

THE POLITICS OF THE COMMONS IN POST-NEW ORDER BALI

Gede Indra Pramana

Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Udayana
Kampus Udayana, Jl. PB Sudirman, Denpasar, Bali
E-mail: indraprama@unud.ac.id

ABSTRACT. This research describes the governance practices of the commons in Bali, including land, water sources, coastal areas, and forests, which are communally owned and managed. The relationship between the state and the community has led to changes in this governance. The author examines the practice of governing the commons in the context of post-New Order Bali, offering an alternative to dominant governance that often overlooks the common welfare. This is a qualitative study that utilizes a case study method to explore alternative governance of the commons in Bali. The study examines the governance of the commons in Tenganan Pegriingsingan and the Masyarakat Adat Dalem Tamblingan, and finds that community groups (Sekaa) are directly involved in the management of the commons. Furthermore, it appears that government intervention in village affairs has had detrimental impact.

Keywords: Governance; Commons; Customary Village; Bali

INTRODUCTION

This research endeavors to provide an in-depth exploration of the governance practices surrounding communally owned resources in Bali, including land, water sources, coastal areas, and forests. The longstanding tradition of subak, embodying water governance, has evolved over millennia and reflects the dynamic relationship between the state and the local community.

Drawing from studies on subak (Lansing 2006, 2007) and coastal management (Warren, 2005, 2007; Fagertun, 2017; Wardana, 2019), this research seeks to understand the adaptability of these ancient governance practices in the contemporary era. By focusing on Bali, the aim is to propose an alternative model for shared asset governance, rooted in local knowledge and practices, countering prevailing governance approaches that sometimes neglect the essence of shared prosperity.

The vision articulated by Governor I Wayan Koster in 2019 for Bali's development, titled "Nangun Sat Kerthi Loka Bali," emphasizes maintaining the purity and harmony of Balinese nature. It underscores the goal of realizing a prosperous and happy life for the local community while adhering to the Trisakti Principles of Bung Karno: political sovereignty, economic independence, and personality in culture.

Noteworthy in the context of resource governance is the transfer of land managed by the Bali provincial government. Land grants, issued not only to villages but also to various agencies, exemplify the complexity of resource allocation. The Bali Provincial Government's grant to Desa Adat Buleleng and the land provided for the Balinese Cultural Center's development by the Klungkung Regency Government showcase these intricate relationships.

Adding to the complexity is the regional regulation (Perda) on Customary Villages (Perda No. 4 of 2019) issued by the Bali Provincial Government. This regulation defines the authority of customary villages in Bali and outlines governance structures for village assets, referred to as Padruwen Desa Adat. It explicitly states that village assets cannot be owned by individuals and emphasizes non-transferable ownership arrangements. Decision-making authority rests with the Paruman Desa Adat or village meeting, underscoring the collective nature of Balinese society. Contrastingly, national law asserts that all resources are managed by the state for the greatest prosperity of the people. This sets the stage for a nuanced interplay between constitutional mandates and customary village regulations, potentially leading to competing claims over resource management by both the state and customary entities.

The governance challenge becomes palpable when considering the historical oversight by technocrats during the green revolution and the neglect of negative impacts in spatial planning by the government (Lansing 2007; Wardana 2019). The research recognizes the concrete implications of determining when community resource management operates independently and when the state's presence becomes essential.

Perspective on The Commons and Customary Village in Bali

There are several contending perspectives in understanding common pool resources. Building on the concept of commons from Garret Hardin to Eleanor Ostrom, this approach seeks to address the problem of common pool resources. Since its publication in 1968, Garrett Hardin's seminal work, "The Tragedy of the Commons," highlights the potential for resource degradation due to individual interests prioritizing personal gain over the common

good, using the example of open access to grasslands for livestock.

Ostrom (2015) challenges the idea of a tragedy of the commons and proposes a new institutional perspective. She introduces three key assumptions: the tragedy of the commons, the prisoner's dilemma, and the logic of collective action. Ostrom's approach views common-pool resources as systems where self-governance, rather than a single controlling authority, can be a solution.

A more critical perspective was developed by thinkers, inspired by Karl Marx., who developed formulations of the commons. David Harvey (2012) offers another perspective, emphasizing the social relations between actors and the aspects of resources being managed together, a concept he refers to as "commoning." Harvey criticizes Ostrom for not adequately addressing relations of production in the governance of the commons.

Massimo De Angelis (2017) expands on Harvey's perspective, conceptualizing the commons as involving a pool of natural and/or human resources, a community with reciprocal and sharing relations, and acts of working together towards community reproduction. Gigi Romero (2020) contributes additional perspectives on the commons, highlighting them as pure entities needing protection from capital appropriation, or viewed institutionally based on recognition from institutions. Romero (2020) also explores the identification of the commons based on the potential for building autonomous and counter-power institutions.

In post-new order Bali, the governing of the commons is influenced by political dynamic in the context of changing political landscape in Indonesia (Wardana, 2019; Warren 2009). The Regional Autonomy Law of 2004 has expanded local government authority, though strategic resources are still managed by the state. Examining shared resource governance in the Balinese community becomes crucial in understanding the dynamics within this context.

