects of life, a fate commonly shared by many...
communities living at the forest margin or inside the forest. The community is part of the upland village communities that share administrative borders with the Lore Lindu National Park in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. The data used in this chapter were collected during several field studies in 2002 and 2003. The first part looks at the basic assumptions of the concept of Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), under which we consider also concepts such as Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM), Community-Based Forest Conservation and Social Forestry. This includes notions of customary law and local knowledge, which are perceived as “conserving” in character. The second part looks into the process of social differentiation of a local village community that dates back to the start of the colonial intervention in the beginning of the 20th century. The third part illustrates the problems linked to the establishment of a community-based forest conservation program, initiated by the National Park Authority. The chapter closes with some considerations on methodological aspects.

**Basic Assumptions of CBFM**

The idea to delegate a certain amount of responsibility and authority in natural resource management to local communities was inspired by several factors. The first was the failure of the “modernization” approach that started after the end of the Second World War, focusing on large-scale and centrally managed programs to alleviate rural poverty and reduce income disparities in developing countries. One effect of this development approach was the immediate degradation of the environment, due to large-scale depletion of natural resources. This occurred even in previously isolated hinterlands. The second factor was the development of a new paradigm of planned intervention, which emphasized a bottom up approach through participation of those people who were the targets of development. The third factor was the surge of human rights’ and indigenous peoples’ movements, which was partly a reaction to the modernization approach that in most instances was implemented without much consultation and did not benefit the great majority of the poor. Under the rhetoric of national development and economic growth, access to natural resources
was granted to large companies for large-scale exploitation putting local communities even further away from access to natural resources. Under international as well as internal pressure a process started that brought a paradigm shift from a centralistic approach to a more integrated approach, which combined environmental sustainability, the acknowledgement of local community rights, and, as a consequence, the devolution of natural resource management and socio-economic development (Western and Wright 1995, Hall 1988, Meinzen-Dick et all 1999, Li 2002). The development of new concepts and strategies became part of the language used by activists and government policy makers alike, such as Community-Based Sustainable Development (CBSD), Community-Based Resource Management (CBRM), Community Based Forest Management (CBFM), and Community Based Conservation (CBC).

The popularity of the devolution concept of natural resource management however, owns its fast growth to an oversimplification of the nature of rural communities and their interaction with natural resources. Leach, Mearns and Scoones (1997) launched a strong critique of the basic CBSD assumptions concerning the communities involved and their interaction with the environment. In this assumption the communities are viewed as closely interwoven, homogenous in character and governed by customary law. It is assumed that these communities originally lived in harmony with the surrounding nature, developed a rich knowledge and sustainable systems of interaction with their natural environment. These local communities were considered to be conservationist by nature. In this view, environmental degradation was considered as caused by external forces. Thus, the process of degradation could be halted and the original state could be restored by restoring the rights of the local communities over their environment and the re-establishment of the local institutions (and local knowledge) for the management of the environment. Alterna-

---

1 The term *devolution* indicates the transfer of responsibility and authority over natural resources from the state to non-governmental bodies, particularly user groups. *Decentralization* refers to authority and management transfer to lower levels of government. *Deconcentration*, on the other hand, describes the reallocation of administrative duties — without transfer of power and authority — from ministry or department headquarters to branch offices of the central government (Meinzen-Dick, Knox, Di Gregorio, 1999: 3-4).
tively, new local institutions for regulating collective action in the management of the human–nature interaction could be developed.

An important aspect of the discussion on the nature of local communities is the phenomenon of 'indigenous knowledge' (IK). As described by Ellen and Harris (2000), a new interest and appreciation for IK grew in the 1960s as a reaction against the "increasing remoteness", and "... perceived arrogance and negative technological outcomes" of modern science (ibid. 12). Part of this reaction, as described before, is the idealization of the so-called traditional, indigenous, primitive people or communities. In correspondence with the notion of communities that lived in harmony with nature, IK is described as intrinsically conservationist and promoting a fairer social and economic structure (Li, 2000). IK does not deal only with systems for adaptation; it also contains the people's perception of natural resources and environment. There has been much criticism of this view of the homogeneous, conservationist indigenous community, living in harmony with its natural environment. Three forms of critique will be highlighted here, namely: 1) the confusion between sustainable adaptation systems and conservation; 2) the theoretical roots of this assumption; 3) the critique on the assumption of the homogeneity of communities.

Sustainability can be a product of one or a combination of several factors such as low human population density, low demand for resources, or limited technology choice. Within this context, conservation of biodiversity can be an incidental by-product of sustainability. From the same point of view, a change in population density, increasing demand and competition for resources because of the availability of technology could endanger the sustainability of the system. Voicing the consensus among academicians, Smith and Wishnie (2000: 501) concluded that to qualify as conservation, any action and practice should satisfy two criteria: 1) it should prevent or mitigate resource depletion, species extirpation or habitat degradation; 2) it should be designed to do so. In view of these criteria, Little (1994:350, cited by Smith and Wishnie, 2000: 516), after reviewing a large number of community-based conservation programs, concluded that "cases in which local communities in low-income regions manage their resource bases with the prime objective of conservation, rather than improved social and economic welfare, are virtually nonexistent".
Instead, indigenous resource management is based on the enhancement of livelihood resources, to safeguard resources from exploitation by outsiders, and to allocate subsistence efforts to the most rewarding areas and resources available (Smith and Wishnie, 2000: 516). An extreme example is posed by Tim Flannery in his book *The Future Eaters* (1998) where the confrontation between human beings and the Australian ecosystem starting some 40,000 years ago resulted in the destruction of the latter, long before the arrival of white people. More specifically Li asserted that instead of engaging in subsistence economic activity, indigenous people have a long history of involvement in the market economy. In this context local forest use could lead to conversion of forest into agriculture land and intensification may lead to further deforestation. This historical approach to the understanding of the interaction between local community and environment, made the assertion of the intrinsically conservationist nature of indigenous people questionable (Li, 2002: 269-270).

