

Structural Analysis on Ethnic Conflict and Violence in Sampit, Indonesia

Sidik R. Usop

Social and Political Science Department,
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,
Universitas Palangkaraya, Indonesia
srusop@yahoo.co.id

Abstract

The study on ethnic conflict and violence in Sampit focused on explaining (1) why ethnical conflict between two ethnic groups, Dayak and Madura, took place, (2) some factors that triggered the ethnic conflict and violence in Sampit. Raif Dahrendof and Lewis Coser's conflict theory was used to develop structural perspective that helped explaining the issues. The findings were (1) there was a social gap because the government depend upon entrepreneurs as the owners of capital to grow the local economics; (2) dominant role of the government more particularly in the establishment of the forest resource exploitation policy had created boundaries for the public; the government treated the public in unfair manner and taken the side of the entrepreneurs; (3) transformation process of which purpose was to create change created boundaries for public; it contributed to ethnic conflict and violence. In other words, ethnic conflict and violence happened because ethnic identity creating cultural boundaries and social distance between Dayak and Madura.

Keywords: *ethnic conflict, cultural boundaries, ethnic identity*

SOCIAL REALITY

The case of ethnic conflict taking place in Sampit is one part of distinctive issues in national integration because Dayak people considered the conflict as revivalism of “mengayau,” a tradition to behead somebody. “Mengayau” was on the verge of extinction after the 1894 “Rapat Damai Tumbang Anoi” resulted in a declaration to stop “habunu” (killing each other), “hakayau” (beheading each other’s head) and “hajipen” (slavery). Since then, indigenous rules that were effective in each of the indigenous population had been used to resolve whatever conflict taking place in the society¹. The researcher was interested in the social condition in order to explain the ethnic conflict and violence in Sampit between Dayak and Madurese.

The history wrote that Madurese people did not make any adjustment toward the culture of Dayak people as the host. There were several conflicts occurred in Kotawaringin Timur between the two ethnic groups. The first one happened in Sampit in 1982. At that time, some Madurese people murdered Dayak people and other Madurese group seemed to support the action. It was worsen by unfinished trial and the fact that Madurese people violated the peace pact these two ethnic groups had agreed on previously.

The second conflict took place in Bukit Batu, Kasongan in 1983. A Dayak man was murdered in a fight against 30 Madurese men. Tjilik Riwut, an important public figure, tried to resolve the problem by conducting “Tiwah,” a traditional ceremony, and the ones committed the crime had to pay for the cost of “Tiwah.” People from the two ethnic group agreed to terms and sign a peace pact that stated that Madurese people would be willing to be relocated from Central Kalimantan had they committed the same crime.

The third conflict took place in Tumbang Nusa in 1999 when a Dayak couple was stabbed by three Madurese people. They were severely injured and hospitalized in Dr.Doris Sylvanus Hospital Palangkaraya. The authority could not arrest the one committed the violence and it was said that they had fled to Madura. In 2000, Sendung was murdered by a group of Madurese people in Kerengpangi Kasongan. The murderers again fled to Madura and as the result, no charge was given against them.

Series of personal conflict and violence between Dayak and Madurese showed that social interaction between these two did not occur as it should be. There was tension between the two ethnic groups since particular system of value that was effective in the indigenous area had been violated. Furthermore, Masoed (2001) stated that national development as the agent of change brought not only positive effects but also some consequences. It improved economic productivity as well as expand the ability to produce goods and service. However, at the same time, national development created a gap in which people that got the advantage of the improving economic productivity. Unfortunately, the positive effect of national development did not touch certain groups of people. In other words, development is a process that involved both direct and structural implementation of violence².

Using Masoed’s idea as the reference, there are several structural factors that trigger the ethnic conflict and violence in Sampit. One of them was the government policy that granted forest concession for private institutions/ companies (*Hak Penguasaan Hutan*). Since 1967, the forest concession has caused some damage to the environment and the locals whose earning depend upon the forest such as *tengkawang*, *jelutung*, resin, rattan, and ironwood lost their income. In addition, it also affected shifting cultivation that relies heavily upon reforestation for fertilizing soil. Indigenous land, particular area that the locals consider as sacred areas, and pieces of land owned by a group of local people no longer existed as the result of forest exploitation, for example *pahewan*, *tajahan*, *sepan*, *kaleka*, *betang* and their ancestor’s cemetery such as *sandang* and *sapudu*. Other negative impacts of the 1967 forest concession are water pollution caused by chemical substance for wood preservation and flood, the effect of deforestation⁴. The social condition raised awareness of Dayak people to respond against the marginalization they experienced. They use the term *temon petak manan sare* (land owner had to plant on the side of the plantation) to describe the condition they experienced.

What Dayak people experienced is a part of dynamic structure that develops macro-subjective reality; macro-subjective reality can be explained through dialogues to understand dialectics between actors in the structure⁵. The question the society has is to what extent marginalization and political isolation Dayak people experience trigger the ethnic conflict and violence in Sampit.