The indigenous community and local knowledge have significant roles in managing resources (Benyei, et al, 2023). Several studies have shown that the framework on the commons is pertinent to understand resource management in Indonesia (Partelow & Manlosa, 2023; Utami and Oue, 2023; Dudayev et al, 2023; Triyanti et al, 2023; Herrawan et al, 2022; Batiran et al, 2021). Carroll Warren's (1993) identifies the coexistence of *adat* (customary) village and *dinas* as village level governing entities in Bali, where their relationship not always in harmonious. Within this context, the research aims to unravel the intricacies of shared resource management in Bali's post-New Order era by exploring two case studies,

Tenganan Pegringsingan Village in Karangasem and the second, Adat Dalem Tamblingan, which is an union of four customary villages in Buleleng, both located in Bali. It seeks to understand how ancient governance practices persist and adapt, offering insights for a more locally inspired and inclusive approach to shared asset governance in Bali.

METHOD

This research is a qualitative study that utilizes a case study method to explore alternative governance of the commons in Bali. The focus is on understanding the complexity of the issues through the experiences of the actors involved. The research involves a desk study where archives, documents, and news are examined to understand state policies in resource governance, traditional governance models, and alternative governance of the commons. The fieldwork aims to gather detailed data on governance in Balinese communities, specifically focusing on the policy sphere and the experiences of the actors. During the fieldwork, the interview conducted with public officials, village customary leaders, community's leader, village members and youth organizations in Tenganan Pegringsingan Village in Karangasem and Adat Dalem Tamblingan in Buleleng. The decision-making processes regarding commons are examined, with attention given to the relationship between the state and the community. The overall goal is to gain an in-depth understanding of governance practices and policies in Bali.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section is divided into two parts. The initial segment provides an overview of the current governance policies in Indonesia and delves into their implications. Special emphasis is placed on the regulatory landscape affecting customary villages in Bali, particularly in the aftermath of the implementation of Perda No. 4 of 2019 on Customary Villages in Bali. The subsequent section delves into case studies featuring two distinctive customary villages in Bali—Desa Adat Tenganan Pegringsingan and Adat Dalem Tamblingan. The selection of these two locales is deliberate, chosen for their exceptional governance experiences, as well as their noteworthy challenges and successes in safeguarding their living spaces.

Desa Adat in Post-New Order Bali

Studies on indigenous villages in Bali have been conducted from various perspectives. Regarding village governance in Bali, research conducted by V. E. Korn since 1933 in the village of Tenganan was

one of the early efforts to examine the legal context prevailing in Balinese society (Korn, 1960). With an anthropological perspective, Clifford Geertz wrote his description of the traditional village, emphasizing the variety and form of village structures in Bali (Geertz, 1959). Carrol Warren's study shows the position of indigenous villages in Bali with the existence of adat villages on one hand and dinas villages on the other, along with the ambivalence and ambiguity generated by this dualism (Warren, 1993).

In terms of policy, *desa adat* have undergone several changes. In 1986, Regional Regulation No. 6 of 1986 on the Position, Function, and Role of Customary Villages as Units of Customary Law Communities in the Province of Regional Level I Bali was issued. Post-New Order, there were several adjustments to regulations related to customary villages, including Regional Regulation of Bali Province Number 3 of 2001 concerning Pakraman Village, amended by the issuance of Regional Regulation of Bali Province Number 3 of 2003 Amendment to Regional Regulation of Bali Province Number 3 of 2001 concerning Pakraman Village.

Brigitta Hauser-Schäublin (2013) writes about the implications of this regulation change. Firstly, the change of village naming, from adat village to pakraman village, where pakraman is inspired by Sanskrit. Second, the recognition of pecalang, the village-level security force in Bali. This policy also regulates the village paruman, tiered according to the level of the region, consisting of paruman alit (kecamatan), paruman madya (kabupaten), and paruman agung (province). Paruman Agung, or the Main Assembly of Pakraman Village, is the highest representative body of customary prajuru at the provincial level.

During the reign of Governor, I Wayan Koster, the position of *desa adat* (customary villages) in Bali was regulated through Regional Regulation No. 4/2019 on Customary Villages in Bali. Based on this regulation, a customary village is a unit of customary law communities in Bali with an area, position, original structure, traditional rights, property, traditions, manners of community life for generations in the bond of a sacred place (kahyangan tiga or kahyangan desa), duties and authorities, and the right to regulate and manage its own household (article 1 point 8).

Regional Regulation Number 4 of 2019 confirms the government's recognition of indigenous villages and characterizes the strengthening of the position of customary villages in relation to the state. However, customary village are not fully autonomous institutions in governing themselves. Perda No. 4 of 2019 on Customary Villages in Bali also regulates the Customary Village Assembly

(*Majelis Desa Adat* or MDA) which is an association (*pasikian*) of Customary Villages at the Provincial, Regency / City, and District levels in stages, with duties and authority in the field of practicing customs originating from Hinduism and local wisdom. The MDA functions to provide advice, consideration, guidance, interpretation, and decisions in the fields of custom, tradition, culture, social religion, local wisdom, customary law, and customary economy (article 1 point 24).

