



Graduate School of Development Studies

**Transnational Environmental and Agrarian
Movements Influencing National Policies:
The Case of Palm Oil Plantation in Indonesia**

A Research Paper presented by:

Nadya Karimasari
(Indonesia)

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of
MASTERS OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Specialization:
**Environment and Sustainable Development
(ESD)**

Members of the examining committee:

Dr Saturnino ('Jun') M. Borras Jr. [Supervisor]
Prof. Dr Peter Knorringa [Reader]

The Hague, The Netherlands
November 2011

Disclaimer:

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Research papers are not made available for circulation outside of the Institute.

Inquiries:

Postal address: Institute of Social Studies
 P.O. Box 29776
 2502 LT The Hague
 The Netherlands

Location: Kortenaerkade 12
 2518 AX The Hague
 The Netherlands

Telephone: +31 70 426 0460

Fax: +31 70 426 0799

Contents

List of Tables	v
List of Acronyms	vi
Abstract	vii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 The Problem	1
1.2 Question	3
1.3 Research Objectives	3
1.4 Relevance and Justification	3
1.5 Definition of Concepts	4
1.6 Methodology	5
1.7 Research Limitation and Ethical Consideration	5
1.8 Organisation of the Paper	6
Chapter 2 Analytical Framework	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Strategic use of information as the core of transnational movements	8
2.3 Transnational movement and its influence towards national policies	9
2.3.1 Strategies	9
2.3.2 Sequences of Influence	11
2.4 Interrelation of transnational movements with other stakeholders	12
2.4.1 Relationship between civil society and the state	13
2.4.2 Relationship between civil society and private actors	13
Chapter 3 History of TEAMs in Indonesia	15
3.1 Introduction	15
3.2 Convergence of Environmental and Agrarian Movement in Indonesia	16
3.3 Linking with transnational movements	17
Chapter 4 Different Approaches of TEAMs: problem-framing, demands, and action	20
4.1 Introduction	20
4.2 Environmental Justice (WALHI-FOEI)	21
4.2.1 Background of the Organisation	21
4.2.2 Approach	22

4.2.3 Problem-framing	23
4.2.4 Demands	24
4.2.5 Actions	25
4.2.6 Influence on National Policy	26
4.3 Food Sovereignty (SPI-LVC)	26
4.3.1 Background of the Organisation	26
4.3.2 Approach	26
4.3.3 Problem-framing	27
4.3.4 Demands	29
4.3.5 Actions	29
4.3.6 Influence on National Policies	30
4.4 Radical Environmentalism (Greenpeace)	30
4.4.1 Background of the Organisation	30
4.4.2 Approach	31
4.4.3 Problem-framing	31
4.4.4 Demands	31
4.4.5 Actions	32
4.4.6 Influence on National Policies	33
4.5 Market-based approach (WWF)	34
4.5.1 Background of the Organisation	34
4.5.2 Approach	34
4.5.3 Demands	34
4.5.4 Actions	35
4.5.5 Influence on National Policies	36
Chapter 5 Conclusion	38
References	40

List of Tables

Table 1 Summary of Findings and Analysis	37
--	----

List of Acronyms

FOEI	Friends of the Earth International
LEIA	Law of Environmental Impact Assessment
LoI	Letter of Intent
LVC	La Via Campesina
RSPO	Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil
SPI	Serikat Petani Indonesia
TEAMs	Transnational Environmental and Agrarian Movements
UN	United Nation
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WALHI	Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia
WWF	World Wild Life Fund for Nature

Abstract

The rapid expansion of palm oil plantation has provoked reactions from environmental and agrarian movements, domestically and trans-nationally. This research attempts to compare four different Transnational Environmental and Agrarian Movements (TEAMs) in the case of palm oil activism in Indonesia. TEAMs are heterogeneous, ranging from the spectrum of environmental justice movements, peasants movements, radical environmentalists, and a Non-Government Organization applying the market-based approach. They have a different approach to perceive the problem, which resulted in different demands and action. Hence, they invoke different kind of change in the policy formulation related to the transformation of palm oil plantation.

Relevance to Development Studies

Environmental pressure is getting more influential in the decision making process of development practice. But, little has been known about the type of influence the “environment” can bring to national government, because environment cannot speak for itself. The concern of environment is being understood, mediated and communicated by environmental movement. With this regard, what kind of process is going on internally in the TEAMs, and how exactly does different approach of environmental problem translated differently in shaping the kind of development practice to be pursued, is still understudied. This study will try to discuss how different approach to see the environmental problem would colour the national regulation about how development practice could be improved or changed in terms of reducing environmental harm.

Keywords

Palm oil activism, transnational environmental movement, transnational agrarian movement, WALHI, Greenpeace, WWF, SPI

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The Problem

Indonesia is the hotspot of palm oil controversies. Together with Malaysia, Indonesia is the biggest producer of palm oil in the world. The expansion of palm oil plantation is massive. It is encroaching into the forest and peat lands area. As a consequence, forest clearance and destruction of peat lands emits an enormous amount of Green House Gas (GHG) emission. This situation puts Indonesia as the third biggest GHG emitter in the world, after US and China. Replacing forest with palm oil plantation could endanger biodiversity. Besides increasing GHG emission, there are other environmental risks. For example, the plantation will monopolize water resources. Pesticides and fertilizers used for the plantation could contaminate the environment and harm the health of laborers and farmers. Expansion of oil palm plantation has social risks, as well. It sparked conflict with local people, because the expansion of palm oil plantation often dislocates forest dwellers and farmers.

The problem attached to palm oil plantation provoked different reactions from different social movements, particularly environmental and agrarian movements. Powerful social movement, which I will call “Transnational Environmental and Agrarian Movements” (TEAMs) are involved in policy advocacy campaigns around palm oil. In varying ways and degrees, they attempt to change the palm oil sector ranging from a call to a stop to transforming the sector into a socially and environmentally just venture. In this context of political contestations around the questions of whether oil palm should continue, and if so, under what terms, Indonesia has become a major battlefield of different TEAMs to speak up their aspirations on palm oil in particular and inclusive and sustainable agriculture and development in general.

It is evident in this study that the TEAMs do have influence, although in varying degrees, on Indonesian national policies and policy-making processes. Nowadays, with regard to the growing concern on environmental issue, policy makers are increasingly influenced by environmental pressure as an important factor in their decision-making. Unfortunately, studies linking TEAMs and national policies remain somewhat limited. Studying the role of TEAMs in policy formulation is relevant because in order to do something about the problem, policies are carried out by the state, but not just as they pleased. Non-state actors contested the formulation and implementation of policies. More importantly, the difference between TEAMs contributes differently in policy making. This study attempts to contribute to our understanding of the variations among TEAMs and their dynamic contestation towards national policies.

Different TEAMs have varied perceptions about the problem of palm oil plantation. Some of the TEAMs think that palm oil plantation is not problematic as long as it is outside forest and peat land area. In other words,

the main concern around palm oil is how to produce palm oil but still keeping forests and peat lands intact. Preservation and conservation of forests and peat lands is indispensable in order to function as a global GHG storage. Other TEAMs think that, even though the plantation could manage not to destroy forests and peat lands area, it could still be a problem. The problem for them is more about how the plantation uses communal land and coercively displaces local dwellers without proper compensation. Other perspective sees that the problem lies in the practice of plantation that harms the livelihood of local dwellers, such as appropriation of land and water pollution. These adverse activities of palm oil plantation violate the rights of local people. In short, TEAMs have a broad and differentiated spectrum of concerns regarding palm oil plantation. Apparently, observers tend to treat uncritically the highly nuanced TEAMs as undifferentiated. This notion has disguised the fundamental, distinct characteristic, perspective, approach and aspiration of each movement. It is also being insensitive to what regulation TEAMs aspire to achieve.

There are four main environmental and agrarian organisations that play a crucial role in influencing Indonesian national policies related to palm oil plantation. They are Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia-Friends of the Earth International (WALHI-FOEI), Serikat Petani Indonesia-La Via Campesina (SPI-LVC), Greenpeace and WWF (World Wildlife Fund). Each organisation is rooted on a different approach to understanding environmental problem, especially around the relation between nature and society. Those different approaches are namely environmental radicalism, environmental justice, peasant rights and food sovereignty, and market-based approach. The emphasis of environmental radicalism is to defend the nature from the threat at any cost. Environmental justice is seeing the problem as not environmental per se, but more about how the local dwellers' life is disadvantaged by the destruction of the environment. The relation of peasant rights approach with the environment is that they see the production of crop by agribusiness as harmful for the environment and the peasants, while the production by peasants or smallholder can save the planet and the livelihood of smallholders. The last approach is the market-based approach, as known as sustainable development, which seeing the problem in the implementation of the production mechanism. Development has to continue. Technical fix will reduce the deleterious effect to the environment. It does not problematize the rate of consumption and production of the crop itself. Each of the four approaches will be discussed further in the next chapter. Each approach differently influences the way we understand environmental problems associated with palm oil, what the causes are, and what solutions are desirable to solve the problems.

The differences among TEAMs are not trivial. These influence their relations towards government and private sector. At times, government and private actors, or other stakeholders in palm oil plantation use the differences among TEAMs to justify their practice and go on without acknowledging TEAMs' accusation of their problematic development paradigm in palm oil. Each TEAM has a different perception on how they should go about on their relation with other stakeholders, confirming what Howell and Pearce (2001)

argued that the relationship between civil society and other stakeholders are varied. Their relation can be divided into three types: as a government watchdog, a welfare buffer, and a participant who shape the state roles. These will be discussed in later chapters. Then, the different roles of TEAMS are reflected in the process of envisioning policies related to palm oil plantation.

It is problematic to lump the movements reaction to palm oil plantation as a monolithic opposition. It is dangerous to generalize them without dealing with why and to what extent they perceive the palm oil as a problem, frame their issues and make their demands. Differences among TEAMS need to be taken into consideration because these give different consequences on the politics of policy formulation. It is also dangerous to see all TEAMS as similar without further remark on their different contribution in shaping and reshaping the regulations on palm oil plantation. Hence, it is necessary to ask how each TEAMS varies in its influence on the formulation of regulation relevant to palm oil plantation in Indonesia.

1.2 Question

This research will try to shed light on whether, to what extent and how TEAMS influence national policies. It will check the interconnectivity between different levels of TEAMS, as well as the divergence in their approach in seeing the palm oil problem. To see how their action influence differently at the national level, the main research question is *“To what extent and how do TEAMS influence national policies relevant to the transformation of palm oil plantation in Indonesia”*?

Sub-questions:

1. Which groups are key civil society organisations in palm oil issue and how do they perceive the issue?
2. In what ways do they try to influence national policies?

1.3 Research Objectives

This study attempt to develop an understanding on the contribution of different approach of seeing environmental problems to the national policies related to it.

1.4 Relevance and Justification

Studying transnational environmental and agrarian movements is relevant because they do influence the politics and regulations around palm oil plantation in Indonesia but we know very little about how they do it (see also Lee Peluso et. al., 2008). The national government as a primary target of transnational movements is an important subject that has been neglected in the literature (Rucht, 2009). Most literature about the impact of transnational movements draws on its effect towards international treaties and convention, as well as its impact on international bodies and international bodies and governance (for example, see Betsill and Corell: 2001).

By and large, the formation and implementation of international treaties depends upon the national context with national government as an authoritative role. Hence the “interconnectivity of movements on different level” (Borras, 2008: 179) needs to gain more attention in the studies about transnational movements. This study would like to contribute to the existing literature on how transnational movements, especially environmental and agrarian movements, influence policies at national level.

The relevance of this study to development is on how environmental issue is taken into consideration in development processes. Environmental pressure is becoming more influential to the decision-making on the practice of development. But, little has been known about the type of influence the “environment” can bring to the national government, because the environment cannot speak for itself. The concern of environment is being understood, mediated and communicated by environmental movements. With this regard, what kind of process is going on internally in TEAMS, and how exactly does different approach of environmental problem translated differently in shaping the kind of development practice to be pursued, is still understudied. This study will try to discuss how different approach to see the environmental problem would colour the national regulation about how development practice could be improved or changed in terms of reducing environmental harm.