ETHNIC CONFLICT PERSPECTIVE

Previous studies categorized violence based on relationship between ethnic groups and structural perspectives. In terms of violence based on the relationship between ethnic groups perspective, Sudagung (2001) in his study entitled *Mengurai Pertikaian antar Etnis* stated that the ethnic conflict in West Kalimantan took place due to cultural difference between Dayak and Madurese. As the consequence, these two ethnic groups developed prejudice against each other, competed and sometimes fight against each other.

Sudagung's study mentioned that Dayak people are egalitarian and think that everyone has equal right to gain resources. Therefore, Dayak people and their inclusive point of view strongly disagree to exclusivity.

In the ethnic conflict in Ambon, Pattiselanno (1999: 59-61) revealed that the relationship between ethnic groups in Ambon was disturbed because migrant (Bugis, Buton and Makassar people) violated the restriction of *sarane-salam* developed through *pela gandong* system. Most of the migrants were Moslem and lived in the *salam* area. They solidified their identity as Moslem and as the consequence, Islamic identity became stronger and the *sarane-salam* relationship was broken.

The description above is an illustration that the *sarane-salam* relationship that initially was developed to strengthen bonds between ethnic groups based on *pela gandong* turned into divided society when new terms that highlighted differences between the ethnic groups were developed. The first term was *Acang* derived from Hasan; the term referred to Moslem people. The other one was *Obet* derived from Robert; it referred to Christian people. *Pela gandong* culture became less effective since *panas pela* ceremony was rarely conducted. The purpose of the ceremony was to strengthen *pela gandong* culture.

On the other hand, Syarib Ibrahim Alqadrie (2002: 6-7) who conducted an analysis towards violence based on cultural acculturation between Dayak and Melayu explained that Melayu people in West Kalimantan was the media of identification for Dayak people who wanted to enter the Melayu group. In this case, Dayak people who converted into Islam no longer call themselves Dayak; they have become Melayu people.

The merit between identification process and the rejection these people experienced because they had converted into Moslem and called themselves Melayu people resulted in alienation of both Moslem and non-Moslem Dayak. *Dayak Besar* people thought that Melayu and Moslem Dayak people isolated them. Such feeling and ideas were psycho-cultural of several factors triggering ethnic conflict in West Kalimantan. Using the context, Alqadrie explained that it was easier to make confused society (anomaly) committing violence.

Parsudi Suparlan (2001) and Human Right Watch (1998) highlighted ethnic violence as religious movement. In his previous study in Sampit, Suparlan (2002:7) beheading and asking Madurese people to leave the area were considered as purification. These actions would cleanse the area from any wrong doing the migrant had done; Dayak people believed that these wrongdoing caused some misfortune for them. Dayak people would conduct a ceremony to call upon the God of Thunder or the God of War. These Gods would possess Dayak people so that they could fight against Madurese people and get rid of what they considered as pollution. Suparlan tend to consider the case as revivalism of Dayak culture as the response to the current issues.

On the other side, Latief Wiyata (2002:167) understood *carok*, Madurese tradition as the response to an action that degraded Madurese people's dignity (*malo* and *marthabhat*). To revive their dignity, they conducted *carok* that was supported by their environment. Wiyata's study described the culture of *carok* between Madurese; in this case, there was not any political or economic interest behind it unlike that between Dayak and Madurese.

Human Right Watch (1998:12) called the ethnic violence in West Kalimantan as type of nativism by a group of Dayak people. The cause of the nativism was when blood of Dayak people were shed, they would announce war against whoever did it.

To start the war, Dayak people would distribute red bowl of which content was spiritual elements such as blood of chicken, pole and thatch. Each of the elements had their own meaning. The blood of chicken symbolized blood while the pole and a number of roofs made of thatch symbolized declaration of wars; these should fly from one village to another despite of the weather or darkness. Putra and Juweng (1998:43) added that prior to the war, Dayak people would conduct ceremony to call some spirits; the spirits would possess some people and they would have the power that the spirits had.

The religious movement mentioned by Parsudi Suparlan and the Human Right Watch referred to Sartono Kartodirdjo (1984: 10) that is movement of which purpose is to create social change in the public and to revive the golden era happened in the past. Not only was the violence considered as religious movement to

revive social order but it also became radical movement to destroy the system that marginalized and limited their movement in the public.

Secondly, based on structuralism, violence is considered as political and economic competition, which is how one interest group (entrepreneurs) and the authority treat ethnic group in order to support both the entrepreneurs and the authority.

Mochtar Masoed, et.al (2001) in their study of which title was Kekerasan Kolektif: Kondisi dan Pemicu took structural violence as the subject and used Galtung and Ted Gurr's framework. The findings stated that the violence taking place in Sanggau Ledo was public transformation dynamics of West Kalimantan people in the middle of the expansion of power from the migrant. In terms of economics, the expansion of power was in the form of capital expansion in various sectors more particularly wood industry. In terms of politics, the government supported the expansion of power. The evidence was the national development mostly happened in Jakarta and the locals had very little participation in it.