The view of a socially and culturally homogenous community living in harmony with nature had its roots in the functionalism in anthropology that views society as functionally integrated with others within its natural environment through its adaptation system. As stated by Agrawal and Gibson (2001: 2-3), the characterization of the community as a Gemeinschaft that functions as an organic whole in contrast to society or Gesellschaft which is differentiated in character, continues to influence the conservationists view of rural or indigenous communities. Modernization theory, influential since the 1950s, shares the same evolutionary idea of societies. In this view, societies developed from traditional to modern, where industrialized societies typify the modern stage of development. This view of a closed, self-sustained and inwardly looking village community has always attracted and served the interest of different, even opposing, parties. Previously, colonial powers constructed an idealized village community as the foundation of their colonial society, from time to time positioning it as the loyal subject of the empire against the radical nationalists. The same village community was hailed by the nationalists as the cradle of national culture and identity. After gaining political independence, the process of nation building was built up on populist ideas where perceived village community institutions and virtues such as mutual help, consensus/musyawarah were used to legitimize state
leadership. In most cases however, the populist rhetoric was used to continue the exploitation of village communities and indigenous people for the benefit of the upcoming urban middle class (Breman, Kloos and Saith, 1997; Wertheim, 1964).

In this context, the critique expressed by Tania Murray Li (1999) of the concept of marginality, a characterization frequently applied to communities living in the uplands and near forests, seems appropriate because the same connotations are attached to the term “indigenous community”. She states that differences in cultures between the marginalized communities and the urbanized centers of industrialized societies have been explained in terms of a time dimension. These communities are assumed to be relics from the past. In other words: indigenous, marginal communities are perceived as – to use Eric Wolf’s expression – “societies without history” (cited by Li, 1999:5 and Schrauwers, 2000:64). Such a view totally ignores the historical forces since pre-colonial times that have not left any community or society untouched, and which connect communities with development at the larger scale. This interrelatedness between the village community and the larger economic and political changes, especially in the last decades, has dramatically changed village communities in all their aspects. Thanks to the increased organizing power of nation states, companies and to the development of technologies, relatively isolated hinterlands have been opened up to loggers, hydroelectric power projects, oil mining, large scale plantations and to land hungry farmers pushed out from areas with high population density. In the wake of these processes, rural communities have become progressively differentiated and local institutions eroded or ruined, changed or replaced by new ones (Hirch and Warren, 1998; Li, 1999; Western and Wright, 1995; Osseweijer, 2000). Focusing on the uplands, Li speaks of the reality of “agrarian transformation” of the uplands as counterpart of the Green Revolution in the low lands, with the critical difference that in the uplands the transformation has been largely the result of local smallholder initiatives rather than state-sponsored programs (Li, 2002:269; Li, 2002b; Sitorus, 2004).
The Differentiation Process of an Upland Community

Ngamba and Kakao’ People

The community that functions as an example of differentiation is commonly known as Napu. Napu people live in the highlands, on the eastern border of the Lore Lindu National Park. Only lately, the community has begun to shake off the term Napu that was forced on them by outsiders, and changed it with their original name, Pekurehua. The legend of the origin of the Pekurehua people tells about the relation between two societies with different adaptation systems: the Ngamba people from the valley and the Kakao’ from the forested uplands. The Ngamba people lived in the upland valleys 1200 meters above sea level, an ecosystem dominated by grassland and bordered by forested hills. The Kakao’ people on the other hand lived in the adjacent forested hills. The legend describes the continuous conflicts between the two populations, each representing an adaptation to different ecosystems.

The legend narrates that a princess from a neighboring village – Winua – offered her services as a mediator. She organized competitions for the strongest members of both groups to decide the winner and to settle the conflict once and for all. After several competitions, however, it appeared that the Ngamba and the Kakao’ people were equally strong and smart. The princess interpreted this to mean that the two groups are actually brothers and destined to live together in peace. There is little historical knowledge on the adaptation system of both categories and the relationship between these adaptation systems. In the southern part of the valley, however, people still differentiate between the lowland and upland regions: Behoa Ngamba and Behoa Kakao’.

Colonial Expansion and External Induced Social Differentiation

The history of Wuasa, the village of our study, started around the end of 19th century with the decision of a tribal chief and his followers to split from the original village and to erect a new settlement called Wuasa, named after a mango species which grows abundantly in that location. In 1905 the Dutch colonial power decided to put the region more directly under its authority. The subjugation of the village fed-
erations of highland Central Sulawesi was completed between 1905 and 1907. As part of the Dutch strategy to control the highlands, the fortified villages located at secure and strategic places were resettled into combined and bigger villages in the valleys, which were better accessible for the Dutch. The political organization envisioned by the Dutch for the people in the highland after their subjugation was a form of federation of “self-governors” under a hierarchical administration system appointed by the Dutch. This political structure was established by the colonial authority without much physical presence of the Dutch themselves – a process that Schrauwers referred to as “bureaucratic amalgamation”. The resettlement of communities in the highlands of lake Poso took place around 1906-1908 (Schrauwers, 2000:48). In the case of the resettlement process of the Pekurehua, inhabitants of two villages – Lamba and Lengaro – were forced to settle in a newly built village situated near the old village of Wuasa. This new settlement became the present Wuasa.

The intervention of the Dutch into the life of the Pekurehua did not stop with the resettlement of the original villages. As described masterfully by Schrauwers (2000), the character of the Dutch expansion into Central Sulawesi was influenced by the Christian mission that was involved closely in the bureaucratic expansion due to the shortage of manpower and financial means of the Dutch at that time, as well as by its imperialistic interests. The Dutch intervention into the life of the Pekurehua was so intense that commenting on the condition in the second decade of the twentieth century the ethnologist Kaudern (Vol. I: 29-30) wrote: “Later development proceeded so quickly that at present very little is left of the original culture. Villages and heathen temples have been leveled with the ground, and new villages have been built after modern principles. The old dresses, the weapons, the adornments, the heathen feasts and much more belong to bygone times”.2

After independence, the state intervention into the local cultural expression continued. Through authoritarian governance and top-down planning, the government has forced concepts of settlement structures