1.5 Definition of Concepts

Throughout this study, definition by Khagram et. al. (2008: 329-330) will be utilized to emphasize the meaning of terms. The unit of analysis in this study is organisations as a part of TEAMS, but there are some things to be highlighted. This study is looking at TEAMS, which could not be simplified as the same with Non-Governmental Organisation (NGOs). Transnational movement could consist of several NGOs or other non-governmental actors across borders as long as it works together in a sustained effort for a certain goal. The use of NGO term is problematic in this study because one of the important organisations being researched upon rejected that they are NGO. For them, being not NGO is important to have a degree of autonomy and self-determination in their struggle. The organisation mentioned is La Via Campesina. They are peasant movement, and for them NGOs are not directly reflecting and representing peasants’ interests. Thus it is important for them to make a distinction than other NGO because their movement is from the peasant itself, by the peasant and for the peasant. They don’t want any representation or intermediaries, which would only use the peasant as a basis of other interest. That is one of the reasons why this study uses the term “transnational movements”.

To understand more about transnational movements conceptually, Khagram et. al. (2008) make it into three different layers. This means, the development of transnational movements could be seen in three stages. The first embryo of transnational movement is transnational network. Transnational network are characterized by network of information. Information exchange is essential to initiate transnational network. This is especially true when taken into consideration that transnational network is

basically based on value and the strategic use of information (Keck and Sikkink, 1998). The second stage is transnational coalition or campaign. After exchanging information, transnational network could decide to perform a joint campaign in order to achieve shared goal. For this purpose, they form transnational coalition or campaign. In this stage, they have closer coordination upon strategies and tactics to be implemented to achieve campaign goal. Finally, after the second stage, if the transnational coalition sustained for a longer term, it become transnational movements. This is the relevant case with Indonesian context, because the TEAMS has sustained in a convergent action for a long period of time. TEAMS in Indonesia have been working together in several issues such as forest protection and local dwellers rights. This joint movement is likely to sustain in the future because for more than 10 years they have solidarity for each other. Not only they perform joint campaign, they also often help in the mobilization for each other's specified campaign.

Form-Dominant Modality:

- Transnational network: Information exchange
- Transnational coalition or campaign: Coordinated tactics
- Transnational movement: Joint mobilizations

1.6 Methodology

To gain information relevant for this research, Skype interviews were conducted with the forest campaigner of Greenpeace, Joko Arif, as well as the forest campaigner of WALHI-FOEI, Deddy Ratih. For SPI-LVC, interview was conducted with the International General Coordinator, Henry Saragih. I also had an opportunity to join the activities of SPI-LVC during a forum held in Rome, "Civil Society Mechanism-Commission on Food Security" organized by Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), where I did slight observation to familiarize with the activities of transnational movements in the global level. On this occasion I also did small simulation of action research on how transnational movements tried to influence policy-making. Other than that, this research gain information from the movements campaign material, media reports, and literature review. I also previously worked at Greenpeace and added some experience I had there as a source of first-hand information.

1.7 Research Limitation and Ethical Consideration

The research is about the specificity of palm oil case in Indonesia, and how TEAMS influence the national policies relevant to it. This research limits itself in studying different approach to environmental problems, which are environmental radicalism, environmental justice, peasant rights and food sovereignty, and market-based approach. This research study further how different approaches in seeing environmental problems is being translated into action by each TEAMS. The translations reflected in the different demands that TEAMS ask in the attempt to shape and reshape the regulation related to palm oil production.

TEAMs demand and action resulted in change in the national policies will transform the practice of palm oil plantation. The implementation of national policies is beyond the scope of this research. As mentioned by Keck and Sikkink (1998) in the analytical framework used by this research, the fifth and final influence by transnational movement is change in state behavior. This stage of influence is not being studied in this research.

This research is missing one key informant, which is from one organisation being studied, WWF. The campaigner of WWF was being contacted by e-mail and phone, but there was no reply until the expected time. To fulfill the lack of information about WWF, this research decided to rely upon the information on their official website, some articles in the media and scholarly publication related to the their activities.

As a researcher, I previously worked in Greenpeace. This particular former experience makes me tends to sympathize to the work of TEAMs. In palm oil plantation issue, without undermining the contribution of palm oil commodity for Indonesian national export, my previous work in campaigning about palm oil issue made me more familiar with the environmental problem caused by palm oil plantation. The adverse effect of palm oil plantation for the environment as well as for local people made me believe that the economic profit from palm oil is not at all comparable with the destruction it had caused.

1.8 Organisation of the Paper

This paper will start with introduction of the problem in the first chapter. The second chapter is about analytical framework. It will provide information on how transnational movement influence policies. It will show the vital elements of transnational movements to be influential, for example the strategic use of information. It will also introduce strategies and sequence of influence as well as the type of relation between transnational movements, government and private sector in the frame of development.

Chapter three is about the findings and analysis of this research. It will give introduction about the history of TEAMs in Indonesia, its development and its different approaches, as well as how it reflects on their problem framing of the palm oil plantation issue. It will also provide information about the process and outcomes of TEAMs influence towards national policies. Environmental movements are unique in character, and it develops into different approach such as radical environmentalism, environmental justice, peasant rights and food sovereignty, and market based approach. It will then tries to deal with what kind of relationship the movement have with government under a certain context of idea about the development project with relation to the role of market.

The final chapter of this paper is conclusion. It will review how environmental concern is understood differently by different approaches, namely radical environmentalism, environmental justice, peasant rights and food sovereignty, and market based approach or sustainable development. It will also show how different approach translated into different kind of demand by the TEAMs that resulted in different national regulation. Thus it will come back to the main argument of this research paper that treating different

TEAMs as the same and as a monolithic opposition is problematic, because this paper had shown the nuance within TEAMs and its different implication towards the national politics and formulation of regulation related to palm oil plantation.

Chapter 2

Analytical Framework

2.1 Introduction

The context in which transnational movements occur is related to the globalizing dynamic of societal relations. Gaventa and Tandon (2010) noticed that the landscape of global authority is changing. It can create new possibilities for the citizen to participate and engage in a new form of power under a transnational action. In contrast, it can also create new limitation and restraint for community action through discourses of dominant power. Under new circumstances, citizens are practicing their role as agency for social change in a more interconnected local-global landscape.

Social movements are broadly conceived as lying on a spectrum ranging from grassroots movements to transnational NGOs engaged in working for what they perceive to be progressive social and ecological change (Ford, 2003: 120).

2.2 Strategic use of information as the core of transnational movements

The power of transnational movements is apparent in the strategic use of information. There are several normative stances of transnational movements. The normative stances are based on their engagement with information and values.

At the core of network activity is the production, exchange, and strategic use of information (Keck and Sikkink, 1998: x).

Throughout their study, Keck and Sikkink noted that transnational network is value-laden, its power is in the creative use and dissemination of information (from facts and testimony), it brings alternative voice, and it “reshape certain contested meanings” (1998: 5). It is based on “voluntary, reciprocal, and horizontal patterns of communication and exchange (1998: 8).” As echoed by Evans (2005), transnational social movements, especially transnational environmental movements, are forming potential counter-hegemonic globalization. It brings meaning through generating “normative cascades” and then uses this “soft power” to shift the balance of power (2005: 9). In line with this role, transnational social movements are referred to as the global justice movements (2005: 2).

Transnational movements need to have local roots to create change. Accordingly, networks are context-sensitive, “both an arena for the contestation of world-views but also is itself and arena of contestation (Howell and Pearce, 2001: 81)”, and “embody elements of agent and structure

simultaneously (Keck and Sikkink, 1998: 5).” The hub of this interrelation is their campaign, in which one can find out their resources and institution relation. Campaign is:

... sets of strategically linked activities in which members of a diffuse principled network (what social movement theorists would call a ‘mobilization potential’) develop explicit, visible ties and mutually recognized roles in pursuit of a common goal (and generally against a common target). In a campaign, core network actors mobilize others and initiate the tasks of structural integration and cultural negotiation among the groups in the network. Just as in domestic campaigns they connect groups to each other, seek out resources, propose and prepare activities, and conduct public relations. They must also consciously seek to develop a “common frame of meaning”-a task complicated by cultural diversity within transnational networks.

The important part of campaign shows how extensive use of information in transnational movements. At work, transnational movements struggle in the realm of meaning making, issue framing, and alignment. Their power is based on the strategic use of information. Transnational movement is a non-profit sector identical with value-laden. It needs to put a lot of effort in conversing the existing norms to organize collective action.

2.3 Transnational movement and its influence towards national policies

2.3.1 Strategies

Transnational movements seek ways to change the national policies in several ways. The first is direct pressure to the national government as well as its representatives in the international bodies. According to Rucht (2009) this might be the most effective way to achieve a goal, but this could make the government react defensively against “foreign intervention”, especially in the name of national sovereignty and economic interest.

Unresponsive government makes transnational movement use soft power and indirect ways to create change in the national government policies. Thus, the second way transnational movements influence national policies is by strengthening domestic pressure to the national government. The way to strengthen domestic pressure is by making network with internal oppositional force in the nation. Transnational movement would encourage them to conduct effective response from the national government. This would supposedly then make a necessary change in their policies or action.

Thirdly, transnational movement influence other countries or multiple countries to bring pressure or make an agreement with the targeted national government. This process needs strong-networked transnational movements with branches in a lot of different countries, in the northern countries and southern countries. The transnational movement has to persuade other countries that the problem with the targeted national country would affect them too. Transnational movement has to communicate that the problem is a

global concern and needs to be solved simultaneously in a global action or agreement.

The fourth way transnational movement could affect national government is by creating public awareness of the problem. In this case, the target of transnational movement is to create a public mobilization, because the individuals in themselves are becoming aware of the problem and jointly communicate to each other to perform actions together to achieve desirable change. Transnational movement tries to achieve change by influencing, negotiation or creating pressure to the national government. The media is important in the dissemination of information, the creation of public awareness and the formation of public mobilization and pressure.

Rucht (2009) proposed that probably the most effective strategy to bring about change in national level is the use of all different strategies in different levels simultaneously in a finely tuned orchestrated coordination. Transnational movement works more like a patchwork of action and not like an army commando. It is not necessary for transnational movement to gain success in one level and only afterwards other level will follow the success. The impacts of transnational movements are rarely linear or straightforward. The most effective strategies usually consist of a mixture of strategies and actions in different levels. The most important thing is to maintain the network in different levels to sustain the struggle together in order to achieve joint goals. As a final remark from Rucht:

Probably the greatest strength of transnational movements lies in using parallels and sometimes finely orchestrated strategies of direct access to governments, e.g. lobbying, mobilization of adherents, e.g. signature boycotts, and getting supportive media resonance. (2009: 210).

Aside from working on change by influencing national government, transnational movement also perform in different ways outside the official arena of national policies. Glover and Newell (2004) show other strategies that have been taken by transnational movements to gain change. These strategies are beyond civil litigation on official policies. They called it “civil regulation”. By civil regulation, they mean,

actions taken by civil society actors that have the intention or effect of restraining, regulating, or resisting the actions of private actors that are thought to be beyond state control. (Glover and Newell, 2004: 220).

Civil regulation is also important in a nonlinear route of influencing the national policies.

The pretext of civic regulation is private actors destruct environment the most by their extractive action or other action to produce goods and services. The problem is, for instance based on their economic influence, some times private actors such as transnational corporations has more power than national government. The transnational corporations contribute in destroying the environment for making profit in their provision of goods and services for the market. But, in many cases, the national government is unable to restrict the transnational corporations or regulate their destructive action. This happened partly because the national government is depended upon them for gaining

foreign investment and creating job opportunity. Thus, the degree of state authority and self-determination is questionable if they are not sovereign in fulfilling their economic needs. Then, the emergence of social movements acts as a double power. One is to make the private actors act more responsibly in their production system. Another is to encourage the national government to take necessary action in order to regulate the bad practice from private actors.