In Mochtar Masoed, et.al's study, there was not any explanation about the public transformation dynamics of the Dayak people or the presence of group leaders that mobilized the people to participate in the action once mentioned by Ted Gurr's theory.

In the context of economics and politics, Masoed distinguished conditional factor and trigger of the ethnic conflict. The conditional factor referred to social gap created by the government and particular interest group so that Dayak people were neglected. It resulted in unhealthy mental condition (stress) that became the trigger of the ethnic violence.

Amri Marzali (2001: 287-289) who analyzed the social violence in Kalimantan using J.Smelser's collective behavior revealed marginalization of Dayak people during the New Order was the cause of the violence. The study focused on the expansion of the entrepreneurs in wood industry in Kalimantan which was considered as the reason why Dayak people disliked both the government and the entrepreneurs. Dayak people thought that the entrepreneurs had destroyed their job that relied heavily on the resource from the forest and took over their sacred areas. Meanwhile, in the city the migrant had taken over the economic sector and Dayak people was alienated from their native land without them realizing it. The condition resulted in violence towards Madurese when the institution was weakened due to the economic and political crisis.

Amri Marzali's idea that used J.Smelser's collective behavior theory postulated that collective violence was movement caused by Dayak people disappointment towards the government that had been accumulated. The intensity of their disappointment increased when Madurese people were given the rights to use the natural resources.

Gerry Van Kinken considered the violence in Sampit as competition among the local elites. Kinken (2002: 69)'s theory referred to Jack Snyder's idea that ethnic conflict may occur in authoritarian regime. In this case, there were anti-democratic elites who used ethnic sentiments to violate the democracy. Towards the ethnic violence in Central Kalimantan, Kinken (2000:86) related the competition of the local elites in the governor election of Central Kalimantan and the ethnic sentiment mobilization. Dayak people wanted Madurese people to leave Kalimantan based on the speech analysis conducted by Sabran Ahmad and *LMMDD-KT* staffs during the preliminary conflict between Dayak and Madurese in Kerengpangi.

ETHNIC VIOLENCE

In general, the concept of ethnic violence is categorized as cultural violence because cultural violence tends to be related to use of cultural attributes (ethnic). Galtung (Steger and Lindt, 1990: 40) defined cultural violence as cultural aspects frequently used to legitimate violent acts. The cultural aspects are related to religion, ideology, language and arts, formal knowledge and fact that take place in the society (empirical and formal science).

Galtung's definition of violence emphasizes on structural concept carried out by a country, a group of people (society) and individual. As an example, violence against the nature resulted in deforestation and the policy that focused on the growth of economics created social gap that contributed to violent acts by several ethnic groups indirectly.

Baskara (2002:28) used the term violence within cultural framework to substitute the term cultural violence. The expert used violence within cultural framework to describe ethnic violence between Bugis and Madurese namely Siri and Carok culture. According to Baskara (2002: 49), Siri and Carok are socio-cultural

value system and personality of which function was to maintain human dignity as an individual and member of society so that they were respected by the society.

Related to Siri and Carok, Alqadrie (2002: 20) reported that the ethnic violence in West Kalimantan happened more frequently among Madurese who carried out Carok compared to Bugis people who carried out Siri as their tradition. The difference took place because Siri has balancing factor attached to Bugis people (siripakasiri) which meant when Bugis people were humiliated or their dignity was violated by other people, they would not do similar thing to them.

Within Madurese people, the balancing factor came from the outside that was Kyai, Moslem religious leader. Wiyata (2002: 47-48) stated that Madurese people considered Kyai as both religious leader and central figure whose role could not be separated from the Madurese society. Unfortunately, Kyai may have negative role in the tradition of Carok. Before Carok, Madurese people would visit Kyai (nyabis) in order to get apagar and jaza (amulets for protection).

Related to ethnic violence of which source was the culture, Varshney (2002: 27) used the term essentialism versus instrumentalism. Essentialism was described as primordial elements such as race, religion and culture or things that distinguish an individual from another individual in the society; when the different religion and culture were related to competition to gain economic resources and political access. In such condition, particular elites would start ethnic group mobilization that raised ethnic identity to support their leadership (instrumentalism). The mobilization was based upon focal point advantageous for both sides. In other words, Varshaney perceived ethnic identity as construction developed by political elites to support their interests.

Ethnic identity that developed violence was explained using the concept of ethnicity that initially was understood by Malinowsky, an anthropologist as definitive and well-arranged unity of culture and territory. According to the anthropologist, ethnic group could be distinguished well both in organization, language, religion (belief system), economics, tradition (laws) and interaction between ethnic groups including in the exchange of goods and service (Pelly, 1998:26).