In carrying out its functions, the Bali Provincial MDA is a working partner of the Regional Government according to its level (article 72 point 2). As a working partner, the MDA is formed by the customary village (article 72 point 1). As the leader of the MDA, a *Bendesa Agung* is elected and confirmed by the Governor of Bali. The election of the *Bendesa Agung* is done by deliberation and consensus, where the *Bendesa Agung* is elected by acclamation.

The Policies on Resource Management in Indonesia

Indonesia's approach to resource management is intricately woven into its legal and regulatory framework, primarily defined by Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution. This constitutional provision underscores two key principles: state control over natural resources and their utilization for the utmost prosperity of the people. However, the interpretation of "prosperity" remains a subject of ongoing debate, given the government's central role as the legal custodian of resource governance.

The landscape shifted significantly with the implementation of regional autonomy, granting local governments the authority to manage their natural resources and issue permits within their jurisdictions. This decentralization reflects a move towards a more localized and region-specific strategy in resource governance.

Environmental considerations play a pivotal role in resource management policies, requiring an in-depth environmental impact analysis (AMDAL) for activities affecting living spaces. Moreover, citizens are actively encouraged to participate in managing resources within their environments, especially in areas like forests and water resources.

Indonesia has enacted various laws to under-score its commitment to managing natural resources for the social welfare of its citizens. Article 33 of the Constitution embodies this commitment, aiming for economic democracy, justice, and social welfare through state control over earth, water, and natural resources. Law No. 32/2004 on Regional Government further empowers local authorities to administer resources within their regions, aligning with the broader

principle of regional autonomy. This includes the management of potential resources as part of an effort to accelerate community welfare.

Law No. 32/2009 on Environmental Protection and Management takes a comprehensive approach, focusing on environmental preservation and the improvement of quality of life. Notably, it recognizes the crucial role of indigenous peoples in resource management, giving regional heads the power to establish policies related to their recognition. Social forestry is actively promoted through specific regulations, such as Ministry Regulation, PERMEN LHK Number P.83/MENLHK/SETJEN/KUM.1/10/2016, which authorizes local communities to manage state and customary forest areas for the welfare of their inhabitants. Law No. 7 of 2004 on Water Resources takes a holistic view, emphasizing equitable access to water resources while considering social, environmental, and economic functions. This law is tightly interwoven with the broader tapestry of natural resource management.

In Bali, regulations such as Bali Provincial Regulation No. 16 of 2009 bring cultural values to the forefront, allowing regencies and cities to make spatial arrangements that align with the principles of Tri Hita Karana. This ensures that resource utilization is not only efficient but also culturally sensitive. Government Regulation (Perda) No. 4 of 2019 on Customary Villages in Bali adds another layer, granting Desa Adat the authority to manage their households. The Customary Village Council plays a crucial role in decision-making related to resource management, further emphasizing the nuanced and community-centric approach.

The Indonesia's laws and regulations on natural resource management aim for a delicate balance, ensuring social welfare by granting authority to local governments, involving stakeholders, recognizing indigenous peoples, and fostering sustainability in a nuanced and coherent manner.

Managing the Commons in Tenganan Pegringsingan

The practice of governance of the commons in Bali can be seen in Tenganan Pegringsingan, one of the *Bali Aga* village whose customary influence is still very strong in all aspects of community life. Before delving further into governance practices, it is important to know about Tenganan Pegringsingan. In terms of its institutional aspects, the village is led by six couples who are native to Tenganan Pegringsingan. Regarding the community, Tenganan village is divided into several groups, namely: *Krama Desa*, *Krama Gumi Pulangan*, *Krama Gumi*, and *Krama Sesambahan*.

As mentioned by the *Village Klian* (leader), Putu Suarjana, the *krama desa* is a married couple who are both Tenganan Pegringsingan people. Interestingly, each *krama desa* has the same opportunity to occupy the highest position in the village institutionally, namely six pairs of village leader. As explained by one of the *Klian Desa* Tenganan Pegringsingan, Putu Suarjana, the leadership system in Tenganan uses a seniority system based on the length of marriage. Then, *Krama Gumi Pulangan* is a former village clan who has stepped down or is not eligible and is not physically disabled. *Krama Gumi* is the entire community of Tenganan Pegringsingan, including those with disabilities. This social categorization has been in place for thousands of years and has been regulated in *awig-awig* and *dresta* (unwritten rules or customs of the village community).

The seniority system in obtaining the highest position is also applied to other groups, one of which is the youth group, namely *Sekaa Truna* (for men) and *Sekaa Daha* (for women). In addition to the seniority system that is rarely found in youth groups in Bali, the separation of groups based on gender and birth class (paternal line for *Truna*, and maternal line for *Daha*) is also a unique characteristic in Tenganan Pegringsingan. Each youth group, both female and male, is divided into three sections based on birth class, namely *Petemu Kelod*, *Petemu Tengah*, and *Petemu Kaja*. Broadly speaking, there is no difference in the duties of each group in either *Sekaa Truna* or *Sekaa Daha*. The division based on birth line only facilitates the order of tasks in rotation.

In contrast to youth organizations (*Sekaa Truna Truni*) in Bali in general, youth organizations in Tenganan Pegringsingan tend to be more of a learning platform for the younger generation of Tenganan related to their responsibilities later as *krama desa* and are mandatory groups. Therefore, the tasks carried out are also an exercise of what will be the responsibility of the Tenganan Pegringsingan community in the future. As mentioned by *Klian Sekaa Truna* Patemon Kaja, the tasks/activities in *sekaa truna* are about ceremony preparation and learning land management, while in *sekaa daha* it tends to be training in making *banten* (offering) preparations or ceremonial facilities. Before entering the youth group, children who will be included by their respective families must go through a cadre procession called *Metrana Nyoman* or *Daha Nyoman*. This cadre activity is carried out erratically depending on the number of children who will take part in the cadre. This activity, which lasts one year, specifically educates about character, manners, *ngayah* (obligatory task), and introduction to the Tenganan Pegringsingan region through ceremonies.

After passing this procession, only then does the individual concerned have the opportunity to enter the village krama group later. During the youth organization, all activities are coordinated by the klian sekaa, who is the most senior person in the group. In addition, group activities are also directly supervised by a former (retired) village krama called Kekayuhan.

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that the social order in Tenganan Pegringsingan is carried out in stages, and there are no shortcuts to be able to occupy the highest position. In addition, a series of educational roles or information distribution from each group has contributed to maintaining intellectual property as formulated thousands of years ago by their ancestors (although not all of them lasted). The seniority system, as well as the strictness in maintaining *awig-awig* and *dresta*, will have implications for the practice of management of the commons in Tenganan Pegringsingan, which will be described as follows.

Village assets in Tenganan Pegringsingan are divided into several things, namely yard land with 8% of the total land area of 1,181.44 hectares, forest with an area of 197.32 hectares, gardens with an area of 480.89 hectares, and rice fields with an area of 255.85 hectares. Regarding the management of natural resources in Tenganan Pegringsingan, the outline has been regulated in *awig-awig* and discussed in detail in the village *dresta*. In the management of natural resources in Tenganan Pegringsingan, some are managed privately and some are managed jointly. According to I Putu Wiadyana who is a member of *krama desa*, joint asset management is carried out by the village krama by managing assets “belonging to adat.”

Of the land in the village, there are several hectares of “privately owned” land whose ownership is hereditary (in the family name), not individually owned. Unlike the practice in Bali in general, “privately owned” assets in Tenganan Pegringsingan have the status of use rights only. This means that the person concerned can organize, manage, and obtain products from the land but cannot trade, rent, or perform other prohibited actions that have been regulated in *awig-awig*. In addition, the village also has the right to take crops for the benefit of the village, even if it is on “private” land.

Based on the interviews with I Putu Wiadyana (*krama desa*), Putu Sudarsana (*Klian Krama*), I Nyoman Sadra (*Elder*) and also as regulated in *awig-awig* and *dresta*, in the aspect of common resource management, there is a division of groups or actors based on tasks. There are three groups/actors that are in direct contact with the management of “village-owned” assets, namely the *Penyakap*, *Bongsanak*,

and *Klian Desa*. Within the group of *krama desa* (village members), it is the 6 pairs of village clans that tend to have the most involvement in relation to the management of village natural resource assets.

According to the *Klian Desa* in Tenganan Pegringsingan, Putu Sudarsana, the *Klian Desa* plays a role in coordinating, authorizing, and evaluating the work of the *bongsanak*, as well as controlling land management activities. In terms of control/supervision of activities on village asset land, the *Klian Desa* is also assisted by members of the *krama desa*. The *Bongsanak* is the head of the *penyakap* group, who used to be part of the *penyakap*, elected based on deliberation by the *penyakap* and authorized by the *Klian Desa*. The *Bongsanak* plays a role in supervising and coordinating between the clan and the *penyakap*. Then, the *penyakap* group are villagers who generally come from outside of villages around Tenganan Pegringsingan and settle in the Tenganan area to work in village-owned lands or rice fields. The use of *penyakap* from other villages is also applied in the management of “private owned” assets where the family is directly related to the *penyakap* individually.

In addition to being granted the right to live in the Tenganan Pegringsingan grounds, the *penyakap* also earn an income based on the land they work. According to I Putu Wiadyana, the division of crops is based on an agreement between the two parties and is generally divided 50%-50%, except for coconut crops 25% for the owner and 75% for the tenant. Unlike in the past, the division of crops is mostly in the form of cash. These cash proceeds are the result of buying and selling with merchants, either by the tappers as a whole or by the landowner, based on the agreement of both parties.