2.3.2 Sequences of Influence

In a more general picture, Keck and Sikkink (1998) summarize the influence of transnational movements in five types of achievement. All of which relates to each other and work in a simultaneous strings to empower the general influence of transnational movement. As follows, the five achievements of transnational movements will be explored further.

The first, transnational movement has an influence in issue creation and agenda setting. This is related to the transnational movements' as a value-based actor and their nature as an arena of information exchange, as well as their strategic use of information in order to form "values" to give guidance or oppose actions taken by government or private actors.

The second is in influencing the "discursive position" (Keck and Sikkink, 1998: 25) of states and international organisation. By providing a hint of values based on information related to the problem and the proposed solution, transnational movements create public awareness. In their direct lobbying and public mobilization, transnational movements influence the state, international organisation, and private actors to take a position about the problem, what kind of stance are they putting forward to achieve proper solution.

After the second achievement, which is influencing the discursive position of government or private actors, the third is to influence on institutional procedures. If the powerful actors who are also important decision makers have a change in how they perceive the problem, or if they have enough pressure to take different stance on the problem, they will negotiate it in the institution. Moreover, they would try to change the institutional procedure to make their institution not being blamed for being involved in making the problem worse.

The fourth is influence on policy change in target actors, which may be states, international organisation, or private actors. When the institutional procedure is change, hopefully it is enabling the stakeholders such as state, international organisation or private actors to make a relevant change in the policy related to the problem. For example, bilateral or multilateral agreement is giving proper incentives to the national government to change policies. This would stimulate more extensive policy change in each countries national policy. The same could take place in the level of other stakeholders such as private actors and international organisation.

Last but not least, the fifth is influence on changing the state behavior. After the national policies are change, the movements have stronger bargaining power to pressure the government to act in line with the regulation. The problem in this level is implementation of national policies by the government. Even though the policies had changed, the implementation is hindered because of the government behavior. In practice, the problem still arise, so having a

better national policies does not always necessarily stop the government from behaving wrongly. In this stage, a stronger movement is needed to control the government. The state would supposedly try to be responsible of their action before the public. In a democratic system, if the government behavior is violating the law or regulation, it will have consequences such as not being elected in the next round, or even further such as being legally processed.

To achieve these effects, transnational movements utilized what Keck and Sikkink (1998) called the “boomerang effect”. Boomerang effect portrays how social movement, which is blocked in their country, bypass the state and seek linkage with transnational allies to bring pressure to their state from outside. Transnational movements are rooted in local movements. The initiative and problem were delivered from the local movements to transnational movements because state authority blocked the route for local movements. Transnational movements were involved then to bring pressure to the state in order to solve problem brought up by local movements. This portraiture is useful to understand the linkage of transnational and national movement. However, it is only partly true because this notion assumes transnational network as neutral, free of interest, and tends to be responsive, while in some cases transnational movements initiate collaboration with national movements.

The analytical framework by Keck and Sikkink (1998) above shows the sequence of influencing change in national policies. Meanwhile, the analytical framework by Rucht (2009) earlier shows the tactics, mechanism and strategies of action by transnational movement to influence the national policies. In combination, both frameworks are more useful to see not only the hard mechanistic process of transnational movements action, but also the soft process behind the surface. The soft process starts from idea exchange, which resulted in, issue creation and agenda setting. The hard process is to find the appropriate outlet of action, what to do when, where and by who. The combination of both approaches emphasizes that transnational movements work not only in grounded action, but they are also closely engaged in the epistemic level of discussion about the ideas surrounding the problem. This notion reveals the level of agency practiced by transnational movement. They are showing that the struggle for change is not only in the level of action, but it started from the change in mind.

2.4 Interrelation of transnational movements with other stakeholders

Aside from the elements of transnational movements mentioned above, it should be remembered that transnational movements are not located in a social vacuum. They interact with other public actors in a political space to advance their demand. There is a danger of seeing transnational movements as a singular power that can influence the national policies alone. In order to get a more comprehensive picture, this research is using the analytical lens that sees the influence of transnational movements depends upon their relations to other actors or stakeholder in the issue, such as government and private actors.

2.4.1 Relationship between civil society and the state

According to Howell and Pearce (2001), there are three roles of civil society in their relationship with the state. The first role is what I called as the “watchdog” of the state. This role arises since 1970s, in the situation of global change. At those moments, the role of state was overshadowed by the celebration of the market. In the late 1980s the Cold War ended and “the market appeared as the triumphant winner in the longstanding state/market debate” (Howell and Pearce, 2001: 4), thus especially in the US, foreign policies were directed in the favour of market, in other words, to give more space to the market. In this context, the civil society blooms because it was expected to play a role as the “watchdog” of the state. Here, civil society was supposed to be the voice to control to the state accountability and transparency.

The emergence of civil society could also minimize the role of the state, because civil society could play similar role like the welfare state. They become substitutes that fix the “failure” of the state. This brings us to the second role of civil society, which I called as a “welfare buffer”. This paradigm was originated in the European Continental continent. Civil society was an example of civil and political rights that supposed to compensate for the economic and social inequalities generated by the thriving capitalist economic system. But, in fact, civil society could never replace the role of state, which brings to the thinking of the third role of civil society in its relationship to the state.

Howell and Pearce argued further for the third role of civil society in relation with the state. As they said, we should move beyond the dichotomy of civil society versus state. In this dichotomy, the role of civil society is merely opinion-maker and the role of state is decision-maker. Beyond this dichotomy, the third role of civil society along with its role as “watchdog” or “welfare buffer” is as a participant in decision-making process. Together with the state, and possibly, private actors, civil society plays role in forming the regulation on a certain issue. In this way, civil society is a political arena, as well as actor.

Talking about the relations of transnational movements with other actors, the relation with donor agency is one that needs to be under scrutiny. The donor’s funding to transnational movement could more or less influence the transnational movement’s agenda. Howell and Pearce noticed the tendency of donor agencies to reduce transnational movement as a technical tool and thus depoliticizing it.

“In this spirit they developed programs to strengthen and even manufacture civil society.” (Howell and Pearce, 2001: 4).

2.4.2 Relationship between civil society and private actors

The relationship between civil society and private actors or the market is debatable. Civil society interacts with private actors to influence the politic and policies of certain issues. Howell and Pearce differentiate three types of relations between civil society and private actors. It is useful to understand the different types because later it provides explanation for the role of different TEAMS in the context of palm oil plantation.

There are three types of roles the civil society plays in relation to the private actors. The relationship between civil society and the private actors and the relationship between civil society and the state can be seen as parallel. Each type is from the same framework, which will be elaborated further in the table below.

In the first type, civil society is a “watchdog” to the state. In this framework, neoliberalism is a final answer, thus this type is also called the “neoliberal” framework. Government should play a minimal role in maintaining domestic and external stability. Its prime role should be protecting the private property of individual, to guarantee economic and political freedoms and facilitate the market. Civil society becomes a vessel for the public to exercise their social and political concern and the state should create enabling space for the self-regulating market.

The second type, civil society as a “welfare buffer”, is giving civil society the role to become compensation to the bad effect of economic development. This framework accepts the market economy but also aware of its negative effects, especially on the social solidarity and cohesion. Thus, this framework is called the “socially responsible capitalism”. Civil society plays a significant role to compensate the alienating tendencies of global capitalism. It can be involved in a partnership with the state. Meanwhile, it supports the market principle to organize economic activities. It modifies neoliberalism because it breaks the myth of self-regulating market. This second framework sees the state, with cooperation with civil society, should have a bigger role than in the first framework. The state and civil society should ensure to minimize the bad side effects of the development of capitalist market economy. Hence, civil society is not apolitical. It is not a neutral space or merely a private sphere of individuals trying to get their own interests.

The first and second framework of seeing the relationship between civil society, the state and the market is originated in the mainstream genealogy of civil society. Meanwhile, the third framework below is seen as originated in the alternative vision of civil society. In the third framework, civil society counters the basic principles of capitalist and market economy system. It does not see the solution in welfare planning. In other words it does not see the system could be compensated in any way. What needs to be done is change in the system because the system itself is the problem. Civil society is aware of the inequalities and other damaging socio-economic and environmental effect of the profit-prioritizing market. It is more open about not having consensus with other stakeholders in attempt to resolve problems related to the capitalist development. Civil society has to play a role as a public space to imagine alternative vision on organizing the society, including the economic activities. It has the power to emancipate participants to contest the ideology and not accepting neoliberal capitalism as the end state of the world.

Chapter 3

History of TEAMs in Indonesia

3.1 Introduction

Indonesia has a unique historical context that made environmental and agrarian movement very closely related to each other. According to Huizer (1972), before 1965, when environmental movements had not yet mainstreamed nationally or internationally, Indonesia had the biggest grassroots agrarian movement. The movement name was Barisan Tani Indonesia (BTI). It is a part of the Indonesian Communist Party and the party has direct coordination route with the Comintern (Communist International) organization. By the nature of this coordination route, the agrarian movements were familiarized with transnational ideas, especially through its leaders. On the other hand, it also contextualized the movements' strategies according to local socio-cultural context and needs. As a result, the agrarian movements grew as a popular and influential movement at the national level, hence the birth of Agrarian Reform Law in 1960, which was considered as the biggest achievement of agrarian movement in Indonesia.

The story had gone astray because the implementation of the Agrarian Reform Law was not as expected by the members of BTI, mostly landless and small peasants. The Law was supposed to distribute land to landless and small peasants, in order to reduce inequality and ensure livelihood securities of the poor. The influence of BTI was evident in pushing forward the agenda to enact Agrarian Reform Law, but apparently not enough to force the state to implement it. The slow implementation was creating impatience and hollow hope for the peasants. The movement stepped ahead and risking their harmonious relationship with the state and other political actors. They did a pressure strategy called "unilateral action", which implies the act of taking the law into one's hand without waiting for the decision of the Agrarian Reform Committee. It is not clear whether this strategy was the initiative of BTI/Indonesian Communist Party, or an instant and spontaneous response from the peasants who can no longer trust the state's procedure.

The unilateral action strategy backfired the agrarian movement in a big way. Indonesian political occurrence in 1965 had witnessed one of the biggest massacres in history, taking the life of more than one million people, mostly landless and small peasants. Their descendant were also got a mark on their identity card which made them rejected for official jobs and other cultural connections such as marriage. In addition to the official banning of communist and Marxist teachings, the massacre and descendant marking was said as a systematic agenda to completely wipe away the communist ideology from Indonesia.

As a result of 1965 political occurrence, Suharto replaced the former president of Indonesia. The new government was named the New Order regime. After a complete clearance of anything communism-related, such as

banning the agrarian movements and labour union, the New Order regime progressed in state-led development and modernization strategies. As a response to rapid modernization and state-led development agenda, environmental movements emerge in order to speak against the natural destruction that has been a consequence of the development projects. In the midst of dictatorship, environmental movements had taken place as a new form of movement free from allegation of communism-related movement (Pye, 2010). The “clean” label was an important survival strategy and a starting point of the revival of social movements in Indonesia. While the agrarian movement was repressed, the environmental movement gained ground in Indonesian state.

The establishment of WALHI in 1980 was a sign that the government accepted environmental movement (Eldridge 1995). WALHI is a national umbrella of local environmental movements. It is a consortium of local environmental NGOs and it acts as the unifying organization, hence it has a strong grassroots reach as well as national coordination. It is important to notice that the state, especially Emil Salim, a minister at New Order regime, supported the initiative of WALHI. The establishment of the Ministry of Environment made the environmental movement having easier accessibility and mobility as compared to other movements, which had to operate underground.