---

2 Kaudern succeeded to save thousands of artifacts from the highlands of Central Sulawesi – ranging from complete indigenous houses to daily utensils – when he left Central Sulawesi.
and dwelling upon the local population. In this context, starting at the second half of the 1960s, houses on stilts were replaced by urban style single-family houses on ground level, each with a garden surrounded by a neat bamboo fence. Administratively, the formerly pluralistic form of local self-rule with its own local laws and regulations (adat) was replaced by a village government system, uniform throughout the republic. The local adat council was reduced to a body of prominent elders of the community with authority limited to social and cultural life. In 1985 a good road connection to the district capital Poso and to the province capital Palu was built. Permanent and temporal immigration of farmers and traders from South Sulawesi have been reported since the beginning of the 20th century. The in-migration from the south gained momentum, however, since the outbreak of the economic crises in 1997. Motivated by the declining value of the rupiah and the high prices of agricultural export products and using the newly built road, land hungry farmers from the south poured in looking for land to grow coffee and cacao. A survey conducted by Yayasan Kayu Riva in 2001 reported an in-migrant population from Buginese origin of 18.5% in Wusana. This immigration brought about an acceleration of agricultural development, particularly by opening new land for horticulture and perennials such as cacao. This process increased trade and transport between the Napol valley and Palu and Poso substantially.

\[3\] Village resettlement has been continued by the Indonesian government in the context of a policy aiming to bring the geographically-culturally-economically isolated tribal communities into the fold of the Indonesian culture. Village resettlement activities took on a massive form since 1970 when large scale natural resource extraction started, under two government programs: "Proyek Resettlement Desa"/ Village Resettlement Project of the Directorate General of Village Development of the Ministry of Interior, and the "Proyek Penanggulangan Peladang Berpin cub"/Project to Overcome Shifting Cultivation of the Ministry of Social Affairs. The consequence is that there are almost no original tribal community villages left in the entire islands of Sumatra, Kalimantan and Sulawesi, a phenomenon that has not received adequate attention by academics studying social and cultural change. In the second part of the 1980ies a new concept was introduced which emphasized the in-situ - without resettlement - development for the so-called isolated tribal communities.

\[4\] The term Buginese used in the survey has to be read as a generalized term for all in-migrants from south Sulawesi.
By the time Wuasa village was established by the Dutch, the community was constituted by two sub-communities originating from the two villages, which were merged into the new village of Wuasa: Lengaro and Lamba. In the course of time, with the immigration of people from other parts of Sulawesi, the population of Wuasa diversified further. This process peaked out when Wuasa gained importance as a center of the sub-district administration. Most outsiders, however, will observe only the difference between the (Christian) locals and the (Muslim) migrants from the south. This is obviously too simplistic a picture of the society in Napu valley and the highland of Central Sulawesi in general. The pluralistic character of the village community is un-observable for the outsider because a large category of the population forming this pluralistic community came from ethnic groups that shared many cultural expressions, and most of these ethnic groups were also Christians. There is always a special bond between people of the same village of origin or of the same ethnic background. This special bond is expressed in mutual help in different fields of activities, economic as well as social and cultural. Mutual help in economic activities is practiced, among others, in *mapalus* groups, where members alternately have the right to use the labor of the group for different purposes, although mostly for land preparation and harvest. In 1986 however, following the many organizations introduced by the government, the solidarity group of people originated from the old village of Lamba turned into a more formal organization, calling itself *Kerukunan Keluarga Lamba* / The Association of Lamba Families. Soon, people originating from Lengaro and other solidarity groups followed this step. Besides the Lamba and Lengaro associations, Wuasa includes at least five other groupings. They represent people of Mori, Pamora (both ethnic groups from eastern Central Sulawesi), and North Sulawesi (mostly teachers), as well as two politically influential extended families of Wuasa village.

Starting with the colonial expansion, a process of differentiation occurred also in the field of religion. The suppression of the local religion went hand in hand with the introduction of Christianity, brought by the Dutch mission which, at that time, cooperated closely with the colonial administration. This cooperation arose from the shortage of administrative manpower of the Dutch. According to local history, the Protestant mission came into Wuasa in 1909 and the building of the
first church started in 1910 at Watutau. This Church building is still in use today. This first proselytizing activity has culminated in the foundation of the Gereja Kristen Sulawesi Tengah (GKST), which dominated the religious life and the entire interpretation of Christianity of Central Sulawesi for a long time. The close relation with the administration continued after decolonization. The administrative wards of the village for example, the so called Rukan Tetangga (RT), have been formed according to the neighborhood Bible reading groups of the GKST church community. The weekly church activities of the different Bible reading groups - e.g. women, spouses, youth - were used by the village administration to spread information and government instructions. Thus, the role of the church came close to the aspirations embodied in the concept of "people's church"/volkskerk that was envisaged by the Dutch "Ethical Theologians" in the early 20th century. According to this idea, the people's church has to resemble and function as the adat/customary law of the traditional communities. That is, it fulfills the spiritual needs of the people as well as setting the norms of conduct in every aspect of life (Schrauwers, 2000: 43-47).

The GKST domination of the religious life of the indigenous population in Central Sulawesi and specifically in Wuasa was broken when the Pentekostal church came to Wuasa in 1955 and began to lay claim on part of the community. The Pentekostal church was introduced in Wuasa amidst a hostile attitude of the GKST church and the village administration. In effect, in its early existence the Pentekostal church had to endure intimidations and outright violence against its missionaries. As already mentioned, after the opening up of the Napu highland and the development of Wuasa as an administrative center of the sub-district, more independent churches have been established in Wuasa. There is now a total of six independent churches within Wuasa village with a population of 2638, of which 220 are Muslims. And in the immediate vicinity of Wuasa there are another three independent churches. The amalgamation of church and government administration became difficult when the socio-religious system of neighborhood groups cracked and splintered because of the growth of religious differentiation brought about by the new churches and the growth of the Muslim community. Today, the religious homogeneity is broken, and the perception of an inseparable
community and its system of believes and norms is disturbed. A new development came to Wuasa village after the political reformation of 1998 and the fall of the Suharto regime. For decades the government party Golkar had dominated the political scene. The political opposition did not get a chance to express itself in an organized form. This condition changed dramatically with the approach of the general elections of 2004. One year before the election, there were representatives of at least eight political parties in Wuasa: the former government party Golkar, the leading nationalist party PDI-P and its small challenger the Partisan Party/Partai Pelopor; three Christian based parties, the Indonesian Christian National Democratic Party/Partai Kristen Nasional Demokrat Indonesia (Krisna-DEI), the Party of Peace and Prosperity/Partai Damai Sejahtera (PDS) and the Love the Nation Democratic Party/Partai Demokrat Kasih Bangsa (PDKB). There were at least two Islamic based parties present, imported by the immigrants from the south of Sulawesi, the large Party of Unity and Development/Partai Persatuan dan Pembangunan (PPP) and the new Crescent Moon Party/Partai Bulan Bintang (PBB).