In relation to the commodities that are planted, especially on plantation land, they are generally determined by the village for “village-owned” land or by the landowner’s family for “private-owned” land. According to the *Klian*, Putu Suarjana, the commodities planted in plantations are generally commodities related to the needs of ceremonial facilities, while on rice fields, the cultivators tend to have leeway in determining the planting commodities. The main commodity in Tenganan Pegringsingan is the palm tree, which produces *tuak*, a traditional alcohol drink and craft, one of the sources of village income.

In addition to asset management that is closely related to economic activities, natural resource governance practices in Tenganan Pegringsingan are also closely related to nature conservation activities. As is known, the area in Tenganan Pegringsingan has not undergone significant changes for thousands of years. Likewise with land functions, which are

very minimal changes. Tenganan's resilience in maintaining its territory is supported by at least five aspects, namely rules, ceremonial activities, economic independence, prominence, and demographics.

First, the presence of *awig-awig* that binds various aspects of the life of the Tenganan Pegringsingan community. The presence of *awig-awig* and *dresta* is very influential in terms of controlling the activities of indigenous peoples, regulating the rights and obligations of village communities, regulating village demographics, village governance patterns, ensuring regeneration, spatial patterns, and ensuring the sustainability of the management and preservation of natural resources in Tenganan Pegringsingan. In addition, the presence of *awig-awig* in Tenganan Pegringsingan is rigid. This means that what is written cannot be contested and it is not easy to amend. Particularly in relation to the management of the village's commons, *awig-awig* clearly states the boundaries and extent of village land, the use of natural products, and prohibitions on the use of natural resources (selling land, cutting down trees, prohibitions on picking fruit, and so on). In addition, land ownership is clearly regulated, along with roles based on class.

The presence of *awig-awig* in community life is also supported by leaders and communities who are keen to maintain and implement *awig*. According to an elder in Tenganan Pegringsingan, I Nyoman Sadra, the role of leadership is also crucial because if the relevant parties do not maintain *awig-awig*, then the regulations (*awig-arig*) can be revised according to interests. This role also helps to ensure the protection of village assets (in the form of land), by seeking legal recognition of customary forests. Despite its rigid nature, there are a number of articles listed in the *awig-awig* that are no longer applied because they violate human rights (putting a baby in the cemetery for a week). In relation to government regulations, Tenganan Pegringsingan village tends to adapt local and central government regulations to *awig-awig*, as conveyed by *Klian Desa* Tenganan Pegringsingan, Putu Sudarsana, and *krama desa*, I Putu Wiadyana.

Ceremony as a form of conservation is also a practice found in Indonesian villages; as well as the role of ceremony as an uninterrupted transfer of knowledge. The connection of natural resources, which are not only present as part of the ceremonial facilities, but also present as a place for ceremonies that are mandatory (ex: *Metruna Nyoman*, *Truna Daha*). So, inevitably the community must preserve its nature (which is also reinforced by the presence of *awig* and *dresta*), for the needs of the ceremony. The presence of ceremonies and a tiered social order causes regeneration issues that are generally found

in traditional villages, to be absent in Tenganan Pegringsingan.

Village independence that ensures the welfare of the community with definite rights and obligations that are balanced according to status. Although *awig-awig* is rigid and binding, there is leeway in the rules, namely the freedom to enter into any group of society with conditions, responsibilities, and rights in accordance with the type of group. Assets (which are in fact owned by the village) are managed by both the village and individuals (groups/families), the results of which are given back for the prosperity of the community and ceremonial purposes. The village also provides employment opportunities in the form of entrepreneurial kiosks with low rental prices. Therefore, economic security and food security are guaranteed. In addition, most of the Tenganan community who work as entrepreneurs facilitate the continuity of traditional activities because of the free allocation of time which is determined directly by those concerned.

Demographic control. The strict provisions of community classification, which in this case are also related to the aspect of marriage, cause the ratio of occupancy to settlement to not experience significant changes. In other words, the population has not grown exponentially. This is related to the absence of the need for land conversion or expansion of residential areas.

As part of the province of Bali and the Republic of Indonesia, applicable laws and regulations naturally have implications in Tenganan Pegringsingan village, especially during the Green Revolution. During this period, there were national changes to commodities in rice fields. It did not escape the attention of the central government in that period; Tenganan Pegringsingan was also affected, namely the change in planting varieties from local rice (Gage rice) to rice as found today. The extinction of local rice in Tenganan Pegringsingan caused constraints in terms of ceremonies (having to look for local rice outside Tenganan) and reduced soil quality (vulnerability to landslides). Meanwhile, in provincial regulations, Tenganan Pegringsingan generally does not experience problems. In addition to obtaining special rights as an old village, the community and government in Tenganan Pegringsingan tend to apply regional regulations as long as the things regulated do not conflict with the village *awig* (the main priority of *awig* and village *dresta*).

Although, in general, the village of Tenganan Pegringsingan has managed to survive with its customs for thousands of years, it has shifted in several ways and poses a threat to the future. First, in the aspect of homogeneous varieties. Like a double-edged dagger, the dominating presence of *jaka* trees is not

only economically beneficial, but there is a significant threat. According to Tenganan Pegringsingan elder, I Nyoman Sadra, the dominance of palm trees can be a threat in the future. If there is damage or disease, the effort to alleviate it will be a significant challenge, and its spread will tend to be easier.

Second, human resources. The convenience that the village offers to its people is a challenge for Tenganan's young generation. As mentioned by one of the village krama, Kadek Supadnyana, with the existing facilities, it will be increasingly difficult to step out of the comfort zone. Therefore, efforts to develop themselves or empower the village become very challenging. Similarly, a community leader, I Nyoman Sadra, mentioned the gap in knowledge between what has been passed down by the ancestors in the form of ceremonies and the current generation. "It's like drinking coffee in the morning, always done, but never interpreting why you have to do it."

Third, the presence of tourism. According to one *krama desa*, I Putu Wiadyana, the presence of tourism has led to the commercialization of culture. In the future, it will cause cultural degradation, where people no longer see ceremonies as part of philosophy that needs to be studied, but as a form/economic product in the form of cultural attractions.

These are the concerns that arise in the case of Tenganan Pegringsingan, which essentially focuses on the quality of its human resources. Related to the land aspect, so far Tenganan Pegringsingan has experienced minimal interference or intervention from the government or investors, due to supporting certificates, one of which is Kalpataru, which makes it difficult for outsiders to enter. In addition to this, the presence of *awig-awig* and leadership also plays a central role in defending the Tenganan Pegringsingan area from "external" parties. In contrast to what happened in Tenganan, intervention issues arise in other areas of Bali, such as the phenomenon that occurred in the Masyarakat Adat Dalem Tamblingan, which is described in the following.

Struggling over Commons in Adat Dalem Tamblingan

Masyarakat Adat Dalem Tamblingan (MADT) *Catur Desa* is also one of the oldest villages in Bali. As an old village, the influence of adat in Catur Desa still remains, although it has now undergone changes in various aspects due to changing times. Adat Dalem Tamblingan, *Catur Desa*, consists of four banjar (hamlet) within its scope as an costumery community and four villages within its scope as a *dinas* village, namely Munduk, Gobleg, Gesing, and Umajero. This duality has several differences in terms of governance. According to *Bendesa Adat* Munduk, Ketut Ariman, in terms of *dinas*, each

village adheres to the government, but in relation to Adat Dalem Tamblingan, each village, called banjar, is commanded or led by *Dane Pengrajeg* and centered in Gobleg. The highest position is obtained through a different system. The government follows the election system (centered to village head) and deliberation (*Bendesa*), while the highest position in MADT is determined based on lineage.

In addition to this uniqueness, other things that make a difference are ceremonial activities and ceremonial infrastructure, where MADT is a society that worships or glorifies water. Apart from these aspects, what is found in MADT generally does not seem different from what happens in other parts of Bali. The adaptation of each village to the policies of the local or central government is quite high, so many things have shifted from the past to the present. Based on its history, as mentioned by the Bendesa of Munduk village, the four MADT banjars were once located in the Alas Merta Jati Forest. However, for the sake of sustainability and preservation of the forest, the four banjars commanded by Gobleg banjar moved to lower areas (which are now occupied). Apart from the Merta Jati mat, the four villages do not have land in the name of the village or owned by the village. Thus, land buying and selling practices often occur in each of the village chess, as is often found in urban areas of Bali.

In terms of the community, most of them are farmers or cultivators. Only a few of the original villagers still own private land, in the form of rice fields; most of these lands are owned by migrants (from other regencies in Bali) who have lived in each village for many years. According to the accounts of each village leader (Jero Made Suartika, I Nengah Sudira, Ketut Ariman, I Nyoman Arya Sidarta), the tourism sector has now begun to be favored, especially by the younger generation. Thus, the issue of regeneration is one of the main concerns of the village. In addition, the other main content and the most important issue is the restoration of the status of the Merta Jati forest, which is currently still a "state forest." Furthermore, regarding assets and governance practices, it will be described as follows.

In relation to natural resources in the Catur Desa in general, in the form of rice fields, plantations, forests, and water sources (such as lakes, rivers, and springs). Based on the narrative of the figures, it is mentioned that in MADT's efforts to manage existing natural resources is through community groups (*sekaa-sekaa*), and the role of the village, especially the official, is very minimal. As mentioned earlier, the village itself has minimal land assets that can be managed. Thus, the village does not have the authority to regulate all land in its area, due to private land ownership. Dinas or adat villages are

only authorized to manage assets related to tourism and public facilities, which are assisted by other government institutions (e.g., government agencies, etc.).