The establishment of WALHI also can be traced from 1972, as noted by Lee Peluso et. al. (2008: 384), “... explicitly traces its origins and inspirations to the Stockholm meeting on Sustainable Development in 1972, a meeting which inspired many mainstream environmental and conservation organizations as well.” The emergence of environmental movement was not only a response to national condition, but also a response to the international concern. On the other hand, the dynamics of environmental movements in Indonesia not only depended upon transnational forces, but also on the origins and historical context of the movements itself. This condition shows that social movements do not work alone in a social vacuum. It is influenced by its interaction with different actors, not only in the national level, but also at the transnational circumstances.

3.2 Convergence of Environmental and Agrarian Movement in Indonesia

The environmental movement become a safe haven for the underground agrarian movements. The environmental movement in Indonesia appear to be technical and apolitical. Meanwhile, they also fought for the agrarian issues, because the rapid state-led development and modernization brought the state to deal with massive extraction of agrarian resources, and creating excess implication for the environment. Environmental issue became very closely related to the agrarian issue, and WALHI became a space for the agrarian movements in Indonesia. One of the argument that was often used is the agrarian inequalities will enforce ecological damage, so the agrarian inequalities needs to be corrected to reduce ecological damage.

3.3 Linking with transnational movements

Based on interview with WALHI-FOEI forest campaigner, WALHI joined the transnational environmental movement, FOEI, in 1983.

A clear affinity of vision and mission between WALHI and FOEI made us officially joined FOEI. (Deddy Ratih, WALHI-FOEI Forest Campaigner, October 2011).

As a national environmental movement, WALHI could expand the exposure of national environmental issues at the international level. On the other hand, WALHI also help campaigning for international environmental issues, and this broaden their horizon of understanding the environmental problem. FOEI also got more grassroots information from their connection with WALHI, because the environmental issues brought up by WALHI are based on the environmental problems on the basis of the reality in Indonesian community level. Information from WALHI helped members of FOEI take strong stance on lobbying their own respective government. For instance, they will inform their respective government to regulate transnational investor because the effect this investment caused in other countries. In this way, for both WALHI and FOEI, the relationship is mutually beneficial. According to the testimony of WALHI forest campaigner, until date there is not yet any disadvantages related to the transnational networking. WALHI are the environmental justice activist who mainly acts as a linking hub between local movements and transnational NGOs (Pye, 2010).

In FOEI, we share about our own countries environmental issues and link it with a wider context. For example, if there were certain projects that cause environmental problems, in FOEI we discuss about it and find the connection with the investing countries of that project. (Deddy Ratih, WALHI-FOEI forest campaigner, October 2011).

By this, they addressed to fix the element of Northern-Southern relationship of the problem. The solution of the problem would be more comprehensive. The movement is not only targeting national government, but also giving pressure to the other stakeholders that have direct relation with the national government. This is an example of Rucht (2009) framework, explaining how connection with transnational network could influence national policies. Not only pressure between states, but also creating pressure to the actors doing investment. The fact that private actors are increasingly becoming the target of movements' pressure needs to be incorporated in Ruchts' framework (2009). Not only political actors are capable of doing pressure towards national government, but also increasingly private actors such as investors and corporations were expected to have a political role in supporting an action to combat environmental problem. This notion is in line with Glover and Newells' (2004) "civil regulation" framework as mentioned above in the analytical framework.

The transnational character of environmental problem widens the horizon of national-based environmental and agrarian movements in incorporating each approach to make their organization identity bolder. Meanwhile, the agrarian movement found its own path to reach out to the transnational level

of organizing. Started from a local level organization at North Sumatra, North Sumatra Peasant Union (Serikat Petani Sumatra Utara-SPSU), the organization expand its networking with other local level agrarian movement and officially formed a national level agrarian movement in 1998 and joined the transnational networking since 1996 (source: interview with Henry Saragih, General Coordinator of LVC).

Since 1980s and 1990s, despite prohibition from the New Order regime, agrarian movements are resurgent underground. There were too many land conflict and land appropriation by the state, especially in the forest and plantation area, which made the peasant felt the urge to withstand. This is the reason for the underground emergence of agrarian movements. During the New Order regime, there was only one agrarian organization allowed. Himpunan Kerukunan Tani Indonesia (HKTI) was the official agrarian organization in Indonesia that is established by and supporting the state. Under these circumstances, the agrarian movements could not be overt; it has to be under cover. Only after the demise of New Order regime in 1998, the agrarian movement declared itself as a national Federation of Peasant Union (FSPI). In 1996, before the formation of national level agrarian movement, the local level agrarian movement had already joined the transnational peasant movement, La Via Campesina (LVC). LVC was established in 1993. After the declaration of FSPI, the member of LVC was no longer the local level agrarian movement but the FSPI (later called SPI). In 2000, SPI was chosen to be the regional headquarter of LVC, and in 2004 it was chosen to become the international headquarter.

Greenpeace was established later on, as a branch of Greenpeace International. It does not started from the grassroots like the WALHI-FOEI and SPI-LVC. It started from the international initiative. Greenpeace, an environmental organization founded in 1971, started to contact Indonesian environmental activist to help their anti-toxic campaign in the 1990s (source: interview with Greenpeace forest campaigner). Indonesia was one of the countries being the place to dump foreign toxic waste. The collaboration continued. At late 2004 or early 2005, Greenpeace officially started to campaign in the purpose of saving the ancient tropical rainforest in Papua, Indonesia. At this period, Greenpeace Indonesia had not yet had an office. One year later, Greenpeace South East Asia was officially registered in three countries, Indonesia, Thailand, and Philippines. In order to get in touch with the grassroots, Greenpeace manage to cooperate with WALHI-FOEI and WALHI partner environmental organisation at local level, such as Jikalahari, Warsi, etc. Meanwhile, WWF Indonesia was established as a national office since April 1998. It decentralized into 3 regions, and up to now WWF Indonesia worked at 25 sites in 17 provinces. Their priority program is in the area of forest, species, marine, climate and energy.

The connection of Indonesian environmental and agrarian movements with transnational environmental and agrarian movements is an achievement. Until 1998 transnational connection was forbidden under the New Regime Order. However, the phenomenon of transnational hub between movements across the globe is not entirely new, especially in the sphere of knowledge exchange, idea transfer, and dialogical space of sharing experience within

different countries. Given the nature of transnational movements that relies much on the utilization of information, the transnational connection of mind is vital for movements not only at global scale, but national and regional level as well. Exchanging information on global level broadens the movements' perspective on analyzing the problem and finding imaginable solution, as well as endorsing global solidarity for the quest of (possible) alternatives. On the other side, first hand experience by movements at national level enrich understanding for the network at global level, bringing nuanced and multiple realities of the problem to be considered for different context (Tsing 2005).

Chapter 4

Different Approaches of TEAMs: problem-framing, demands, and action

4.1 Introduction

The government argues that palm oil is an important source of income for the national economy (Basiron 2002, Barlow et. al. 2003, Zen et. al. 2005). It gives employment for the population and it is a source of income for small holders. But palm oil plantation also has huge adverse environmental effect (Colbran and Eide 2008, Fitzherbert et. al. 2005, Okamoto 2000, Soyka et. al. 2007, Germer, and Sauerborn 2008, Sandker et. al. 2007, Silvius and Diemont 2007) as well as social effects (McCarthy 2009, Rist et. al. 2010, Lee 2007). The expansion of palm oil plantation usually clears the forest by burning it down (Casson 1999). The criticism against palm oil plantation mostly comes from environmental and agrarian movements and not from the labour of palm oil plantation itself (Li 2011, Li 2010).

The companies are smart because they give some benefits for the labours and small holders, for example health care and house. Their live condition could be improved but it is difficult to really change their economic status into a better situation. They are locked in to be a labour. There is no chance for upward mobility. Their life is just a matter of survival. (Henry Saragih, General Coordinator of LVC, October 2011).

McCarthy (2010) also noted that the result from engaging with palm oil plantation is diversified. For some farmers, palm oil makes them rich, for others, palm oil makes them more miserable. The problem, according to McCarthy (2010), is the absence of government role in the palm oil issue, which creates larger inequalities among local dwellers. This is related with the demand of grassroots organisations especially LVC-SPI. They does not oppose palm oil plantation per se but they are opposed to the injustice related to ownership of palm oil plantation. They are struggling for the small farmers to gain more power over the palm oil plantation.

The global campaign against palm oil plantation was intensified mostly in reaction to the issue of biofuel directive in EU, started in 2006-2007. Several transnational movement joined the campaign against biofuel directive, such as Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth International (FOEI), and La Via Campesina (LVC), the latter prefer to use the term agro fuel instead of biofuel because it is derived from agricultural product. The biofuel directive was a entrance momentum to be used by key organisations to campaign for their mission and values. Palm oil plantation is highlighted in their campaign, because it gives evidence of how the plan to massively produce biofuel could induce adverse effect for the global environment, for example forest clearing and peat land burning in Indonesia.

The unsustainable practices of palm oil plantation have been existed since long time ago, but why now it deserves attention from transnational movements? As argued by Pye (2009), the momentum sparked during palm oil boom. Palm oil boom shows the interrelatedness of palm oil as a commodity that unfolds several transnational processes. First, the palm oil boom itself was stimulated by the needs of EU climate policy in order to reduce global problem of climate change. Second, transnational corporations has created global supply chain linking palm oil plantations with the processing such as refineries and manufacturing, which creates transnational space use in areas such as Indonesia. Third, the palm oil plantation has created increasing need for migrant workers. This creates transnational space, for example between Indonesia and Malaysia. Fourth, palm oil boom provoked controversies that increase the political space and connectivity between South East Asian movements and European movements. The South East Asian movements could use this momentum of increasing global criticism against palm oil to raise issues from the ground, while the European movements could internationalize the problem on the ground to create increasing global awareness and pressure. In sum, palm oil expansion is an example of multiple crises at the global level, namely the crisis of global climate change, biodiversity loss and failed development (Pye, 2009).

Different approach has different base of perception on how significant environment is, how the relationship between nature and society is supposed to be, and whether or not development itself is inherently problematic, or is technical improvement could solve the short term and long term problem. This study will be interesting in comparing different perspective on the environment carried out by different TEAMS, such as environmental justice, food sovereignty, radical environmentalism, and market-based approach. It will also show how different approach have a different influence on the kind of change desirable in the practice of palm oil production and the national policies relevant to achieve those aims.

4.2 Environmental Justice (WALHI-FOEI)

4.2.1 Background of the Organisation

FOEI has a unique form of organization as compared to the other two international environmental organizations, Greenpeace and WWF (see also Doherty, 2006). FOEI takes shape as a federation of national environmental movements, thus each member has an autonomous position. The national member of FOEI could have a different position than the FOEI position for particular cases, as long as they stated it clearly to the other members of FOEI. For example, some member of FOEI could encourage market-based approach, other does not, but they dialogue about each position and views. Even though they had different position, the main principle for each member is to not discredit other members. The federation form is good because it makes the initiative of the organization not top down, but based on dialogue among members. Members have the same amount of vote, not based on their financial contribution to FOEI. This will ensure greater amount of democratic participation within the organization.

The strong networking and participatory dialogue among member organization is one of FOEI's outstanding qualities. Again, different than other environmental organization such as Greenpeace or WWF, the rule of thumb in FOEI is participation from grassroots. If the grassroots did not agree with the position of WALHI or FOEI, if they did not contribute in the struggle to solve the environmental problem they faced, then the problem will not be solved. Change will not happen, no matter how many advocacy and campaign WALHI-FOEI had done. WALHI-FOEI campaign has to be in line with the grassroots' social and cultural background. They prioritize to build on the existing struggle already done by the grassroots. Based on this principle, WALHI-FOEI emphasizes dialogue, training and regular informal education with the grassroots especially on the theme of human rights and assessment of environmental effects. WALHI-FOEI dedicates themselves as a friend of the grassroots, trying bridge conversations in the grassroots level to understand their perception of the problem and the project to solve it.