The Transformation of the Natural Resource Management System

Before the commercialization of agriculture became dominant among the Pekurehuwa, the local adaptation system distinguished a multitude of tenure systems. The various tenure systems can be considered as a continuum, with individual based ownership of land at the one extreme and communal tenure at the other. The land within the settlement where the houses were built has always been and still is regarded as private property, kinata, of families that claimed it and passed it through inheritance from generation to generation. The permanent gardens fall into the category of private ownership too. However, a permanent garden would be returned to the communal sphere if it was not used for a long time.

---

5 The first election in 1999, directly after the Reformation of 1998, did not provide enough time for the organization of political parties. In Wuasa the election was accompanied by heavy intimidation on part of the village administration. Golkar won 80% of the votes, the rest went to the only oppositional party, the PDI-P.
neglected for a long time, and would than be available to be obtained by others. The shifting cultivation complexes, in contrast, were under the communal property tenure system. The traditional norm did not attach special rights to persons that pioneered the clearing of a patch of forest. Shifting cultivation land abandoned for fallow would turn automatically into communal land, free to every one to make use of. This may explain the local practice – in contrast with many shifting cultivation systems in other regions in Indonesia – of not planting tree crops in the shifting cultivation fields.

Since the introduction of coffee trees as cash crop in Napu in the Dutch colonial time, there has been a process of change in the local land tenure system. A stronger notion of private land rights has steadily encroached into the land that was previously defined as common property resource. Patches of coffee trees inside the forest became the object of inheritance, a phenomenon unknown before. The real change of the local land tenure system, however, was brought about by several factors: the introduction of the national land registration system in the 1960s and 1970s, the expansion of irrigated rice cultivation under strong government supervision and the immigration of land hungry farmers from south Sulawesi. The national land tenure system was forced upon the Pekurehu, as part of an overall integration of the community into the national economy and state administration system.

In reality, however, the first two decades after the introduction did not greatly change the way people managed and used the land, which was always available to them. Until well into the 1980s shifting cultivation was still practiced under the principle of communal property. On the other hand the new national land tenure system fitted well to land categories that are furnished with strong property rights, as wet paddy fields, the kintal and the permanent gardens. Government programs to develop wet paddy fields in the 1970s were an important factor in pushing the growing notion of private land ownership. The development programs had two main objectives, to stop the practice of shifting cultivation and to establish sedentary agriculture. The rice fields were then registered under individual ownership. Fields in use were registered as dry land. People had also the right to register some reserve land. The land market brought about by the immigration of land-hungry farmers from the south, shortly after the opening of the road connection between Palu and the Napu valley in 1985 pushed the de-
The development of private ownership of land even faster. Besides the land shortage in their place of origin, the farmer migrants from the South were motivated by the high price of export cash crops such as coffee and especially cacao. The commoditization of land and the land registration have developed to such an extent that in 1996/1997 there was no land under communal property anymore. Table 1 shows that there existed a lively land market as early as 10 years after shifting cultivation ceased to be the dominant agriculture system, and with that ended as well the tenure principle of common access of land. The majority of land transfers involved dry land (96.5%), the category of land that was defined as common property resource in the past system of land tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of transaction involved</th>
<th>Land size involved in transactions (Hectares)</th>
<th>Total money involved (Rp.)</th>
<th>Average price of land (Rp/ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46.96</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>22,335,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>107.24</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>232,405,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>28,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>32,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>13,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>176.61</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>328,940,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Land-transactions in categories of land: dry land 96.5%; wet paddy field 1.6%; land within the settlement 3.2%.
- Total agriculture land of Wuasa 1258 hectares, consisting of: 944 hectares dry land, 314 hectares wet paddy fields (Monografi Desa Wuasa, 1999)

Table 1. Data on land transactions from 1997 to 2002 in Wuasa village*

*) Analyzed from village administration data.

**) Information on the money value of the land transactions was not always available. The average value of land for each year was calculated in accordance.
For the year 1997 data on the money value of transaction of 23.9 hectares land are missing; for the year 1998 the figure is 15.59 hectares; for the year 2001 the figure is 0.95 hectares.

At the outset, land transfers usually went one way from the indigenous people to the migrants. Very soon, however, land transfers went the other way too. In the span of 5 years, between 1997 to 2002, over half of the land transaction cases (109 land transfer cases from total 194 or 56.18%) were transfers from locals to immigrants, which involved 62.6% of land transferred. This left a substantial portion of other transactions, such as from migrants to migrants or from migrants to locals and between locals. It showed that land transactions had already gone beyond a simple relation between the land hungry immigrants and the land rich local people. Today, an open land market is in operation.

The privatization of land rights resulted in the fragmentation of land, limiting the access to land to those who own land. Commoditization of land that goes hand in hand with its privatization resulted in a land distribution pattern that is not always in accord with the needs of the local people. The establishment of the Lore Lindu National Park (LLNP) set further limitations in access to land and other natural resources for the members of the community. The LLNP is composed of two conservation areas, the Lore Kalamanta National Park that was nominated as Biosphere Reserve under UNESCO’s Man and Biosphere Programme (MAB) in 1977 and the Protection and Tourism Forest/Hutan Lindung dan Hutan Wisata of the Lindu Lake and two extension areas which encapsulate the Lindu Lake protection forest in its western, northern and eastern parts. The permanent border of the LLNP was marked with concrete poles in 1999, comprising 217,991.81 ha or 2.4% of the forested area of Sulawesi. A large part of the Lore Utara sub-district, where the village in study is located, falls within the national park, namely 90,525 ha with a park border of 99 km. Along this border there are 14 indigenous villages and two transmigration villages. With the designation of the LLNP and with

---

6 Cases of land transfer from migrant to migrant were substantial: in 1998 it involved 20% of the cases, in 2000 41% and in 2001 22.1%.
7 Sub-District Lore Utara has been split into two Sub-Districts, Lore Utara and Lore Tengah.
the current park management concept, which banned all human activity inside the park, a large part of the sub-district’s area became part of the park and thus legally became inaccessible for local people. In the case of Wuasa, 200 ha of the village land bordering the settlement, consisting of flat and formerly agricultural land, is lost — notwithstanding the loss of timber and non-timber forest products from what was formerly a common resource. This refers likewise to the other 116 villages surrounding the LLNP.

Over a span of 15 to 20 years the land tenure system of the Pekurehua has experienced a fundamental change. The originally diverse tenure system, with common property land tenure for the larger part of the land resources, changed into a uniform system of private land ownership. On top of that part of the agricultural land and the access to forest products were forfeited to the protectionist policy of the Park Authority. A list of land tax in the year 2003 from a centrally located section of Wuasa village may illustrate the distribution of land ownership in the community. From the 73 households 15 are immigrants. The total land involved in this tax register is 135.94 hectares.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership (hectares)</th>
<th>Number of household</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 0.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0.5 – 1.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1.5 – 2.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2.5 – 4.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total land involved: 135.94 hectares (all categories of land)
- Average holding: 1.86 hectares
- Maximum ownership: 7.8 hectares
- Minimum ownership: 0.06 hectares

Table 2. Land ownership in Dusun 2, Wuasa, sub-district Lore-Utara (according to land tax registration of 2003) Source: Register of tax on land and buildings for the year 2003 of Dusun II, Wuasa, sub-district Lore-Utara.
The tax register shows that the average land ownership is 1.86 hectares, which includes all categories of land. Almost half of the people registered (49.2%) owned land between 0 – 1.5 hectares. In terms of agriculture land only – irrigated as well as dry land – the figure is even less. The average land holding figure of 1.86 hectares does not deviate significantly from figures in the past. There are, however, two fundamental differences in the condition of the households in the past and at present, in terms of their economic position and in terms of their access to land. In the past the different categories of land were used to secure subsistence and to meet expectations bound to cultural and life cycle events. Such needs were defined and managed locally. At present, the need for subsistence is only a small part of what the land resource has to produce. There are other needs that have to be fulfilled, such as education, health, clothes and living style, house and land tax, and the provision of water and electricity. The definition of such needs is largely beyond the influence of local people. Another fundamental difference is the access of people to land. In the past, the whole Napu valley was a potential resource open to be used by each household, constrained only by the household work force, the character of the ecosystem and by the cultivation plans of others in the community. In other words, the resources of the Napu valley – the grass lands, forest, fallow land and ex-shifting cultivation fields, the wetlands near the river, irrigated paddy fields – as an integrated whole could be included in the household strategy. At present, each household is attached to a fix land holding, limiting the possibilities and reducing the flexibility of the household while confronted with continuously increasing obligations.

Data on individual land holdings do not reveal an unequal agrarian structure. On the contrary, they present a picture of marginalization of a local community, where agriculture does not provide a sufficient base for socio-economic development. However, this observation is only partly correct. Almost all local households have agricultural land, where they cultivate maize, vegetables, red beans, or potatoes, and many start to plant cacao in their gardens. Most local households have also irrigated rice fields. An important part of the community, however, lives only partly from agriculture. They spend part of their time as carpenters, construction worker, keeping a small store or food stall, etc. A fairly large group of the locals are government functionaries,
engaging in agriculture in their free time. Most of the old elite families, the ones who are part of a line of ancestors reaching back to mythological figures, succeeded in preserving their social and economic status by occupying strategic positions in the civil service. From the moment modern education was introduced in Central Sulawesi, however, these old elite families have to share their influence and power to new prominent families that have climbed upwards through education and the Church.

The end result of a long process of external interventions is a community, horizontally and vertically differentiated through traditional as well modern categories. As already mentioned, the Wuasa community is already divided according to village of origin. Immigration created differentiation in both ethnicity and religion. The influx of different church congregations competing for the “lost souls” of the tribal communities, helped to differentiate further the Christian part of the community. Across these lines, and sometimes strengthening the already existing lines, are the electoral groups of political parties. The old elite families and the new prominent families make up the class that through the combination of education and their network of blood and marital ties dominate the political power in the region and through that gain access to the means for individual economic empowerment. These old elite families and the new prominent families became the upper class of the community. They are on the point of expanding their power and influence – through bureaucracy, education and the church – beyond the limits of the village and the sub-district to the district and even the provincial level. The migrants, especially the farmers from the South, largely dominate the agricultural sector, producing the bulk of marketable vegetables and export products such as cacao and coffee. We see here the development of a social class that can be characterized as an ethnic group and/or religious group, which dominates the economic sector largely because of their capability to get more from the land than the locals did. In this condition, transfer of land from locals to the migrants is a logic phenomenon. At the bottom of the social ladder, there are the majority of the locals that are mainly dependent on agriculture for their livelihood. People of this last category have to rely on their limited land as their sole economic resource, taking advantage of the local institutions for mutual help – such as the mopalus – in preparing land and for generating income.
Some complement the income from agriculture with petty commodity trading and services.

The fast pace of social differentiation left little room for an essential process of internalization of new ideas and cultural elements and of acculturation. A condition is created where individuals live with multiple ideologies as alternatives, most of it without deep roots in the community, and with bits and pieces of the remaining indigenous culture and institutions. In this condition, collective action will be difficult to realize. In contrast, idiosyncratic behavior can go quite far without being confronted with public outcry.

**CBFM and Local Reactions**

The boundary of the National Park never received local recognition. Trespassing and encroachment became daily events. There are three sources of this perceived lack of legitimacy: First, it is the disputable status of the LLNP in the local perception. The borders of the LLNP were decreed without proper consultation and consideration of the rights and long-term needs of the local community. At the start of the surveys for the boundary of the National Park, people were not fully aware of the consequence of the activities done by the surveyors. Only after the borders were defined and concrete poles were erected, people were sure that the surveyors had done the job in the easy way by avoiding the forest and taking instead the more easy terrain closer to the village. As already mentioned, the LLNP encloses approximately 200 ha of land perceived locally as common property and used as agriculture land. At the time the border of the National Park was marked, part of the land was already covered by individually owned coffee gardens and other fields with seasonal crops. Second, there are no comprehensive regulations on people’s rights to extract timber and non-timber forest products essential for household use. Third, it is common knowledge that elements in the National Park Authority facilitated illegal logging initiated by large timber merchants and operated by local entrepreneurs who also employed individual chain saw owners from the village.

Despite the overall disagreement from the side of the local community, there was no open protest against official decisions on the
boundary of the National Park. There were several reasons why the LLNP did not spark a community wide protest movement in Wuasa. In a certain sense, the park is a problem only for a part of the community. The LLNP has the most effect on people who depend on land complexes on the west side of the village and which became part of the National Park. Part of the land is covered with individually-owned coffee gardens. As a result, there is no common interest within the community as a whole to resist the encroachment of their agriculture land by the LLNP. There was no single dominant perception among members of the community on the LLNP, whether positive or negative. There were influential persons in the community who support the existence of the LLNP. There was also a local NGO that came to life focusing its activity on promoting the LLNP. This NGO was also active in reviving certain aspects of the local culture, such as local knowledge in natural resource management. One aspect that cannot be neglected as a factor that adds to people's favour for the LLNP is the national and international prominence that the Lore Lindu region and the community received once the LLNP was promulgated. This went hand in hand with a keen attention from different development and research programs of the national government as well as of international organizations. Furthermore, there is the fact that the community of Wuasa has become socially differentiated and quite complex, which countervails the development of a platform that could aggregate people's opinion on the LLNP and turn it into collective action.

It is important to know this background if one wants to understand the reaction of the local community towards the Community Agreement for Conservation program (KKM / Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat) that was launched by the National Park Authority. The KKM program was a form of Community Based Forest Management concept, which was developed as part of the Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs) which were meant to support the protection of several National Parks in Indonesia, among others the Siberut, Kerinci Sebelat, Gunung Leuser, Bunaken, Bogani, Wartabone/Domoga-Bone and the Lore Lindu National Park (LLNP). The common aim of these projects is "to ensure the conservation of biological diversity by reconciling the management of protected areas with social and economic needs of local people" (World Bank, 1996 cited in CSIADCP, Working Paper no. 2). The project that was as-
signed for the LLNP, the Central Sulawesi Integrated Development Community Project/CSIADCP, started in the middle of the 1990ies. In this project, the LLNP and its buffer zone of 60 adjacent villages were considered together as one unit, called the “Lore Lindu Bioregion”. The basic assumption of this project is that “...biodiversity conservation depends almost entirely on people’s values and the way in which they are put into effect through day-to-day decisions about the use of resources” (CSIADCP, Working Paper 2:2). Part of this assumption is the view that environmental degradation is related to the limitation of information, preventing people from acting in their own best, including practicing a sustainable natural resource management. On the other hand, social and economic distortion prevents people from turning their appropriate information into the right decisions. The CSIADCP project is designed to these limitations and distortions by responding in detail to the cultural, social and economic needs of the 60 villages in the buffer zone of the LLNP.

Part of the CSIADCP project is the development of a management plan for the LLNP, executed by The Nature Conservancy (TNC), an international, US-based environmental NGO. As part of the development process of this management plan, local NGOs were recruited for conducting research on certain fauna species and on different aspects of the village communities in and around LLNP. In a later phase TNC and some NGOs were involved intensely in developing the Community Conservation Agreement / Kesepakatan Konservasi Masyarakat (KKM). In its first phase, the KKM agreement was closed with five villages at the border of the LLNP, Sedoa, Wuasa, Kadiwaa, Watutau and Betue. The concept of the KKM was based on the basic assumption of the undisputable status of the LLNP. This starting position exerts consequences for the NGOs involved. They had to embark on a two-pronged strategy of balancing the interest and rights of local people and the preservation of biodiversity. Within the large programs of CSIADCP and the development of park management under the coordination of TNC, solidarity with local community rights and interests had to stop at the border of the LLNP. In the following, the implementation of the KKM will be described and analyzed, based on two contrasting processes, that of the villages of Toro and Wuasa. This is to disclose the consequence of basing ones program on false assumptions on the community in case. Further, it will show the importance of
internal dynamics in determining the outcome of external intervention, albeit the distribution of power between the intervening actors and the community subject to intervention. As stated by Long, (2000:13), all forms of external intervention are inevitably mediated and transformed by the actors and structures subject to the interventions.

The KKM agreement between the National Park Authority and the community of Toro was constructed within the context of the village’s struggle to resist resettlement. In other words, the agreement was constructed with the active involvement of Toro leaders who had developed their specific visions of local natural resource management. This was directly linked to their struggle towards preservation of what they perceived as their ancestors’ rights. In contrast to the KKM agreement in other villages, Toro appeared with its own tailored supporting institutions. In this context the adat council assumed a prominent role as the authority to supervise the management of natural resources through enforcing traditional forms of sanctions. Patrol squats were formed manned both by forest rangers of the National Park Authority and volunteers from the village. In developing a special institutional foundation for the community-based management, Toro deviates from the formal concept where the supporting institutions follow the given government administrative system.

The process towards the establishment of the KKM agreement in Wuasa took a different form, which resulted in a different agreement. Although the village of Wuasa has lost quite a substantial part of its land and the access to timber and non-timber forest products to the LLNP, its existence was never in danger, such as in the case of Toro. Wuasa is located outside the LLNP and surrounded by quite extensive agricultural lands. The village as a whole never felt threatened. Therefore, problems related to the existence of LLNP were perceived more as individual issues. Problems with the LLNP were never taken up by the village as an institution, but were confronted at the household level. Conflicts were fought out between forest rangers with individual members of the community or with groups of individuals. Within this context, the external agents took TNC all the initiatives leading to the KKM agreement in this case. Activities such as participatory mapping, workshops to assess the threats and ecological services of the LLNP to the villages around the park, the forming of supporting organizations for the community conservation agreement, were all initia-
ated by the TNC. Between December 2000 and March 2001 a process of participatory mapping of the resources and resource use of Wuasa was carried out under the initiative and coordination of TNC. This mapping activity was also used to identify historical or cultural sites and objects in the forested area. Despite the widespread complaints against the LLNP border, there was no mention in the document of land within the LLNP claimed by the village, nor of land and resources lost through the LLNP. The document only mentions the difficulty of finding the border signs because the majority of them were not anymore in their places, and the existence of coffee gardens inside the LLNP.

Close to the mapping activity, a large workshop was held in Wuasa called “Peoples Consultation for Conservation Planning”, with participants from most villages of the sub-districts Lore Selatan, -Tengah and -Utara. In this three-day workshop, ecological and socio-economic functions of the National Park which directly affect adjacent villages, as well as threats to the National Park were evaluated through participatory processes. In this three-day workshop each aspect of the forest – such as forest ecological services, non-timber forest products, and occurrence of wild animals – was scored on a continuum from bad to excellent according to the perception of the participants. Thus, to the threats to the National Park, their magnitude and solutions were discussed. Some conclusions were drawn from an exercise, which convinced the participants that parts of the LLNP adjacent to the village are still in good shape. However, some threats to the National Park, which caused environmental problems for the villages, needed more resolute measures. One of the most critical problems identified was the effect of logging which, although still small in scale, already produced erosion that silted and clogged the Pembala river running through the village. At the previous rainy season this condition already brought flooding on a scale never experienced before. Interestingly, the most strategic solution that was suggested by the participants was the restitution of the ancestors' land, which was now occupied by the LLNP. The idea was that if parts of the margins of the LLNP were acknowledged as the ancestors' land, this move would encourage and intensify the community's responsibility for the security of the park. The legitimacy issue of the park area became a focus again when the participants discussed the critical problem of agricul-
tural encroachment into the LLNP. It was emphasized by the participants that an important factor behind those encroachments was the shortage of agriculture land, a condition common to most villages on the border of the LLNP. In that relation participants suggested that the borders of the LLNP has to be renegotiated.

Amid demands of the participants to renegotiate the border of the Park, TNC emphasized the definitive and undisputable status of LLNP and its borders. The logical consequence of this position taken by the National Park is that the forest cover of the agreed KKM area has to be maintained. This second point means that the area cannot be converted into any other land use, not even into agroforestry systems. Estate crops such as coffee and cacao, which always are planted under shadow trees, are not allowed. The KKM area may be enriched with forest trees, which produce timber, nuts and fruits. However, the extraction of timber and certain non-timber forest products such as rattan from the KKM area is allowed only for private use, not for the market. Despite the lip service of participation and acknowledgement of local or ancestors’ rights, the agreement was ultimately constructed according to the interest of the National Park, leaving many problems encountered by local communities unanswered.

The processes toward the KKM agreement in Toro and in Wuasa (and in most other villages) used participatory principles and methods. The detailed management system of the KKM in Wuasa, however, did not deviate from the restrictions put up by TNC and the National Park Authority. This did not consider complaints and suggestions for solutions that were expressed during the “participatory” workshops. From the perspective of TNC and the National Park Authority, the participatory processes were not seen as negotiations of concepts and solutions with the local community. From the outset it was obvious that the objective was mainly to convince the community of the indispensability of the LLNP and to involve people in transforming a finished concept into real organizations and regulations. As Mosse asserted, that “participatory planning” is more accurately viewed as the acquisition and manipulation of a new “planning knowledge” rather than the incorporation of “people’s knowledge” by projects (Mosse, 2002: 22-23). Although the KKM agreement of Wuasa village was utterly unrealistic in its concept of land use and failed to meet the real needs of parts of the community, local perceptions of it were not uniformly
negative. There were pro’s and con’s towards the KKM, and they were raised by different categories of people in the village. Those who perceived the KKM as positive were composed of at least a large part of the retired and active senior functionaries of the village and sub-district administration, the more educated members of the community, members of the community that owned and worked on land on the other part of the village far from the border of the LLNP, and young environmental activists. The perception of retired and active senior functionaries reflects in general the official opinion of the government on natural resource management, including the whole idea of a National Park and the KKM. Part of this category is a circle of highly educated senior members of the community who occupy important positions inside and outside the village administration. One of them holds the only master degree in the village and is also a member of the Pekurchua adat council at the sub-district level. Another person was the head of a secondary school in Poso predating the violent conflict. Part of this category consists of heads of the different Churches. Because of their formal position and social status they defended a legalistic standpoint and represented the urban, modernist and developmental point of view that considered their own community as backward, with low working ethos. In line with this idea, they refused the idea of shortage of land and blamed rather the low intensity of land use as cause of the depleted economic conditions. There were, however, important exceptions. Certain formal and informal leaders showed personal interest in the KKM area, among others because the obvious reason of their past activities in that area. In public these figures have to represent the formal standpoint, in reality they ignore the agreement.

Young environmental activists who were sponsored and trained by local and international NGOs from Palu who were active in advocating the LLNP, took a rather different position. These young activists from Wua, a couple of them had gone through university education, set up their own small NGO in close connection with NGOs in Palu. Although these youngsters support the KKM agreement, they positioned themselves quite independently vis-à-vis the village administration and the National Park Authority. In terms of ideas, this local NGO represents the combination of the typical urban environmental movement and the indigenous movement for cultural consciousness.
and human rights. As educated youngsters they perceive the social dimension as particularly relevant in the relationship between man and environment. That is why the NGO took Pekurehua as its official name, as to express its indigenous ethnic consciousness. It developed into an element that had to be taken into account in the local decision-making process—not only because of its capability to mobilize opinions among the people, but also because of certain qualities of its leader, such as knowledge in the decision-making process, environmental issues and the capability to mobilize opinions among NGOs in the provincial capital. With support from outside, this village NGO organized educational activities on environmental consciousness, public meetings on transitional justice or collective actions like in planting bamboo along the Pembala River.

There were four categories of people who did not agree with the KKM concept of collaborative forest management. The first category is composed of people who, since generations, used to farm at the western side of the village bordering the LLNP. When the land tenure system developed into a private property regime, people who cultivated land on that part of Wuasa perceived the land as theirs. The second category consists of youngsters who are still landless and live from the land of their parents. They heavily depend on inheritance because there is no reserve land any more. The third category is people who don’t have traditional access to land. They come from other regions and don’t possess any blood or marriage relation with the local population that would give them rights to land. Among these people are, besides farmer migrants, employees, teachers and members of the military and the police. The fourth category is comprised of people whose income depends on harvesting of forest products, in particular timber and rattan. For all these people, the KKM agreement means a real or at least potential threat, as it puts their economic security at risk.