Ethnicity, according to Bart (1998) was based not only upon a territory where an individual lived or standardized recruitment system but also evaluation and judgment so that everyone played in the same game. Based on the judgment and evaluation, within social interaction, ethnic identity was constructed to distinguish between in group and out group.

In plural society characterized by multiple ethnic groups, Barth (1998: 16-20) stated that ethnic identity may appear within exclusive context; relationship among ethnic groups that paid no attention to ethnicity, competition to gain limited resource and demographic perspective that was related to balance in number of people living in a country based on ethnicity.

More specific explanation came from Pelly (1999: 28) who described ethnic violence using the term collision between ethnic groups. It did not happen due to ethnocentrism, return to the tribe or the particular culture or separatism. Instead, the collision was cultural protest against unfair treatment, violence and abuse towards particular ethnic groups. They violated the social order that had been developed together previously. Therefore, the collision between ethnic groups occurred due to the broken of the social order taking place in multiple ethnic's society and demand to rebuild the new social order for the sake of togetherness, justice and healthy, organic solidarity.

Based on Pelly's idea, Alqadrie (1999:39) called ethnic violence as ethnic consciousness and ethnically based solidarity to react spontaneously towards marginalization and rejection of local ethnic groups. The condition happened not only because dominance and over-exploitation of resources where the local ethnic groups could not participate in, but also by intimidating them to leave their houses, black-mailing and taking-over their production tools by the migrant from other ethnicity or other interest groups.

Abdullah (2000: 6) stated that the balance of inter-ethnic relations in Sampit, Central Kalimantan was affected by the discrepancy and control of resources between the local ethnic and the migrant . The discrepancy in utilization of resurces resulted in political access that led to ethnic domination. In this case, there are two dangerous things, when the dominant ethnic group got the privilege from various social agencies, especially the government and when awareness of cultural boundries began to emerge. The local ethnic began to realize that their house had been occupied.

Related to granting privilege to certain ethnic group, Feagin (1996: 494) perceived ethnic violence as a colonial legacy. In the violence between Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda, the colonial government put the Tutsis

as the superior ethnic group while Hutu became the inferior. That difference was later constructed into the self and the others. Then, the term the others referred to the inferiors, slave, lazy, uneducated for the purpose of controlling others.

The ideas put the inferior ethnic groups as objects who had to answer to the government, such as during the New Order government, it was known as bureaucratic authoritarianism. Little and Mujadi (2000: 136), who used O'Donnell's ideas as the reference mentioned that authoritative government required political stability through military command to secure economic development and capital from foreign capitalists. According to O'Donnell and Schmitter (1995: 57, authoritarian regime action felt that it was the responsibility of the state in regulating the life of society, so that they had the authority to conduct a systematic repressive measures against political parties, social organizations and individuals. Such condition may also be used as an excuse to control the chaos in the public and concealed acts of corruption the government did.

When the power monopoly started to decline, conflict and violence in Indonesia started to happen as the revival of the local ethnics to fight against the dominance of the central government. In practice, Nordholt (2002: 104) stated that during the New Order the concept of ethnicity, religion, race and class were considered as taboos and created monster that caused the acts of violence in Indonesia. Towards the condition, Nordholt thought that some regional conflicts, ethnic and religious violence could be categorized into violent persuasive discourse that mobilized a group of people causing them to destroy the enemy. The violence between Dayak and Madurese in Kalimantan was considered as a tool to prevent the rise of Dayak people by motivating Madurese to destroy Dayak people.

The impact of global capitalism, as well as the dominance of global information and communication had encouraged the emergence of a new form of society united by a network of cooperation based on collective identity. Castell (1997: 6) stated that the collective identity was a social construction formed by using cultural attributes as well as their meaning and presence in subjective reality. The identity was source of new experiences formed, maintained, modified or reshaped in social interaction.

Castell's ideas tend to perceive ethnic conflict and violence as the process to develop collective identity that emerged based on collective awareness to fight against influence of global capitalism that put ethnic groups in disadvantageous position. At the opposite, Crawford (1998:12) argued that collective identity emerged so that entrepreneurs could support their economic and political interest.

GOVERNMENT AS THE PRODUCER OF VIOLENT ACT

To understand political violence, Gurr (1995: 124-130) stated that collective violence that would happen when: the first, there was growing variation in the society due to economic and political pressure. The second, widespread collective disadvantage such as economic and political disparities, group discrimination groups as well as demographic and ecological pressure spread widely. The third, there were three external factors that distributed group identity namely, the magnitude of disadvantage between groups in society, widespread of cultural differences between groups in social interaction and intensity of conflict with other groups and with the government. The fourth was the expansion of group cohesion and group mobilization.

Galtung (1980:67) defined violence as violence as an action that prevented other people from developing their potentials. Based on the concept, Galtung categorized violence into two categories, direct violence and structural violence.