The most important rule from FOEI for the members is they cannot cooperate with World Bank nor accept any funding from it. They mainly depend on public fundraising and donor agent, which does not force an agenda towards them. This is related to the position of FOEI that sees World Bank as part of the problem. World Bank cause inequalities in the world because its choking debt for the global South countries.

FOEI has sought to address environmental issues through a critique of social and political inequality, and explicit attack on neoliberalism and a commitment to environmental justice as a central principle. (Doherty 2006: 862).

This means, in relation to the type of civil society by Howell and Pearce (2001), WALHI-FOEI claimed to be not under the neoliberal framework. They are also not satisfied with the socially responsible capitalism framework. They oppose the market-based solution in the case of palm oil plantation. They aspire to be the alternative movement that has a role as a participant to influence the decision of the state about development trajectories. In this way, they defend the interests of the communities to participate in development.

We are critical to the government, but we are not their enemy. We encourage change by sitting down in one table and discuss inputs based on the real condition in the communities. We give critique through sending letters or meeting the government officials to say that their decision making is more influenced by business interests and political interests from the competing political parties. We also discuss about draft of regulation with the government. (Deddy Ratih, WALHI-FOEI forest campaigner, October 2011).

4.2.2 Approach

Environmental justice is mostly about the fundamental distribution of political power and the need for structural change. (Schlosberg, 2009: 54)

To understand environmental problems from environmental justice perspective is to make it embedded to the wider social economic context of the

problem. At the beginning, environmental injustice is against the environmental harms that are distributed mainly to the poor people in US (Jamieson 2007). Disparities in social power create environmental injustice. Addressing justice is not only about distributing environmental gain and loss to certain community, but also about recognition of different worldview and participation in decision-making process. On later development, this perspective also seeks to confront the global power politics, because environmental injustice could not be seen as a localized problem only. This perspective embraces dialogue within environmental movement, not a top down coordination. They do not aim for a single explanation of injustice or a single coordination line of environmental justice. They encourage communicating diverse form of injustice.

The environmental justice movement can be unified but it cannot be uniform. An insistence of uniformity will limit the diversity of stories of injustice, the multiple forms it takes, and the variety of solutions it calls for. (Schlosberg, 2009: 179).

To fight against the cause of environmental injustice, this perspective calls the states' role as a key actor to regulate society in order to make a more just structure of societal relationships. The result expected from this role is the environmental risks and opportunities are being distributed equally, thus the responsibility for the environment will come as a common responsibility. Besides emphasizing the role of state, this perspective also emphasize the importance of considering the environment as a significant element in decision-making process. They also seek to maintain a close relationship between the environmental injustice research and the social movements. In this way, they will understand a more nuanced portrait of the form and process of environmental injustice (Sze and London, 2008 :1343).

4.2.3 Problem-framing

Environmental organization that applies environmental justice perspective in Indonesia is WALHI-FOEI. WALHI-FOEI is the biggest grassroots environmental organisation in Indonesia, which has been campaigning against the expansion of palm oil plantation. As an organisation based more on the interest of people being victims of environmental problem, WALHI-FOEI is using environmental justice approach. For them, the problem is not environmental per se, but how the livelihood and rights of local dwellers is being disturbed by environmental problem. Not only present generation, justice future generation is also their concern because the earth is only one for all.

It is our task to push for issues of social justice within their more purely environmental agenda.” (FoEI Secretariat summary document for NOVIB, 2003).

As compared to other environmental organizations, WALHI-FOEI is most sensitive about national histories and context. Based on Howell and Pearce type of civil society, WALHI-FOEI could be included in the third framework, the alternative framework, even though it does not have to be confrontational with the government. The reason is WALHI-FOEI sees

environmental problem from a bigger, more structural perspective of development failure. They see the connection of environmental problems in the global South with the consumption patterns and lifestyle in the global North, as well as colonial legacies.

“Some Southern groups stressed the centuries of looting of their national resources by colonial powers, and now by corporations, whether national or transnational, and aligned their struggles with those of indigenous peoples against a global model of development.” (Doherty, 2006: 869).

They also have a clear standpoint about resisting neoliberal globalisation in order to achieve environmental justice. Their statement is clear as follows:

FOEI challenges the current export-oriented neoliberal economic development model as it is fundamentally flawed. (FoEI Secretariat summary document for NOVIB, 2003)

To have justice in the distribution of the fruit of development is an essential task for WALHI-FOEI. They do not see environmental problem as environmental *per se*, but it is related to the social injustice and structural cause. They see the problem of palm oil plantation lies in the unfair development programme. The development of palm oil plantation is not based on a participatory approach from the grassroots who live and feel the effect of palm oil plantation in their daily life.

Development intervention is based on the needs of the market instead of the needs of local population. (Deddy Ratih, WALHI-FOEI forest campaigner).

Using the perspective of environmental justice, they see the problem lies not only at national level (Indonesia as the producing countries). Further than that, they also see the problem lies in the consumption rate of palm oil products, because palm oil is a cash crop, meaning a crop dedicated for export purpose. That means they see the problems related to the overconsumption of palm oil in the Northern countries and new emerging countries such as India and China. Solution of the problem should be simultaneously addressed in production mechanism as well as the overconsumption rate. WALHI-FOEI summarized the problem of palm oil plantation as follows:

oil palm plantations in Indonesia continue to be established in violation of indigenous communities’ rights – in particular the rights to participate, rights to culture, water and health, the right to work, and the right to be protected from ill-treatment and arbitrary arrest and the right to life. (Friends of the Earth et. al., 2008: 102)

4.2.4 Demands

WALHI-FOEI demand and target related to palm oil plantation issues is a better management of palm oil plantation. Based on their audit in grassroots level, there should be a punishment and reward mechanism for the practice of palm oil plantation management. There should be a clear division of land tenure, because the fact is an overlapping in the indicative map of palm oil plantation and forest. Until there is a better management that does not violate the rights the local dwellers, expansion of palm oil plantation has to stop.

WALHI-FOEI demands for moratorium of palm oil plantation since 1996. They want the production of palm oil plantation to be based on principles and criteria and strategic planning. The space management has to prioritize the needs of local population. The local population has to have the rights of production space, not only as a spectator of development. The environmental problem has to be seen as not environmental *an sich*, but more about the human rights to live and manage their landscape. They also combine environmental movement with the need to enforce agrarian reform because agrarian reform is the needs of the community. It shows the close connection between environmental and agrarian issue in Indonesia.

4.2.5 Actions

In the case of palm oil plantation, they have been campaigning against the expansion long before the global buzz around biofuel directive started. They based their campaign on the grassroots reality in the forest conversion area caused by the expansion of palm oil plantation. Their significant role is as a mediator of different organisation in the movements around palm oil issue. The way they tried to influence national policies is by directly lobbying the national government because historically they have better relationship with the national government.

WALHI-FOEI has a role in influencing public opinion. WALHI-FOEI emphasizes their role in creating public awareness by making annual reports and position paper. These studies are collected from each local movements as well as ad hoc academician community. These studies inform the condition of the environment at a particular year. It also predicts the condition next year if the problem was not solved. They communicate it to the media and mostly their prediction is true. This role is related to the first type of transnational movements' influence, which is issue creation and agenda setting.

With other TEAMS, WALHI-FOEI generally has good relationship, but they are selective in doing collaboration with other movement. They have to think whether they could collaborate or not, in terms of demand, ideology, strategy. They have a good position in Indonesia because they are the pioneer of environmental movements in Indonesia and historically have a good relationship with the government. They also have a strong basis in the grassroots. Sometimes they are involved in joint campaign, but sometimes they have different position. With SPI-LVC they always worked closely together, as well as with one other organization, The Anti-Debt Coalition. They claimed that these three organizations have the same line of thought, especially because the context in which grassroots environmental movements were closely related to the grassroots agrarian movements. With Greenpeace, they sometimes can have a similar position, for example in the case of APRIL and APP (Asia Pulp and Paper) – a timber and palm oil corporation that burn the forest – they support Greenpeace action to confront, do direct action and boycott APRIL and APP. With WWF, WALHI-FOEI often does not have similar position. For example, in the case of APRIL and APP, WWF are engaged to influence the corporation by consensual and not confrontational means.

4.2.6 Influence on National Policy

National policy is one main interest of WALHI-FOEI. After finding out the substantial problem of the environment, they will target the national policies related to it and discuss with related actors to make a change. In terms of national policies, WALHI-FOEI was involved in discussing the Law of Environmental Impact Assessment (LEIA) 2009. They did not blow it up to the media because they think the dialogue process will be more effective without media exposure. The process started from WALHI-FOEI workshops and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with the grassroots. They discuss since 2008-2009 about the conception of LEIA 2009. Then, they brought it to the Ministry of Environment as well as lobbied different fraction in the parliament. Finally, after the rather secretive discussion and limited FGD, a draft was done.

Apparently there were a lot of restraints in the political process. WALHI-FOEI is not a political party, thus in the political discussion inside the parliament, the final Law was different than the draft discussed with WALHI-FOEI (source: interview with Deddy Ratih, WALHI-FOEI forest campaigner). This research will not discuss thoroughly about the content of the LEIA 2009. It only intends to show how WALHI-FOEI was involved in influencing national policies. It shows that even though the movement was involved in the preliminary discussion, at the end the movement lacks decision-making power.

For further development of the organization, WALHI-FOEI aspires to increase its frequency in having a direct dialogue with corporations, to share their opinion and views. This shows the growing importance of engaging with corporations. Learning from their experience of influencing the LEIA 2009, for them it is not taboo to think politically about the environment. It is also not taboo to form a green political party. For the time being, it is not taboo for them to send their aspiration through the existing political parties, to have a dialogue with them. Some of the alumnae of WALHI-FOEI also already officially joined political parties. This is not a problem as long as while they are formally worked in the WALHI-FOEI they are not officially involved in any political party. This regulation is to avoid the movement being occupied by political parties and interests.

4.3 Food Sovereignty (SPI-LVC)

4.3.1 Background of the Organisation

The emergence of SPI-LVC could be traced back to the aspiration of landless and small peasants in Indonesia to enact the Agrarian Reform Law 1960. The master frame of their perspective is Food Sovereignty (Desmarais 2002). Organization-wise, LVC is a plural coalition that is ideologically autonomous (Borras 2010). In addressing environmental problem, they clearly stated that the problem is not environmental *per se*. For instead, the solution that they said is to reduce energy consumption and change the international trade.

4.3.2 Approach

According to LVC, Food Sovereignty is the global alternatives for the neoliberal capitalist system and the multidimensional crisis. The concepts is a

counter of the “Food Security” concept, which only try to solve insufficient food problem by providing food for the people in need without further addressing the problem why food insecurity happened in the first place. In order to enforce Food Sovereignty, SPI-LVC has seven principles of food sovereignty include: Food as A Basic Human right, Agrarian Reform, Protecting Natural Resources including biodiversity, Reorganizing Food Trade, Ending the Globalization of Hunger, Social Peace, and Democratic control. In this approach, the problem caused by the expansion of palm oil plantation is poverty, criminalization of peasants, and agrarian conflict (Yakub, 2011).

4.3.3 Problem-framing

SPI-LVC denounces the expansion of palm oil plantation. It is not only destroying a huge area of forest, but also the benefit palm oil plantation is not for the small farmers. Moreover, it appropriates small farmers’ land. The benefit is for big agribusiness. Thus SPI-LVC asked the development of palm oil plantation to be directed towards the needs of small farmers, not large scale agribusiness (La Via Campesina 2009).

Until now, small farmers only get the disadvantages of palm oil plantation. Small farmers really feel the destruction of environment by palm oil plantation has impact on their livelihood. The destruction of forest caused increasing rate of flood and destroyed irrigation system. Paddy field turned into palm oil plantation, hence rats does not have a place and run to the existing paddy field. Small farmers get difficulties to fulfil their food needs. (Henry Saragih, General Coordinator SPI-LVC).