One of the assets jointly owned by MADT is Alas Merta Jati (AMJ). However, as mentioned earlier, AMJ's current status is still as a "state forest," resulting in a number of restrictions. In terms of its relationship with nature conservation, MADT has a way of conservation through ceremonies. Quoted from the statement of the head of Team 9, the way indigenous people perform ceremonies and live (do activities) in nature is a form of environmental conservation that has become an inseparable part of the community's life. This was also mentioned by Bendesa Munduk, Ketut Ariman, who mentioned the presence of ceremonies and temples, in particular, which binds the community to preserve what is there (even though it has been factually degraded). In contrast to what happened in Tenganan Pegringsingan, communal practices that occur in Adat Dalem Tamblingan have actually weakened in various aspects, making it easier for intervention from the government and the private sector.

Awig-awig is not binding on the community and tends to be adaptive to local government regulations. What is meant by non-binding is that awig-awig does not regulate in detail about community behavior, especially regarding forest management, the role of the community, community classification, and the like. So that the community is more free and tends to be individualistic because there are no binding obligations, as well as the rights received specifically do not exist. In addition, in terms of amending awig, it is possible to adjust to changes in power or policies at the provincial level that relate to indigenous villages. In other words, the *awig-awig* present in the context of indigenous villages is not rigid and can be amended to adjust to the renewal of leadership at the regional level, as stated by *Bendesa Adat* Gesing, Jero Made Suartika.

The role of ceremonies is not too binding on the community. Thus, there is more freedom to take other options besides those in the village (e.g., youth working on cruise ships or migrating to Denpasar). The lack of closeness of the youth to their natural surroundings (no ceremonies or activities that introduce them) means that the issue of regeneration becomes hard, and the youth and the village area become more distant.

Villages do not guarantee the welfare of the community. Just like in urban and other areas, villages do not guarantee prosperity for their people and cannot provide jobs. In fact, the village does not have the capacity to do so (the resources are lacking).

There is no common ownership of land. Land ownership in Catur Desa is private, and no land is owned by the village or managed by the village. Regarding land ownership in Alas Merta Jati, it was only recorded in inscriptions and lontar, none of which detailed the area. The historical context is also less supportive. That is, from the Dutch colonization until now, its status has not been officially mentioned and recognized as a forest belonging to an indigenous village (*hutan adat*). Therefore, evidence such as inscriptions and lontar tends to be less strong to claim an area that has the status of a state-owned forest.

Uncontrolled demographics. The large number of people from outside, causing land ownership in each village in *Catur Desa* to be increasingly controlled by migrants. The increase in migrants also reduces attachment to the surrounding environment and customs. So that not all have the same understanding of the urgency of returning the status of Alas Merta Jati as customary forest. Lack of solidarity between villages. Not all parties fully support Team 9, and not all parties have the same understanding of the urgency of Alas Merta Jati.

As mentioned earlier, the presence of local and central government tends to be more pronounced in Catur Desa, Adat Dalem Tamblingan. This can be seen from the emergence of government actors, such as the Traditional Village Council (MDA), District and Regional Level Governments, and BKSDA, which are part of the central government and are directly involved in relation to Alas Merta Jati or the Catur Desa area as a whole. There are several problems that are often faced by MADT related to government parties and investors. The series of problems resulted in each MADT banjar forming Team 9, which is a representative of each banjar and chaired by the Former *Bendesa Adat* Munduk, Putu Ardana.

Problems that are often faced are related to tourism development that is not in accordance with MADT values (related to nature) and cases that attempt to damage nature and existing ecosystems. There are several cases that Team 9 has faced, namely the eviction of settlements in the Tamblingan Lake area, theft of forest timber, construction of new temples in the forest, efforts to spread catfish seeds (predators) without village permission, the formation of a new village under the name Tamblingan, and so on. Even these cases cannot be separated from the central and regional governments as the upstream of the problem.

According to the Coordinator of Team 9, Putu Ardana, the granting of "state forest" status to AMJ facilitated the presence of investors and the emergence of government actors who contributed to environmental damage (e.g., logging, etc.). The most

visible environmental impact is the extinction of a number of fauna and a decrease in water discharge due to logging and hunting. Meanwhile, the social impact lies in the weakening of the community and the village as an institution, which cannot act on environmental damage that occurs in what is considered as sacred forests by the community. In addition, the presence of regional regulations, such as Perda No. 3 of 2001 and Perda No. 4 of 2019, regarding customary villages, also brings a number of impacts in practice. On the one hand, it triggers an uproar in relation to the election of bendesa; on the other hand, the presence of MDA is considered a uniformity effort made by the government towards traditional villages in Bali.

In addition to these issues, the problem that often arises in each village is the issue of regeneration. As a result of the massive influx of tourism in Bali, the younger generation in chess villages also has a tendency to work in the field. This has led to the loss of a number of old village customs and an increase in the activity of buying and selling land for tourism. Even this impact is already visible, as mentioned above.

CONCLUSION

Upon examining the governance of the commons in Tenganan Pegringsingan and the Masyarakat Adat Dalem Tamblingan, it is evident that community groups (sekaa) play a direct role in management of the commons. Additionally, ceremonies serve as an integral aspect of the indigenous peoples' way of life in managing natural resources. The presence of sekaa is a conscious organizational effort to manage natural resources, while ceremonies, whether consciously or unconsciously, have been carried out for hundreds or even thousands of years. Ceremonies not only serve as a means of preserving nature but also function as a tool for mapping various flora and fauna species. This mapping goes beyond being a mere inventory database; it serves as a tool to assess the quality of the environment, which is considered part of the intellectual property of indigenous peoples. For example, the use of dragonflies indicates whether the air quality is clean or not. Alongside ceremonies, the presence of temples is another key element related to environmental conservation. Temples indirectly demarcate the forest areas in both Tenganan and AMJ. According to belief, the temple area is sacred and strongly discouraged from being "disturbed" for economic interests such as the construction of tourist attractions.

Moreover, government intervention in village affairs has had a detrimental effect based on these findings. The natural resource management practices

of indigenous peoples, often deemed outdated and abandoned, prove to be the most relevant. Tenganan Pegringsingan, with its unique approach to nature management and limited external intervention, has successfully navigated through changing times, even global crises. In contrast, in Masyarakat Adat Dalem Tamblingan, government presence has resulted in various problems.

ACKNOWLEDMENT

The researcher would like to thank for the support of Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat Universitas Udayana.

REFERENCE

- Angelis, M. D. (2017). *Omnia Sunt Communia: Principles for the Transition to Postcapitalism*. Zed Books
- Armitage, D. (2008). Governance and the commons in a multi-level world. *International Journal of the Commons*, 2,(1). 7-32
- Benyei, P., Calvet-Mir, L., Reyes-García, V., & Villamayor-Tomas, S. (2022). Indigenous and Local Knowledge's Role in Social Movement's Struggles Against Threats to Community-Based Natural Resource Management Systems: Insights from a Qualitative Meta-analysis. *International Journal of the Commons*, 16(1), 263. <https://doi.org/10.5334/ijc.1154>
- Davidson, J. S., & Henley, D. (Eds.). (2007). *The revival of tradition in Indonesian politics: The deployment of adat from colonialism to indigenism*. Routledge.
- Dudayev, R., Hakim, L. L., & Rufiati, I. (2023). Participatory fisheries governance in Indonesia: Are octopus fisheries leading the way? *Marine Policy*, 147, 105338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2022.105338>
- Fagertun, A. (2017). Waves of Dispossession: The Conversion of Land and Labor in Bali's Recent History. *Social Analysis*, 61(3). <https://doi.org/10.3167/sa.2017.610307>
- Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. Verso.
- Herrawan, H., Sirimorok, N., Nursaputra, M., Mas'ud, E. I., Faturachmat, F., Sadapotto, A., Supratman, S., Yusran, Y., & Sahide, M. A. K. (2022). Commoning the State Forest: Crafting Commons through an Indonesian Social Forestry Program. *Forest and Society*, 20–39. <https://doi.org/10.24259/fs.v6i1.10680>

- Lansing, J. S. (2006). *Perfect order: Recognizing complexity in Bali*. Princeton University Press.
- Lansing, J. S. (2007). *Priests and programmers: Technologies of power in the engineered landscape of Bali*. Princeton University Press.
- Li, T. M. (2021). Commons, co-ops, and corporations: Assembling Indonesia's twenty-first century land reform. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 48(3), 613–639. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2021.1890718>
- Obeng-Odoom, F. (2021). *The commons in an age of uncertainty: Decolonizing nature, economy, and society*. University of Toronto Press.
- Ostrom, E. (2015.). *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge University Press (1st edition published in 1990)
- Partelow, S., Manlosa, A.O. (2023). Commoning the governance: a review of literature and the integration of power. *Sustain Sci* 18, 265–283. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-022-01191-2>
- Ruivenkamp, G., & Hilton, A. (2017). Perspectives on Commoning. *Perspectives on Commoning: Autonomist Principles and Practices*
- Roggero, G. (2020). To Avoid the Farce of the Common. *Praktyka Teoretyczna*, 4(38): 161–168. DOI: 10.14746/prt2020.4.16
- Triyanti, A., Indrawan, M., Nurhidayah, L., & Marfai, M. A. (Eds.). (2023). *Environmental Governance in Indonesia*, Springer International Publishing. 61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15904-6>
- Utami, A. S., & Oue, H. (2023). Traditional value and its function in managing modern irrigation system in West Sumatra Indonesia. *Sustainable Water Resources Management*, 9(2), 54.
- Wardana, A. (2019). *Contemporary Bali: Contested Space and Governance*. Springer Singapore. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2478-9>
- Warren, C., & McCarthy, J. F. (2009). Community, environment and local governance in Indonesia: Locating the commonweal. *Taylor & Francis Group*. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/anu/detail.action?docID=1024674>
- Warren, C. (2005). Community mapping, local planning and alternative land use strategies in Bali. *Geografisk Tidsskrift-Danish Journal of Geography*, 105(1), 29–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00167223.2005.10649524>