Galtung's idea put the government as creator of violence structurally. There were four aspects included as the act of monopoly as one form of colonialism against a community. The first was exploitation that referred to exchange of interaction between two people or groups; there was increasing gap between those who have benefited most and one who benefited the least. The second was penetration that was forcing ideas from authoritative group to controlled group. The third was fragmentation or an effort to maintain and reinforce inequality to strengthen domination. The fourth aspect was marginalization that stigmatized marginal community as an ignorance and backward group of people. The forms of violence that appeared as the implication of the fourth aspect were uneven distribution of resources, income, education, health care and authority in making decisions related to the resources.

STRUCTURAL THEORY ANALYSIS

One of the experts that developed the theory of conflict was Ralf Dahrendorf. He was well-known as the critics against the functional structure that put aside conflict as inherent part of the society. Dahrendorf (1959:162) argued that (1) the society kept changing and social change was inseparable part of the public dynamic; (2) conflict and disagreement would always happen in the society; social conflict would appear among the society constantly; (3) each component of the society contributed to social disintegration and social change; and (4) the society was integrated based on coercion from a number of individual towards other groups of individuals.

The source of the social conflict and change was resource scarcity that resulted in uneven distribution of the resource. As the effect, there were a group of people who got the supply and another group who did not. Based on Marxist idea, the condition was the result of possession of production factors that created bourgeois, the group of people that got the resources and proletariat, the group who did not. On the other hand non-Marxist argued that the cause of conflict was authority. It happened between a group of people who owned the authority and those who did not.

Based on Dahrendorf (1959:176), conflict in the society happened due to different position in the authority. Dominant groups tried to maintain their social structure using their legitimate authority and non-authoritative groups (subjection) tried to change the social condition taken away by the dominant group.

Using the social structure above, there was a group of people called imperatively coordinated association that hierarchically control the life of other group of people. Dahrendorf's idea put the government as the group that forced its citizens to obey the authority in order to create social stability.

According to Dahrendorf, pseudo group should fulfill three types of requirements before being organized into real group of interests. The first was technical condition of organization, a group of candidates with ability to organize expectation of the pseudo group into reality. The reality referred to value system and became the guideline for activities conducted by the group. The second was political condition of organization, freedom given by dominant group to turn expectation into reality. The third was social condition of organization, opportunity for all pseudo group members to communicate to one another. Without the social condition, leadership and communication ability could not guarantee recruitment of the pseudo group members into members of the interest groups (Turner, 1978:152).

Lewis A. Coser was Simmel's protégé who developed the theory of conflicts. Coser (1956 :31) quoted Simmel that conflict was one type of socialization where there was not any harmony in social and structural process. They created harmony as much as disharmony, unity and chaos. In this case, conflict was no longer considered as disturbance; instead, conflict was social function that resulted in cooperative work so that it was an essential element in the live and development of a group.

Supporting the statement above, Simmel mentioned that conflict would develop and maintain identity and boundaries in the society. Besides that, conflict developed recognition towards group identity and maintained conflicting cultural boundaries existed in the society (Coser, 1964:38).

Coser's idea of conflict according to Ritzer and Smart (2001:146-147) was convergent to Dahrendorf's theory of conflict that was the correlation between the dominant groups and the inferior groups. Such condition led to balance and eventually consensus, while Coser perceived conflict as effort to trigger consensus and change. Therefore, these experts thought that conflict had positive consequence to reduce tension and trigger continuity of a system.

In another part, Coser (1964:37-38) postulated that tension in the society created conflict. However, tension did not automatically result in conflict, even though increasing intensity of tension may lead to conflict. In this case, conflict intensity was merely trans-action. During tension, when there was uneven distribution of privilege, tension would result in conflict. In this case, Coser agreed with Dahrendorf that government had contribution to trigger conflict because they increased social tension through uneven development that created social gap.

Turner (1978:185) stated that Coser and Dahrendorf had the same perspective that conflict happened due to uneven distribution of limited resource in social system. At the opposite, conflict may also reorganize an organization or trigger integration from group of people in the society through adaptability and flexibility.

METHODOLOGY

Ritzer (1996:515) explained that within structural approach of which basis was social paradigm/ social facts, there were historical quality and structural dynamics that formed macro structure. In this context, actor's daily interaction and activities played some role in producing and re-producing macro-structure (macro subjective) or another wider structure.

On the other hand, withing social construction approach that used social definition paradigm and focused on action/ activities, interaction and social construction, there was highly influential actor who produced and re-produced micro-structure (micro-subjective). Based on the idea, an alternative approach combining levels of analysis between macroscopic and microscopic approaches to develop meta-theory was needed.

Combined approach, according to Guba and Lincoln (1994:112-113), referred to an alternative approach called critical theory. In the context of investigation, the purpose of the approach was to investigate economic, political, social and cultural transformation that developed structural dynamics. On the other hand, in terms of knowledge, it involved structural and historical condition that changed due to structural dynamics formulated as the result of dialectics between the actor and the structure.

Harvey and MacDonald described the critical approach emphasized on the importance of the actor's limitation to analyze and take action due to the nature of the social world where he lived. Therefore, the approach encouraged people to pay attention to social context both historical social context and its correlation to social structure (Sugandi, 2002:111).

In line with Sugandi's idea, Guba and Lincoln (1994) mentioned that in order to understand the dialectics between the actors and the structure, one should conduct dialogue and combine both qualitative and quantitative approach for data analysis. Based on these ideas, the findings of the study had been analyzed based on the quantitative data in order to obtain deeper understanding of the qualitative analysis.

GAP IN INTER-REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The policy development that issued the zoning development model created the social gap between the development in the city (Sampit) and that in rural areas (hinterland), which was the community on the bank of Seruyan, Katingan and Mentaya rivers. The social gap was the impact of the zoning development model which adopted the model of economic growth by taking advantage of economic resources from outside to exploit natural resources.

In making decision, business people/ entrepreneurs who exploited the natural resources paid more attention to market mechanism and as the consequence, they considered the government would take care of any issues related to the society living around the areas where the natural resources were at. Consequently, capital flight where people living in the cities took advantage of economic surplus instead of the locals happened in Kotawaringin, a municipality in Central Kalimantan.

Such condition represented the government's failure in carrying out their functions to distribute the development program to rural areas in order to meet the local's expectation. The failure was closely related to the government orientation that emphasized on generating higher local revenue. It was also related to their effort to create trickle down effects from certain investment for the national development in order to improve the local economics.

The social gap was evident based on the income per capital of Kotawaringin Timur; it was 5,009,769 rupiahs. The income per capital of Barito Utara was 6,662,908 rupiahs. The Gross Regional Domestic Product of Barito Utara was 1,057,286 rupiahs or far lower than that of Kotawaringin Timur that was 2,643,431 rupiahs. As a matter of fact, Kotawaringin Timur contributed larger amount of local revenue compared to other municipalities; the municipality contributed 30% of the total local revenue of Central Kalimantan.

The gap was also represented by the Human Development Index (HDI) of Kotawaringin Timur. The HDI of the municipality was 65.3% or lower than that of Kapuas 72.1% and Palangkaraya (the city) (72.3%). Besides that, the economic structure relied heavily on the forest. 18.26% of the total contribution from agricultural sector of Kotawaringin Timur (48.41%) came from the forest. It showed how much dependence the government had towards the forest. As the result, the government overexploited the forest to generate more local revenue. It put aside human development through even distribution for developing the lives of the locals.

IMPACT OF FOREST DEVELOPING

The government as the agent to carry mandate from the citizen had the authority to grow nation's economy to improve the welfare of its people. However, the authority may also be violated by emphasizing on the interest of certain groups before the public interest.

The participation of the government to exploit the forest through the entrepreneurs increased foreign exchange tremendously, but at the same time put the society in disadvantageous position. The effect of forest exploitation was loss of income, deforestation, flood and landslide. In addition, some indigenous areas, sacred areas and cultural sites were damaged as the result of the exploitation.

It was concluded that, in general, the government had failed in carrying out their role as the agent of development since the growth of economy that focused on the free market went under control, accelerated environmental damage and put aside the public welfare. National development should emphasize on public welfare. Such orientation should be developed constantly to create independent society.

ETHNIC RESOURCE DISCREPANCY

Ethnic resource discrepancy was a part of development affecting the life of the Indonesian people extensively. All Indonesian citizens had the rights to live in Indonesia.

Migrant referred to a group of people who had huge motivation to improve their living standard in a place other than their hometown/ home country. Due to limited economic resource, some friction may appear between the locals and the migrants. In social interaction, some friction may appear since the locals and the migrant had different value and tradition. The friction may get worse when the migrant had certain privileges.

Based on political point of view, ethnic group was mobilized in order to support particular political elites who make use of differences between ethnic groups in order to strengthen ethnic identity and cultural barrier that set them apart. It would lead to wider social gap between ethnic groups and may result in ethnic conflict and violence.

Population in Kotawaringin Timur was distributed into three areas of development, namely the northern area of which center was the bank of Seruyan river, the central area of which center was the bank of Mentaya river and the southern area of which center was the bank of Katingan river. 50% of the population in Kotawaringin Timur lived along the bank of Mentaya River and Sampit became the center. 60% of the population in Sampit was Madurese, 20% was Banjarese, 10% was Javanese and the last 10% was Dayak people.

In terms of occupation, Madurese people dominated the economic sector in Sampit. 55% of them sold vegetables, fruit and meat. 80% of them worked in the harbor or construction workers. 80% of pedicab drivers and motorcycle taxi drivers were Madurese. 50% contractors were also Madurese. 55% of Madurese owned land transportation and 75% of them owned water transportation. Most of Banjarese people sold grocery or food while Javanese people had various type of business. Finally, 65% of Dayak people worked as government employees.

CULTURAL BARRIERS AND STRENGTHENING ETHNIC IDENTITY

It is expected that development as an agent of change created change of value in the form of integration of modern value into traditional value as adjustment towards the change. The modern value may be introduced to the society forcefully and as the result, it created response and disagreement from the society.

Since Indonesian people came from different ethnic group (plural society), social interaction did not mean having the same cultural value; social interaction should be in the form of simultaneous effort from Indonesian people to live side by side peacefully. Indonesian should keep a balance in the society. However, in such dynamic society, conformity should be kept and Indonesian people should be aware of cultural difference they had.

Cultural boundaries and ethnic identity appeared because cultural value that become the source of integration started to vanish. Economic pressure experienced by particular ethnic group created social discrepancy; the discrepancy triggered ethnic solidarity that strengthened ethnic identity and created cultural boundary in the interaction between ethnic groups.

The structural economic pressure, combined with discrepancy in terms of welfare between ethnic groups, would result in ethnic identity and cultural boundary that potentially created ethnic conflict and violence.

CONCLUSION

The finding of the study revealed the role of the government authority to manage the society. Such authority may create conflict and violence in ethnic conflict.

First, the actor does not try to find peaceful solution for the conflicting ethnic groups (technical condition); instead, they triggered the ethnic identity and widened the social discrepancy. The political actors and public organizations tend to find the flaw committed by the ethnic groups rather than re-organize limited natural resource management (political condition). They should respond to the complaint made by the public (social condition), instead of factually develop their organizations by creating cultural boundaries in each of the ethnic groups.

Secondly, different culture between ethnic groups was not the root of the problem. The major cause of the ethnic conflict and violence was difference created by the government that resulted in social and economic discrepancy between ethnic groups. The government even gave privilege to certain ethnic groups due to political interest. In other words, the government could not translate public interest well.

Ketiga, the public transformation was the reflection of public history in responding the problems they had encountered. The series of historical experience developed continuous collective consciousness by the emergence of movement to fight against economic and political pressure that reinforced and made adjustment towards ethnic/ cultural value. The findings corroborated with the findings of Castel and Alqadri's study about raising awareness of the inferiors to fight the dominant group that put them in disadvantageous position.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abdullah, Irwan. 2001. Penggunaan dan Penyalahgunaan Kebudayaan Indonesia : Kebijakan Negara dalam Pemecahan Masalah Konflik Etnis. *Antropologi Indonesia*, Vol.25, No.66
- [2]. Abdurahman 2002. Lembaga Kadamangan Di Kalimantan Tengah. *Mubes Damang Kepala Adat. Palangka Raya, June, 22-23.*
- [3]. Alqadrie, Syarif Ibrahim 2002. Pola Pertikaian Etnis Di Kalimantan Barat dan Faktor-faktor Sosial , Budaya, Ekonomi dan Politik yang Mempengaruhinya. *Percik, Seminar Internasional. Dinamika Politik Lokal di Indonesia*. Salatiga July 9 – 12
- [4]. ----- 1999. Konflik di Ambon dan Sambas. Suatu Tinjauan Sosiologis. *Antropologi Indonesia*, Th.XXIII No.58.
- [5]. Alvesson, Mats dan Skoldberg, Kaj 2000, *Reflexive Methodology, New Vistas for Qualitative Research*, Landon : Sage Publications.
- [6]. Barth, Frederik 1998. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Illinois : Waveland Press. Inc.
- [7]. -----,2000. Boundaries and Connection (dalam Anthony Cohen) *Signifying Identities. Anthropological Perspectif on Boundaries and Contested Value*. London and Newyork : Roudledge.
- [8]. .Castells, Manuel 1997. *The Power of Identity*. Massachusetts : Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- [9]. Chaniago, Andrinof 2001. *Gagalnya Pembangunan. Kajian Ekonomi Politik terhadap krisis Indonesia*. Jakarta : LP3 ES
- [10]. Cohen, Anthony 2000. *Signifying Identities. Anthropological Perspektif on Boundaries and Contested Values*. London and Newyork : Roudledge.
- [11]. Crawford, Beverly, 1998. *The Mith of "Ethnic Conflict" : Politics, Economics and Cultural Violence*. Berkeley : University of California.
- [12]. Collin, Finn 1997. *Social Reality*. London and New York ; Routledge.
- [13]. Coser, Lewis 1964. *The Functions of Social Conflict*. New York : The Free Press.
- [14]. Delanty, Gerard 1999. *Social Theory in a Change of Modernity*. Cambridge : Polity Press.
- [15]. Denzin Norman K dan Lincoln S.Yvonna 1994 *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London : Sage Publications
- [16]. Feagin 1996. *Radical and Ethnic Relations*, New Jersey : Printice Hall
- [17]. Galtung, Johan 1999. "Cultural Violence" dalam Steger dan Lind, *Violence and its Alternatives an Inter Disciplinary Reader*, New York : St. Martin's Press.
- [18]. Gidden,Anthony 1984. *The Constitution of Society : outline of The Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley : University of California.
- [19]. Gurr, Ted Robert 1970. *Why Men Rebel*, New Jersey : Princenton University Press
- [20]. Human Rights Watch 1998. *Konflik Etnis Di Kalimantan Barat* (translated by Herlan Artono). Jakarta: Institusi Studi Arus Informasi.
- [21]. Marzali, Amri 2001. Kekerasan Sosial Di Kalimantan: Sebuah Analisis Antropologi Sosialkultur", *Analisis CSIS*, Tahun XXX / 2001, No. 3.
- [22]. Masoed, Mochtar 2002. *Kekerasan Kolektif. Kondisi dan Pemicu*, Yogyakarta: P3PK UGM.
- [23]. Nitibaskara, 2000. Etnografi Kekerasan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Demokrasi dan HAM*, Vol.2, No. 1.
- [24]. Nordholt, Henk Schultc 2000. Geneologi Kekerasan. *Jurnal Demokrasi dan HAM*, Vol2, No 1
- [25]. O'Donnell, Guilermo dan Schmitter, Philippe C. (1995). "Transsition From Authoritarian Rule : Tentative Conclusions About Uncertain Democracies" dalam Nilj.Kritz (ed). *Tansitional Justice*. Washington : United States Institute of Peace Press.
- [26]. O'Donnel,Guillermo,A 1979. Modernization and Bureucratic Authoritarian: Studi in South American politics dalam R.William Liddle dan Sjaifrul Mujadi Islam,Kultur Politik,dan Demokrasi. *Jurnal Demokrasi dan HAM*. Vol.1 No.1.
- [27]. Pattiselanno, J.Th.F 1999. Tradisi Uli, Pela dan Gandong pada Masyarakat Seram, Ambon dan Uliase. *Antropologi Indonesia*, Th XXIII No.58
- [28]. Pelly, Usman 1999. Akar Kerusuhan Etnis di Indonesia. Suatu Kajian Awal Konflik dan Disintegrasi Nasional di Era Reformasi. *Antropologi Indonesia* Thn XXIII, No 58
- [29]. Ritzer, George 1996 *Modern Sociological Theory*. New York : The McGraw-Hill Companies, INC