For SPI-LVC, palm oil plantation is a proof of 100 years of continuing colonialism in Indonesia. It is not merely a recent environmental problem triggered by the biofuel directive in Europe. The problem is the structure of palm oil plantation production, which is identical with the colonial structure of plantation. The difference is only the owner of palm oil plantation. During colonial times the owner was Dutch who enslaved Indonesian labour, now the owner is multinational agroindustrial corporation, still employing labour with not much choice of livelihood opportunity, thus not much different that slave labour. The practice is called *Buruh Harian Lepas* (BHL) as a new form of *Kuli Kontrak*. This practice means there are no job security and certainty nor social security. The labor is being contracted for only one day and gets paid for that day, depends on how much they produce. The implication is they cannot plan for their life or getting a basic secure livelihood. Anytime, they can be unemployed. Small holders are also in a disadvantaged position. They become the supplier of palm oil fresh bunch with no rights whatsoever to determine the price of product, thus involved in coerced terms of trade.

This current situation of unfair working condition is seen as a resemblance of colonial strategy. During colonial times, the climax of cashcrop growth during colonial times took place during Van den Bosch government in the 1830s because he implemented *Cultuurstelsel* to the colony. *Cultuurstelsel* obliged individual village to grow cashcrops, thus coerced farmers to allocate more time and energy as a forced labour to produce cashcrops instead of foodcrops. In the eyes of colonial government, Indonesia had “abundant reserves of unutilised land suitable for the cultivation of crops, if only the necessary labour

could be mobilised” (Booth, 1988: 202). Apparently, the reason for imposing *Cultuurstelsel* was native people, especially Javanese, were neglecting the cashcrop cultivation, because they were not interested to be involved in capital economy nor motivated by possible profit of cashcrop. They preferred to stay steady in subsistence culture to secure their daily needs (Booth, 1988: 201). By implementing *Cultuurstelsel*, Dutch government was able to “at least in the short run, in breaking the labour bottleneck” (Booth, 1988: 202), to capture the risk-averse European capital to invest in the colony, and to cover the “desperately needed profit” from the colony.

The colonial aroma of palm oil plantation is still parallel with the condition today, because palm oil is still a cash crop or crop dedicated for export purpose. Since its inception in Indonesia, together with rubber, copra, coffee, tea, pepper and other spices, Booth (1988) categorized palm oil as “cashcrop”, as opposed to foodcrops such as rice, which is more associated with domestic demand and subsistence need. The consequence of planting cashcrop was not much different than the situation today: depending upon foreign market demand created vulnerability of commodity price fluctuation. Thus, the growth rate of cashcrop and the government intervention upon it were to a large extent responsive to the situation of global market.

SPI-LVC did not see palm oil itself as inherently problematic, but the problem lies in the agroindustrial capitalism managing the plantation system of production, which is influenced by the colonial trajectories in the past. With the agroindustrial scheme, palm oil plantation will never fulfil its promise to provide sufficient job for those being dispossessed from their land. It will never solve the problems of poverty; even it will make it worse and deepens inequality between people. It also poses serious threat to food sovereignty and the environment.

They also see a bigger ideological problem related to the way government and corporations marginalize peasants. The problem is neoliberal ideology that serves the interest of global economic investors rather than peasants. This ideology prefers economic profit rather than protection of basic human rights, social security and justice. One relevant example here is the critical analysis from LVC-SPI that sees expansion of palm oil plantation under agroindustrial scheme will never solve the problem of domestic food demand, because whenever the international price of crude palm oil raises, the plantation will increase the export of palm oil, resulting in domestic scarcity and increasing price for the local consumer. This means that the benefit of cash crop production, in this case palm oil plantation, is not being felt by the local dwellers and the national economy. This perspective is in close affinity with the perspective exercised by WALHI-FOEI mentioned above.

The dramatic amount of surplus from cashcrop, which was acquired from the hard work of labour, were not at all allocated for the enjoyment of labour themselves, not even for the benefit of Indonesian development. As noted by Booth,

in Indonesia much of the benefit of cashcrop agricultural development was either remitted to the Netherlands or devoted to private and government consumption within the colony. At least until the 1930s, little industrial

development took place beyond the processing of agricultural exports, and the colony remained economically underdeveloped right up to 1942. (1988: 239).

4.3.4 Demands

SPI-LVC is demanding food sovereignty, recognition of Farmers Rights, as well as formal law. For the law they are attempting to pass the food security and sovereignty bill, protection and empowerment of farmers bill, solution to agrarian conflict bill and the implementation of agrarian reform law. They also demand the establishment of a special ministry of food. On the bigger picture, they reject the agroindustry of food and free trade agreement because these destroy the livelihood of small farmers, for example, they want World Trade Organization (WTO) to not be involved in agriculture product because agriculture product is special. It is a basic human needs and rights.

Other demands embedded in their struggle is to establish small holder farms to be the foundation of Indonesian economy, not food estate; to create national industry to process farmers product, to implement a logistic body and give social security for the people especially food for poor people, pregnant women, widow, and small children. Basically they ask for the government to take political position in favour of the rights of small farmers, not the large-scale (transnational) agroindustry. This is supported by Martinez-Alier (2011) which argues that small-scale agriculture is more productive than large-estate plantation.

4.3.5 Actions

SPI-LVC target is to involve the people especially small farmers to fight for peasant rights and empower themselves, as well as targeting the official pathway to produce laws related to their interest. They often do long march and express their demand to the officials. They also ask for judicial review of several laws that disadvantages peasant and food sovereignty. For the victim of agrarian conflict, they visit the Human Rights Commission in Indonesia and report all actions from military or government that violates the human rights of peasants. In terms of organization, they succeeded in maintaining and establishing the branches throughout Indonesia for further coordination. On direct action, they did education of organic farming as well as practice, reclaiming land and planting agriculture crops in that land. They also give assistance in direct selling market of agriculture products for the betterment of peasants' livelihood.

In their struggle they show that the biggest threat for their organization and for the peasants is the WTO, WB, IMF and transnational corporation. Those threats are able to use bigger power and supporting facilities while the peasants are not. (source: interview with Henry Saragih, General Coordinator of SPI-LVC). To counter, the peasants power lies in the strategic use and understanding of national law and constitution, which has the aim to protect its national citizens including peasants.

They put emphasize on the national sentiments of struggle, but the transnational level of struggle are also playing an important role, especially in getting information about agrarian issues and support for Peasants rights and

Agrarian Reform. By getting information from abroad and learning from others country experience, they could immediately respond to different agrarian issues, which are being proposed to Indonesia such as biogenetic, and the danger of privatization.

For the future of the organization, their strategies are to strengthen the organization and alliance of peasants, to improve the education and enlarge the membership of the organization. For the short target they are going to fight for the land conflict cases faced by the peasants and provide the peasant needs such as seeds and cooperatives.

4.3.6 Influence on National Policies

SPI-LVC rejoice their success in the judicial review process on the cancellation of articles in the Law of Foreign Investment, number 25/2007 and Law of Plantation number 18/2004 that give land tenure security to plantation corporation for 95 years without clear boundaries. This exactly resembles the 1870 colonial law known as *onderneeming ordonatie* and *agrarijst wet*, which give 75 years of secure land tenure. The implication of these laws is peasant being dispossessed from their land and being criminalized when they try to fight to get their land back. They succeeded in reducing the maximum tenure in the Law of Foreign Investment from 95 years into 35 years only. They see that this success is related to the fact that agrarian problems are real problems and the excesses of this problem are felt by all society. They need to denounce the agribusiness model into small-scale farming.

One important factor that needs to be included in the element for success of influencing national policies in the national constitution, and they ask for the contribution of lawyers and experts who could argue for them. SPI-LVC has the most success among other TEAMS in changing national policies because they often do judicial review of articles in the Law that is, according to them, against the law. Their strong argument is the national constitution does not allow exploitation of the people and aims for social justice. SPI-LVC always puts their struggle in line with national struggles and interests.

The other success that they achieve in influencing national policies is their support in the peasants judicial review to get cancellation of one article in Plantation Law number 18/2004. This law stated that any activities that disturb the plantation company could be sentenced in jail. By cancelling this law, it is deemed illegal if the plantation company criminalized peasants who work on their land. SPI-LVC did not directly use the name of the organization in the judicial review. Four small peasants who are advocated by SawitWatch organization initiated the judicial review. SPI-LVC claimed that they are totally supporting this initiative.

4.4 Radical Environmentalism (Greenpeace)

4.4.1 Background of the Organisation

Greenpeace establish a branch in Indonesia in 2006, under South East Asia regional office. The concept of mindbombs, which will be discussed later, was translated into different forms in this campaign, namely news, reports, photos,

and videos, backboneed by the research and direct action on the ground to fulfil the bearing witness principle.

In 2005-2010 they are in the Forest Campaign with Greenpeace international. They asked for an independent network on the forest issues, consisting of Brazil, Indonesia and Congo. They become more independent and getting less intervention from the international office. They can take their own decision. The campaign was more effective. After evaluation, they realized that without effective involvement of local or national Greenpeace, who knows the problem and have closer proximity with the location of the forest, the campaign is not knowledgeable enough. The national and regional Greenpeace also complained that the coordination and intervention from the international body is too much limiting their activities as if they lack control and having command only from the international organization.

Every year they have evaluation of the organizations work and they also plan for the next year agenda. Coordination is happening in the global scale and yearly planning was conducted. After having an office in Indonesia they got more coordination and capacity. The management of human resources is more effective.

4.4.2 Approach

In the context of Indonesia, Greenpeace has to adapt that Indonesia is a “developing countries” (source: interview with Greenpeace forest campaigner). They have to adapt the right communication strategy. They have to ask demand but also provide solution. For them the opposition from Indonesian national government is normal as a phase in every country. They are more open in their position as opposition to government or whomever doing destruction to the environment. They are not against national industries or national economic development as accused by the respective government of each country. The reasons are twofold. They are involved in a global campaign where the demand is same with in the international office in Netherlands. The second one is about national industries that are doing black campaign or trade war because the change in international market. Greenpeace emphasize that they are not against the national industry of palm oil plantation.

4.4.3 Problem-framing

Greenpeace campaign towards palm oil plantation issue in Indonesia was targeted to reduce the GHG emission. They frame their problem in the context of global climate change (Greenpeace 2007). Greenpeace was mostly concerned about changing the activities of the companies involved. Glover and Newell relate this to the civil regulation framework.

4.4.4 Demands

Their demand is moratorium of deforestation. This is the same demand with WALHI since 1990s, so they make it having a continuation and a longer life. The first corporation to agree with moratorium is Unilever. The company agrees to save the lasting forest. They also ask for saving the peat lands in Riau in 2007. International pressure was also induced.

In the case of palm oil plantation, Greenpeace is continuing the agenda of WALHI. Since 1990s, Walhi already demand for moratorium of deforestation. But Greenpeace makes it an official government regulation in a quicker process. They use what Rucht (2009) said as an orchestrated strategy of the transnational movements to influence national policies. The first strategy is direct action without violence. Direct action implies direct communication with stakeholders of in charge of palm oil plantation problems, such as government and corporations. The second one is directly lobbying the national government. They do a meeting with the forest department and industry to find solution for the deforestation problem. They also invited to the meeting with the parliament. They also meet the industry and ask in conference to present question and answers and check in the field.

4.4.5 Actions

The way they do the pressure is more systematic and all encompassing in different levels. The first is the pressure Norwegian government who has a clear commitment to save the existing forest. They give one billion dollar as a fund to save the forest. They give the fund because it is transparent. They lobby of funding donor country to pressure Indonesian government. They also give example of Brazil who already implements the grant in 2009. They accommodate the governments' commitment because during election in 2009 the president already commits to reduce the emission with help from other countries. To get the grant, there are two preconditions that need to be fulfilled during two years of moratorium. The first precondition is in two years they succeeded in stopping deforestation and not using it for industrial or commercial purpose. The second one is that they have to respect the rights of indigenous people.