Both, the representatives of pro and con alike, participated in meetings and workshops coordinated and facilitated by TNC with the objective of constructing the KKM agreement. Despite the disagreement of the whole community on the boundaries of the LLNP and on the unrealistic concept of the KKM land use, the agreement that came out of this process did not affect at all the positions taken by TNC and the National Park authority. It is therefore not surprising that one month
after the signing of the KKM agreement, a group of people went into the KKM area and cleared about 40 ha of forest for agricultural purposes. Following this encroachment, a meeting was organized between the village administration, the Lembaga Konservasi Desa/Village Conservation Body and the National Park Authority, where it was decided that encroachment had to be stopped and the affected land had to be re-planted with forest trees. The already planted cacao or coffee plants, however, were left untouched. What is interesting in this incident is the fact that the encroachment was spearheaded by prominent leaders of the community, who also participated in the participatory process in developing the KKM agreement. These were not the ones that needed land most. In this contradictory condition, the drafting of the KKM agreement became a process in itself that had little correlation with reality. In the face of the ongoing activities of local people inside the designated KKM area, the locals assessed the stiff attitude of the National Park Authority and TNC with its predetermined conditions as a position remote from reality. For many people of Wuasa, outside and inside of formal institutions, pro or against the KKM, the KKM proposal that they helped drafting was perceived as a stepping stone to reclaim part of the LLNP area that was seen as an integral part of the community. There is, however, a fundamental difference between Toro and Wuasa in regard to the land regarded as ancestors’ land. In Toro the KKM program became an integral part of their struggle for recognition of their village. A whole array of norms has been developed, including organizations to manage and enforce sanctions for encroachment into a forest zone that the village itself has defined. In the case of Wuasa, the reclaim of land was not related to a community wide agenda. With the signing of the KKM agreement, the role of the village community as a legitimizing factor ended. The formal organization – Lembaga Konservasi Desa/the Village Conservation Body – that was created as part of the KKM agreement to execute and control its implementation at the village level, did never really function. No socialization of the agreement among the members of the community was done. It was obvious that after the agreement there was no need on the side of the influential members of the community to implement it. At the village level there was no institution, modern or traditional, that was capable to exert pressure towards implementation of the agreement. Most of the strategic positions in the existing
formal and informal organizations at the village level were filled by the same small circle of elite and prominent families that did not have interest in the implementation of the agreement. A situation was created where no authority can prevent people from breaking the agreement, and act on their own interest. This explains the large-scale encroachment of the KKM land shortly after the agreement was signed.

Some Deliberations on Participatory Approaches

In itself, the community-based management approach is an improvement compared to the development programs inspired by the modernization theory of 1950-1970 with their top-down structure of communication, centering on the idea of the transfer of knowledge and technology, management and financial aid to less developed parts of the society. However, programs of community based natural resource and environment management were dominantly based on too simple assumptions about the forest village communities that were involved in these programs (Leach, Mearns and Scoons, 1997; Johnson, 2004). The consequence is that both approaches show the same position in regard with the nature of rural/forest village communities: communities that are socially homogenous and imbued with conservationist values. In this perception, the formal and informal leaders of the community are believed to share the same interests with the whole community they represent. Based on this assumption, the participatory approach has been applied by involving these formal and informal leaders. In her foreword to the book by Agrawal and Gibson (2001: ix) Ostrom states “even if legislation or policy boasts a ‘participatory’ or ‘community’ label, it is rare that individuals from the community have had any say at all in the policy”. Part of the blame for this condition, according to Ostrom, can be laid on the naive view most community based conservation (CBC) programs have of the “community”. This paper tried to show how complex the structure of the community actually is, horizontal as well as vertical. Although Indonesia has decentralized its governmental system, the imprint of almost thirty years of centralistic authoritarian rule can still be felt. The village administration is the government administrative system at the lowest level, responsible to the next higher government administration level, repre
senting rather than the government’s interest. Simplification of the nature of the local community has direct consequences for the participatory process. Uma Kothari (2002: 142) emphasizes the problem that lies in a simplification of the nature of power relations in local communities. Being ignorant of the complexity of social differentiation and the power relations within the local community, a community-based participatory program could result in reinforcement of power and social control by certain social groups already in power and thus perpetuate the existing inequality rather than empowering the disempowered.

Observing the participatory approach from the implementing agent, Hall (1988) indicates four major modes of people’s participation: 1) anti-participatory; 2) manipulative; 3) incremental; and 4) participatory (ibid. 93). According to Hall, most developmental participatory activities fall between the manipulative and the incremental modes. While the ‘anti-participatory’ mode precludes any popular participation, the ‘manipulative’ mode of participation is planned and controlled entirely for the ulterior motive of serving government objectives. The ‘incremental’ mode of participation is implemented on an ad hoc basis as a result of a half-hearted belief in the feasibility of popular participation or simply as a result of inefficient planning (ibid.: 93). In falling between the manipulative and incremental modes, the motives behind most of the participatory programs are ‘instrumental’ in character, such as gaining political support for the program or through taking advantage of local knowledge and institutions and thereby reducing costs of implementation (ibid.: 93-94; Cleaver, 2002: 37). Genuine participation, or more accurately the radical mode of participation, involves devolution of decision-making power to local institutions as part of basic social and economic reforms (Hall, ibid. 93). In this radical view, participation includes empowerment of the poor through class action, with transformation of structures of subordination through radical changes in law, property rights, and institutions (Hall, ibid: 95; Cleaver, ibid: 37).

The participatory approach applied in the development of the CBFM concept in LLNP can be characterized as being based on simplifications of the nature of rural communities and at the same time as a manipulative and incremental mode of people’s participation. Although the Toro and Wuasa communities shared many common char-
acteristics in terms of social structure, the outcome of the KKM process was profoundly different. In the case of Toro, the initiative in developing the KKM was entirely taken over by the community and exploited to safe the village as a whole, employing in the process the discourses of 'ancestors rights' and 'local environmental knowledge and wisdom'. In the case of Wuasa, there was no platform of common interest. The so-called representatives of the community took a compliant attitude in the process of developing the KKM, while at the same time conveyed their own agendas. The KKM became a stepping-stone for individual interests, spearheaded by the elite of the community. If a more radical participatory mode had been applied, the existing power structure would have been weakened, if not broken in favor of the community in general. A participatory approach in the context of a socially differentiated society or community has to abandon the idea of formal and informal leaders as representatives of the community. In a socially differentiated community, it is the powerful that will act as representatives of the community. A true participatory approach under such conditions would have to involve the smallest groups beyond the family such as neighborhoods, at least representatives of them. Only by this means, a counter balance against the power of the formal and informal leaders could be established.
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