- [30]. Ritzer, George dan Smart, Barry 2001 *Handbook of Social Theory*, London : Sage Publications Ltd.
- [31]. Satia, M. Riban 2001 Analisis Alternatif Kebijakan Resolusi Konflik Antara Etnik Dayak – Madura Di Sampit Kalimantan Tengah, *Thesis UGM* Yogyakarta.
- [32]. Smelser, Neil J. 1976. *The Theory Collective Behavior*. London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd.
- [33]. Steier, Fredrick 1991. *Research and Reflexivity*. London : SAGE Publications Ltd.
- [34]. Sudagung, Hendro Suroyo 2001. *Mengurai Pertikaian Etnis: Migrasi Etnis Madura ke Kalimantan Barat*, Jakarta : Institut Studi Arus Informasi.
- [35]. Sugandi, Yulia 2002. *Rekonstruksi Sosiologi Humanis Menuju Praksis*, Yogyakarta : Pustaka Pelajar.
- [36]. Suparlan, Parsudi 1999. Kemajemukan, Hipotesis Kebudayaan Dominan dan Kesukubangsaan. *Antropologi Indonesia*, Thn. XXIII, No.58.
- [37]. ----- 2001. Keyakinan Keagamaan dalam Konflik Antar Suku Bangsa, *Simposium Internasional Kedua, Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia*, Padang, July 18- 21 2001.
- [38]. Silverman, David 1993. *Interpretating Qualitative Data. Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interation*. London : Sage Publications Ltd.
- [39]. Turner, Jonathan H 1978. *The Structure of Sociological Theory*, Homewood : Dorsey
- [40]. Usop, KMA 1994. *Pakat Dayak. Sejarah Integrasi dan Jatidiri Masyarakat Dayak dan Daerah Kalimantan Tengah*, Yayasan Pendidikan Kebudayaan Batang Garing.
- [41]. Van Klinken Gerry 2002. Indonesia Ethnic Elite, (dalam Nordholt dan Abdulah, *Indonesia in Search of Transition*, Jakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [42]. Varshney, Ashutosh 2002. *Ethnic Conflict and Civil Life Hindus and Muslims in India*. New Haven & London. Yale University Press.
- [43]. Wilber, Charles K dan Jameson, Kennet P 1992. *The Political Economic of Development*, Singapura : Mc. Graw-Hill Inc.
- [44]. Wiyata, A, Latif 2002. *Carok, Konflik Kekerasan dan. Harga Diri Orang Madura*. Yogyakarta : LKiS.