As chronicled by the Economist, 21 April 2008, Greenpeace activists climb Unilever headquarters in London, dressed as orang utan. They asked liability of palm oil to the company. The singled out Dove brand and attributed shame to the brand. The credibility attack to world-known brands was seen as successful. The Economist sees it as being effective, because the company decided to get its palm oil from "sustainable" sources by 2015. Other worldwide known brand was also being targeted, for example KitKat, BurgerKing, Kraft, even HSBC, a bank who gives credit to the palm oil companies involved in deforestation. KitKat chocolate,

has been attacked in a spoof online advertisement that shows an office worker eating a finger of KitKat. The chocolate digit turns out to belong to an orang-utan, with bloody consequences (The Economist 2010, as seen in <http://www.oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/?p=2872>).

Greenpeace take some time before they release an advertisement putting shame to those major brands, usually two years, but the company didn't respond before they feel the affected by this strategy. The building of Nestle HQ in Croydon, London, was also occupied by Greenpeace activist dressed as orang-utans. Even, the most shocking act was during Nestle's Annual General Meeting (15 April 2010). Outside, thirty activists in orang-utan costum greeted the participant. Inside the meeting, Greenpeace activists dropped from the ceiling and put two large banners directly over the heads of shareholders. The

result was these companies change their buying policies and pay more attention to distant reach of supply chains. Nestle, KitKat's company, finally have to suspend all purchase of palm oil from a company that alleged as violating the law, because the orang-utan finger ads were viewed 2 million times and get more than 200,000 e-mails of protests (Greenpeace 2010).

4.4.6 Influence on National Policies

The recipe for success of Greenpeace is they are consistent in bringing out the voice of global public in the concern of environment. The second is because they have international support. The third is because they can induce international pressure. In 2007 they talked about their aspiration through public action and lobbying the corporation and government.

They also use the timing of presidential election. The new government candidates are campaigning for the environment. They ask and get a huge success to have an environmental vision especially the mission to save ancient forest. They give petition to the elected president to do implement moratorium at the end of 2007 there are more than 70,000 petition. They have a track record of campaign, so they can ask the elected president to go back and remind of their commitment to environment. In 2009 they establish Climate Defenders Camp in Riau. Their demand is to stop deforestation and destruction of peat lands. In 2010 they got a commitment. They made coalition with different NGO to have a together platform and give inputs to the government. Finally in May 2010 they come to an agreement in a Letter of Intent with Norway to have a moratorium for 2 years starting in 2011. This Letter of Intent was only being signed in 2011. To be effective, the LoI is enacted as Inpres no 10/2011. This formal regulation is coming out for primary forest and the ones that haven't got a new concession.

The main reason for their success in giving pressure to the government is based on the media communication. They also cooperate with local organization. For them WWF initiative of RSPO is voluntary, unregulated, it is just excuse for the corporations.

About the certification, there is no certification that can stop the destruction of the forest so it is not our choice, for us it is only an excuse for the companies to continue exploiting the forest. (Joko Arif, Greenpeace forest campainer, October 2011).

For their future aspiration they want to have direct impact to the society to give some solution and to get a different behaviour from the companies that destroys the environment.

We do not want to negotiate with companies who destroy forest. That will be the same with the colonial times. The colonizer negotiates with us while behind us; they are still doing harm to us. That trick would not fool us, it would not work that way. (Joko Arif, Greenpeace forest campaigner, October 2011).

4.5 Market-based approach (WWF)

4.5.1 *Background of the Organisation*

WWF is an international organization focused on nature conservation. It was established in 1961. WWF was founded by a group of British conservationist to gain donor funding through secret fundraising campaigns and media coverage (Bonner 1993). Contrast with WALHI-FOEI, SPI-LVC, and Greenpeace, WWF accept funding from UN, World Bank, USAID, etc. WWF is considered to be the best-funded international conservation organization in the world (Neumann, 2005). Similar with Greenpeace, WWF use top-down mechanism in their coordination.

Related to the sustainable palm oil production, one of WWF mission is:

ensuring that the use of renewable natural resources is sustainable. (source: http://wwf.panda.org/wwf_quick_facts.cfm)

4.5.2 *Approach*

“The market requires regulation but in a way that does not rely wholly on the state. Partnerships and dialogue among civil society, business, and government provide a new means of regulation that simultaneously injects a degree of morality into the working of capitalism.” (Pearce and Howell, 2001: 8)

Market-based approach basically implemented in the certification process of palm oil products. This trend emerged as a part of ethical consumerism (Ketola 2009). The difference with previous ethical consumerism is the target actors. Palm oil is a very versatile product. Its derivative is largely use in many food, pharmaceutical and cosmetic product available in the supermarket. Hence, it would be difficult for individual costumers to differentiate and practice ethical buying of palm oil derivatives. This condition leads to the change of target actors of ethical consuming. The target is not individual consumer but the large-scale transnational corporations. In this way, movements gain greater exposure to the media and hopefully greater effect on promoting sustainable practice of palm oil production. The ethical consuming would be facilitated through eco-labeling as known as certification.

The idea of 'eco-labeling' goods began in Germany in 1977 Eco-Labeling now ranges from forest products (which can be certified as free from destruction of tropical hardwoods) to organic food. (Dryzek, 2005: 132).

4.5.3 *Demands*

Future revenues from the industry can be maintained and even increased, by concentrating on increasing productivity, particularly amongst small holders, expanding plantations on idle lands and developing downstream processing industries to add value without increasing pressure to convert natural forests. (WWF, 2011: 43)

In line with the first and second role of civil society actors with the state and private actors within the frame of development, WWF chose to play a

strategic role as an environmental organization that enforce responsible capitalism. In this way, WWF understood the need of Indonesian national economy to further develop palm oil production.

In case of palm oil plantation in Indonesia, WWF is the organisation that does not oppose the expansion of palm oil plantation. They want to regulate it into sustainable practice of plantation. That is why they are different than other organisation campaigning around palm oil plantation issue. Other organisation, which has been mentioned above, also acknowledged that they have different position with WWF regarding palm oil. Together with other stakeholders such as corporation and government, WWF is a member of Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO), a forum that gives principles and criteria for certification on sustainable way of producing palm oil. The certification process does not ended up formulated as a formal law but the certification process is being adapted to regulate palm oil plantation. This is consistent with the definition of responsible production

Responsible production refers to those situations where the lead actors of supply chains make a deliberate effort to include, throughout their supply chain, labour and environmental standards that go beyond the existing minimum legal requirements (Knorringa, 2009: 81).

4.5.4 Actions

This organisation is collaborative to the intention of government and corporation to expand palm oil plantation as long as the production process fulfil the principles and criteria of sustainable palm oil. Regarding environmental issue, they use market-based approach to solve the problem, which is giving incentive and consequence for different practice of plantation. It has no problem in continuing development process as long as it can be regulated in terms of its risk and benefit to perform a sustainable practice. On the other hand, it also promoted the better way to produce palm oil by applying Sustainable Principles and Criteria from the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO). Based on those principles and criteria, RSPO labelled palm oil producers as sustainable or not. The production of palm oil plantation can be moderated but not stopped, thus not harming the income for national economy, the employment generating effort and the transnational corporation activities.

This scheme seems to be a win-win solution for all parties. But one of the problems that arise is the power relations between stakeholders. By design, certification scheme is biased towards large agribusinesses, because the cost to gain certification is beyond the reach of smallholder farmers. There is an asymmetric participation in the decision-making of this multi stakeholder organization, because not all voice is included inside. The danger is WWF and SawitWatch as environmental organization joined inside this multi-stakeholder initiatives. This makes the questionable initiatives and procedure gained legitimacy because they can claim that they already have representatives of the civil society organizations. Meanwhile, the other voice from other TEAMs could be dismissed as irrelevant. This means making a lot of difference between TEAMs could go against their own purpose.

Managerial and technical fix such as proposed by WWF was having good intention but vague result. It is good to put together different stakeholders and sit together in the representation of state, corporations and civil society. The problem is in the representativeness of each stakeholder. It is discriminatory because it does not reflect different approach and perspective of environmental problem. Different approach and movement are rejecting it, This shows that there is something wrong in this mechanism. However, this mechanism is the one with most ready and short-term solution without neglecting the aspiration of state to develop. It takes development process as taken for granted without further questioning what is development and for who? But this is also showing the challenge toward critical TEAMS to make a more visible and clearer alternative agenda to correct the current situation as they perceive it. Even it will be a short termed solution perpetuating the deeper structural cause of the problem. The question of development demerits should create rethinking and reflection about current development goals and trajectories.

4.5.5 Influence on National Policies

WWF role could be best described under the “socially responsible capitalism” framework (Howell and Pearce, 2001). They seek to collaborate with the state and private actor in a certification mechanism. RSPO is a multi-stakeholder initiative in the process of giving certification. This initiative is voluntary, but other TEAMS such as WALHI-FOEI, SPI-LVC, and Greenpeace are opposing this initiative. They are not involved in this initiative. Henry Saragih, the General Coordinator of SPI-LVC said it is just a trick by the private corporation to continue their business without changing their bad practice (interview, October 2011). Greenpeace went further. They showed through direct action on the ground to give evidence of the destruction done by companies with certification. This means, the certification is just a paper and not fully implemented in the reality.

Table 1
Summary of Findings and Analysis

TEAMS	Palm Oil Problem	Issues They Raised	Demand	Action
WALHI-FOEI	Overconsumption of Palm Oil for food and energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >Local livelihood disturbed by palm oil plantation >Pollution, flood >Violation of peasants rights (land appropriation) >Injustice development 	Stop expansion of palm oil plantation	Lobby, training/ education for local dwellers, focus group discussion, Research
SPI-LVC	Agribusiness Estate Plantation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >Benefit of palm oil not for small farmers >Labour treated like slave >Violation of Peasant Rights >Coercion to plant cash-crop instead of food crop 	Small-scale peasant, not agribusiness palm oil planting	Workshop , lobby, mass mobilisation, judicial review
Greenpeace	Forest and peat lands destruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >GHG emission >Biodiversity threaten by monoculture >Pollution and health problem >Violation of the rights of indigenous people 	Stop deforestation	Direct action, lobby, International pressure, civil regulation
WWF	Unsustainable planting system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >Sustainable Palm Oil >Social Responsibility 	Certification of Sustainable Palm Oil	RSPO

Source: own research

Chapter 5

Conclusion

This research seeks to find out whether, to what extent and how do TEAMS influence national policies relevant to the transformation of palm oil plantation in Indonesia. The sub-questions are which groups are key civil society organisations in palm oil issue and how do they perceive the issue, and in what ways do they try to influence national policies?

Based on the research upon four key TEAMS, namely WALHI-FOEI, SPI-LVC, Greenpeace, and WWF, the TEAMS to some extent do influence national policies relevant to the transformation of palm oil plantation in Indonesia. For example, Greenpeace was successful to pressure the government to enact Inpres 10/2011, which regulates moratorium of deforestation for two years with agreement to the Norway government. On the other hand, SPI-LVC is successful in the judicial review of an article in the Investment Law 2007. They succeeded in cancelling the tenure of foreign land investment from maximum 95 years to maximum 35 years only. Their success will change the regulation of foreign investment on palm oil plantation. Meanwhile, WWF did not force a formal regulation, but it joined RSPO initiative to give voluntary certification for palm oil producers. The certification will show that the company is producing palm oil in a sustainable way.

Relevant to the theories of transnational movements by Keck and Sikkink (1998), the research shows that information is a core element of the TEAMS. Information shapes the values demanded by TEAMS. Different TEAMS has different approach and this reflects to different demands in the national regulation. In the case of palm oil plantation in Indonesia, TEAMS have succeeded to some extent in four sequence of influences (Keck and Sikkink, 1998), namely issue creation and agenda setting, influencing the discursive position of the state and international organization, influence on institutional procedures, and change in policy. Meanwhile, the fifth sequence of influence, which is to change the behaviour of targeted actors, TEAMS influence is limited, with some exception. Mostly, when the government behaviour is concerned, TEAMS influence is limited. But, if the targeted actors are private companies, TEAMS such as Greenpeace has a strong influence in changing the behaviour or decision and practice of companies such as Nestle, Unilever, Burger King, etc.

TEAMS influence in issue creation and agenda setting is shown in the socialization of the bad effect of palm oil plantation. TEAMS influence on the discursive position of the state and international organization can be shown from the position of Norway government who are willing to fund the LoI to stop deforestation in Indonesia. This is part of Greenpeace success to pressure the government of Norway, and as a result the government of Norway influence the decision of Indonesian government. The influence in institutional procedure can be seen in WWF initiative to collaborate in the RSPO. This new

institution is creating labels through certification in order to distinguish the sustainable practice of palm oil plantation and the unsustainable one. The fourth influence, which is change in policy, can be seen in the work done by SPI-LVC. They succeeded in changing two relevant policies related to palm oil plantation. This process is done through judicial reviews, especially because they have a strong support from academicians and lawyers who understand the national constitution.

The strategies used by TEAMS to influence national policies are combination of four “orchestrated strategy” (Rucht 2009) and “civil regulation” (Glover and Newell 2004). TEAMS have done the first strategy, direct pressure to national government, through direct action or demonstration and mass mobilization. As compared to other organization, Greenpeace and SPI-LVC are especially strong in this strategy. The second strategy, strengthening domestic pressure, could be seen from SPI-LVC action to bring national academicians who have deep understanding of the national constitution; hence they could pressure the government to make regulation strictly in line with the constitution. The third strategy, influencing other countries or multiple countries to bring pressure or make an agreement with the targeted national government, can be seen especially in the case of Greenpeace. They pressure Norwegian government who then agreed to sign LoI with Indonesian government, with one single purpose to stop deforestation. Meanwhile, all TEAMS do the fourth strategy, creating public awareness.

Last but not least, civil regulation (Glover and Newell 2004) plays an increasingly important role in the strategy of TEAMS nowadays. Civil regulation is “actions taken by civil society actors that have the intention or effect of restraining, regulating, or resisting the actions of private actors that are thought to be beyond state control,” (2004: 220). TEAMS do this action to private actors in different ways. WALHI-FOEI does this through contacting the transnational network and asks them to pressure their respective government to regulate the investment of their private actors. SPI-FOEI do civil regulation through strengthening the grassroots action against private actors. Greenpeace does civil regulation through direct action and confrontation, which then made visible to the public through media coverage. While WWF do civil regulation by collaborating with the private actor in an initiative to certify sustainable practice of palm oil plantation.

This research found that to some extent TEAMS has influence over national regulation. Their different perception resulted in different demand, and they use different strategy to achieve it. TEAMS struggle to some extent has transform, shape and reshape the practice of palm oil plantation. In conclusion, government needs to incorporate different inputs from each TEAMS to improve regulations related to environmental problems. Future research could include studies about how TEAMS could improve its influence to government regulation and private actors, especially on changing the behaviour of targeted actors.

References

- Barlow, C., Z. Zen and R. Gondowarsito (2003) 'The Indonesian Oil Palm Industry', *Oil Palm Industry Economic Journal* 3(1): 8-15.
- Basiron, Y. (2002) 'Palm-Oil and its Global Supply and Demand Prospects', *Oil-palm Industry Economic Journal* 2(1): 1-10.
- Betsill, M.M. and E. Corell (2001) 'NGO Influence in International Environmental Negotiations: A Framework for Analysis', *Global Environmental Politics* 1(4): 65-85.
- Bonner, R. (1993) *At the Hand of Man: Peril and Hope for Africa's Wildlife*. New York: Vintage.
- Booth, A. (1988) *Agricultural Development in Indonesia*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin Australia.
- Borras, S. (2010) 'The Politics of Transnational Agrarian Movements', *DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE* 41(5): 771-803.
- Casson, A. (1999) 'The Hesitant Boom: Indonesia's Oil Palm Sub-Sector in an Era of Economic Crisis and Political Change'. Accessed 8 January 2011 <www.cifor.cgiar.org/publications/pdf_files/CASSON.pdf>
- Colbran, N. and A. Eide (2008) 'Biofuel, the Environment, and Food Security: A Global Problem Explored through a Case Study of Indonesia', *Sustainable Dev.L.& Pol'y* 9: 4.
- Desmarais, A. (2002) 'PEASANTS SPEAK - the Vía Campesina: Consolidating an International Peasant and Farm Movement', *Journal of Peasant Studies* 29(2): 91-124.
- Doherty, B. (2006) 'Friends of the Earth International: Negotiating a Transnational Identity', *ENVIRONMENTAL POLITICS* 15(5): 860-880.
- Dryzek, J.S. (2005) 'Leave it to the Market: Economic Rationalism', *The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses*, pp. 121-142. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eldridge, P.J. (1995) *Non-Government Organizations and Democratic Participation in Indonesia*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, P., 2005. *Counter-Hegemonic Globalization: Transnational Social Movements in the Contemporary Global Political Economy*.
- Fitzherbert, E.B., M.J. Struebig, A. Morel, F. Danielsen, C.A. Brühl, P.F. Donald et al. (2008) 'How Will Oil Palm Expansion Affect Biodiversity?', *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 23(10): 538-545.
- Friends of the Earth, LifeMosaic and Sawit Watch (2008) 'Losing Ground: The Human Rights Impacts of Oil Palm Plantation Expansion in Indonesia'. Accessed 12 July 2011. <<http://www.wrm.org.uy/countries/Indonesia/losingground.pdf>>
- Friends of the Earth International (FoEI) (2003) *Guide to Working in Open Space*, unpublished document.
- Ford, L.H. (2003) 'Challenging Global Environmental Governance: Social Movement Agency and Global Civil Society', *Global Environmental Politics* 3(2): 120-134.
- Gaventa, J. and R. Tandon (2010) *Globalizing Citizens : New Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion* London: Zed Books.
- Germer, J. and J. Sauerborn (2008) 'Estimation of the Impact of Oil Palm Plantation Establishment on Greenhouse Gas Balance', *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 10(6): 697-716.

- Glover, D. and P. Newell (2004) 'Business and Biotechnology: Regulation of GM Crops and the Politics of Influence', in Jansen, K. and S. Vellema (ed.) *Agribusiness and Society*, pp. 200-231. London: Zed Books.
- Greenpeace (2010) Caught Red Handed: How Nestle's use of Palm Oil is having a Devastating Impact on Rainforest, the Climate and Orang-Utans.
- Greenpeace (2007) 'How the Palm Oil Industry is Cooking the Climate'. Netherlands: Greenpeace International.
- Howell, J. and J. Pearce (2001) *Civil Society and Development: A Critical Exploration*. USA: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Huizer, G. 1972. *Peasant Mobilisation and Land Reform in Indonesia*. Working Paper edn. The Hague: ISS.
- Jamieson, Dale (2007) "Justice: The Heart of Environmentalism", *Environmental Justice and Environmentalism*, pp. 85-98.
- Khagram, S. J. V. Riker and K. Sikkink (2008) 'From Santiago to Seattle: Transnational Advocacy Groups Restructuring World Politics', in Vincenzo Ruggiero and Nicola Montagna (ed.) *Social Movements: A Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- KAY, C., S.M. BORRAS JR and M. EDELMAN (2008) 'Transnational Agrarian Movements: Origins and Politics, Campaigns and Impact', *Journal of Agrarian Change* 8(2-3): 169-204.
- Ketola, T. (2009) 'Corporate Responsibility for Individual, Cultural, and Biodiversity', *Management of environmental quality* 20(3): 239.
- Knorringa, P. (2009) Reach and Depth of Responsible Production In: A. Posthuma and D. Nathan (eds.) – *Labour in Global Production networks in India*. New Delhi and London: Oxford University Press, Chapter 3, pp. 79-97.
- La Via Campesina (2009) *Industrial Agrofuels: Fuel Hunger and Poverty*. La Via Campesina.
- LEE PELUSO, N., S. AFIFF and N.F. RACHMAN (2008) 'Claiming the Grounds for Reform: Agrarian and Environmental Movements in Indonesia', *Journal of Agrarian Change* 8(2-3): 377-407.
- Lee, K.T. (2007) 'Palm Oil: Addressing Issues and Towards Sustainable Development', *Renewable & sustainable energy reviews* 13(2): 420-427.
- Li, T.M. (2010) 'To make Live Or Let Die? Rural Dispossession and the Protection of Surplus Populations', *Antipode* 41(s1): 66-93.
- Li, T. (2011) 'Centering Labor in the Land Grab Debate', *JOURNAL OF PEASANT STUDIES* 38(2): 281-298.
- Martinez-Alier, J. (2011) 'The EROI of Agriculture and its use by the Via Campesina', *JOURNAL OF PEASANT STUDIES* 38(1): 145-160.
- McCarthy, J.F. (2010) 'Processes of Inclusion and Adverse Incorporation: Oil Palm and Agrarian Change in Sumatra, Indonesia', *Journal of Peasant Studies* 37(4): 821-850.
- Neumann, R.P. (2005) *Making Political Ecology*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Okamoto, S. (2000) 'The Growth of Oil Palm Plantations and Forest Destruction in Indonesia', *A Step toward Forest Conservation Strategy* (2): Interim Report 1999-IGES Forest Conservation Project : 361-380.
- Pye, O. (2009) 'Palm Oil as a Transnational Crisis in South-East Asia', *ASEAS–Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies* 2(2): 81-101.
- Pye, O. (2010) 'The Biofuel Connection-Transnational Activism and the Palm Oil Boom', *JOURNAL OF PEASANT STUDIES* 37(4): 851-874.

- Rist, L., L. Feintrenie and P. Levang (2010) 'The Livelihood Impacts of Oil Palm: Smallholders in Indonesia', *Biodiversity and Conservation* 19(4): 1009-1024.
- Rucht, D. (2009) 'The Transnationalization of Social Movements: Trends, Causes, Problems', in Donatella della Porta, Hanspeter Kriesi and Dieter Rucht (ed.) *Social Movements in a Globalizing World*, pp. 206-222. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sandker, M., A. Suwarno and B.M. Campbell (2007) 'Will Forests Remain in the Face of Oil Palm Expansion? Simulating Change in Malinau, Indonesia', *Ecology and Society* 12(2): 37.
- Silvius, M. and H. Diemont (2007) 'Peatlands, Climate Change, Poverty, Biofuels, Pulp and Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation', *Institute for Environmental Studies* 66.
- Schlosberg, D. (2009) *Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Soyka, T., C. Palmer and S. Engel (2007) 'The impacts of tropical biofuel production on land-use: the case of Indonesia', *Tropentag 2007 Conference on International Agricultural Research and Development*, pp9–11.
- Sze, J. and Jonathan K. London (2008) 'Environmental Justice at the Crossroads' *Sociology Compass* Volume 2, Issue 4, 1331–1354
- The Other Oil Spill; the Campaign Against Palm Oil. (Palm Oil and Sustainability)', (2010) *The Economist (US)* 395(8688): 72.
- Tsing, A.L. (2005) *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- WWF Business Report (2011) 'Business Solutions: Delivering the Heart of Borneo Declaration: Focus on Forestry, Palm Oil and Mining', *Heart of Borneo*, No. HoB NI, pp. 43-62, WWF.
- Yakub, A. and E. K. Samon (2011) 100 TAHUN INDUSTRI DAN PERKEBUNAN SAWIT DI INDONESIA “Saatnya Memajukan Kepentingan Nasional Dan Kemakmuran Rakyat Tani”. (Policy Paper edn). Jakarta: SPI.
- Zen, Z., C. Barlow and R. Gondowarsito (2005) *Oil Palm in Indonesian Socio-Economic Improvement: A Review of Options*. Australian National Univ., Div. of Economics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies.