



Within-Community Conflict on Mining Policy: Assessing Implication in Rural Indonesia

Laila Kholid Alfirdaus^{1*}, Teguh Yuwono, Hendra Ardianto, Dzunuwwanus Ghulam Manar

¹Universitas Diponegoro, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received February 17, 2023

Revised July 05, 2023

Accepted July 12, 2023

Available online August 31, 2023

Keywords:

Mining Policy; Development Policy;
Mining Conflict; Policy Argumentation,
Rural Community



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.
Copyright © 2023 by Author. Published by Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

ABSTRACT

The case of Kendeng, Rembang regency, Central Java, due to the expansion of cement factory buildings in Tuban and Gresik East Java, has led to conflict not only between the community and policymakers but also between community members. This paper discusses the fragmentation in the community by mapping argumentation behind pro and contra the policy. Based on research during 2018-2019, applying desk study, interviews, and direct observation, this paper identifies that the conflict has led to the social grouping into pro-, anti-cement, and neutral people, which impacted the daily social life of the community. The grouping has created tension in daily social relationships, creating fragmentation among the village community members. The case allows us to reflect more on the need for the policy to be aware of the social impact of a development policy within the community; moreover, for rural communities, the neighborhood is a crucial institution for them.

1. INTRODUCTION

The coming of extractive company in a rural area is responded differently by the community (Basedau & Roy, 2020). In some areas, people are enthusiastic because they have expectation for the bettering off their daily income by working in the company. In the other parts, disagreement among local people to whether accept or not the company is not rare to happen either due to economic, environmental, and/or cultural reasons. While, some studies tend to discuss inter-relationships between community and the company (Basedau & Roy, 2020; Crost & Felter, 2020; Faruque, 2018; Taabazuing, Luginaah, Djietror, & Otiso, 2012), or between community and the government, who used to be depicted as the back-up of the company (Banks, 2008; Horowitz, 2009), this study tries to identify conflict within community in the rural areas through the competing discourse of against and pro the policy.

As some scholars argue, community does not always have one voice in responding to mining-based development (Welker, 2014). In Welker's study, community battles to win Newmont's sub-contracted and/or Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)-related projects. This study sees the conflict in the establishment of a state-owned cement factory, namely PT. Semen Indonesia. Discussing community conflict within their internal environment is interesting to further trace how this brings implication on village's 'new' social structure, which is formed based on community members' view towards the establishment and operation planning of the cement company.

This paper refers to a case in mining policy from Rembang regency, Central Java Province, Indonesia. The case deals with cement factory establishment. The name of the company is PT. Semen Indonesia, a state-owned company, which produces cement as its main activity. The location of the cement factory to be established is in the mountainous areas of Kendeng in Rembang regency, one of the poorest regencies in the province. Based on data from the Rembang Statistics Bureau, the population of the regency in 2017 was 628,901, the width of the area is 1014.08 km², and the poverty rate in 2018 was 15.41 percent (2018). As the national poverty rate was less than 10 percent in 2018, the percentage is considered high in the country.

*Corresponding author

E-mail addresses: alfirdaus_laila@yahoo.com

The coverage area for the cement factory involves four villages in the Gunem subdistricts including Kajar, Timbrangan, Tegaldowo, and Pasucen, and one village in the Bulu sub-district, Kadiwono. Among these villages, Timbrangan and Tegaldowo were the most affected because their populations live closest to the company when compared to the other villages. As in other Rembang regencies, most of the population in these villages are traditional Muslim, with a lack of formal education, and they live as farmers or small traders. If approved for operation, the company expects to produce up to three million tons of cement annually.

Regarding the cement factory establishment planning, the community is divided into three different positions, including the supporters, the protesters, and those who do not openly support or oppose the policy. The division leads to social categorization based on pro, anti, and neutral. The “pro” one is those who support the cement factory establishment because they believe the development will improve local economy. The “anti” one is those who oppose the development policy, mainly because of the impacts they are anticipating following the factory’s operations. The “neutral” one is those who did not express their positions towards the conflict, mainly because they avoided to have a conflict with their own neighbors. Despite the grouping, what interesting in this case is the way community members construct their argumentation to agree, disagree or abstain the development planning, which this paper is trying to identify.

Despite the use of simple language, as well as daily examples and analogies in constructing their argumentation in the discourse battle, elaboration of the issue led us to the notion that the community’s interests towards mining vary and somehow lead to social divide (Gallemore, Harianson, & Moeliono, 2014). While the pro perspective is close to the arguments of the corporation and the local government, the anti/con is closer to the views of NGO activists and environmentalists. The perspective of the pro, indeed, is related to dominant views, while the con’s is identical to a counter-discourse in the grass-roots community, or Faruque’s term is called sub-altern (2018).

Some researchers have found that areas with resource policy tend to be more prone to conflict than those without resource policy (Crost & Felter, 2020; Lavaux, 2016; Paivi Lujala, 2009; Päivi Lujala, Gleditsch, & Gilmore, 2005; Ross, 2006; Ross, 2003, and Ross, 2015). Most of these studies discuss the heightening conflicts in areas rich with resources in various kinds (oil, diamonds, gold, coal, chopper, and so forth). Ross (2006), Lavaux (2016) and Lujala (2005) for instance see that high value resources like oil and diamond extraction are associated with high risk of conflict. While others see that other kind of resources, as gold and gas, equally have potential for causing conflicts (Aspinall, 2017; Karim, 2012). All these studies contribute to the enrichment of information on various kind, degree and scope of conflicts in natural resource rich countries and regions.

However, how conflict happens within the internal community in smaller scopes also need for further elaboration. As a matter of fact, the most difficult battles for people are not only with the state, corporations, and academicians, but also with their fellow neighbors. Battling against their fellow neighbors who support the mining initiative is no less challenging than pushing the state or corporations to postpone the project. This is because neighbors are used to being partners in social activities. Moreover, for rural people who are used to living in a *gemeinschaft* society (Tönnies, 2001) and practicing organic solidarity (Durkheim, 1984), neighbors are an inseparable part of daily life for mutual sharing and helping each other. Therefore, scrutinizing the conflict in a grass-roots community is intriguing.

2. METHODS

This research is based on fieldwork that apply in-depth interviews and direct observation during February-June in 2018. Interviews were conducted with community members that are pro, against and neutral to the planning of cement factory establishment, community leaders, local legislature member, and local government. In total there are 30 informants. Interviews with informants from various backgrounds are meant to enable researchers gather various perspectives, which is useful for triangulation processes (data cross-checking). The research collected data from interview and observation results, which then were analyzed applying interpretive methods, based on interview transcript and observation notes analysis. By scrutinizing conflict within community, it is expected that the roots, networks, and argumentation the community members build to retain their position will be identified.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Conflict over the cement factory establishment policy have been happening since the mid-2000s follows (see Table 1). The debate has heated up ever since the project milestone was enunciated in early

2014. Despite strong protest, the regency government insisted on officially inaugurating the factory building on 16 June 2014, as reported by Merdeka, an online newspaper that highlighted local community's protest on 13 April 2016. To current time, the project has not run smoothly because some local community members sued the government for having a flawed mining license. The license was formalized through the Governor's Decision Letter No 660.1/30/2016 about Environmental License for Mining Activities. Interestingly, the Supreme Court accepted the lawsuit in October 2016 and forced the government to cancel the project by issuing Decision No. 99 PK/TUN/2016. The protests continue because the provincial government refuses to obey the Supreme Court's decision. They argued the Supreme Court's decision is no longer applicable for the changing legal subject. Close to the deadline of the Supreme Court's letter No 99 PK/TUN/2016, the company changed its name from PT. Semen Gresik to PT. Semen Indonesia and reduced the company's coverage area from 1800 to 860 and 520 hectares. With these changes, the provincial government argued that the Supreme Court's letter was no longer applicable, and thus, for them, it was justifiable for the company not to stop operationalization. The governor of Central Java province later renewed the license by issuing Governor's Decision Letter No. 660.1/6/2017 on mining licenses dated 23 February 2017 to legalize the company's operationalization. WALHI, a national environmental NGO, and the local community sued the decision letter once again through the Court of the State's Administration (Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara/PTUN) in Semarang, but the lawsuit was rejected. This rejection meant that the governor won the charged case. With the Governor's Decision Letter, which is strengthened by the High Court's decision, the provincial government claimed that the operation of PT. Semen Indonesia is legal.

Table 1. Chronology of the Conflict

Timeframe	Conflict Chronology
Early 2000s	Rumour about cement mining in Kendeng mountain areas widespread between communities in Rembang and Pati
Mid 2000s	Cement mining was planned in Pati and pushed conflict
2009	Cement mining planning in Pati was cancelled
2010-2014	Cement mining site plan was moved to Rembang
2014	Project milestone enunciated in Rembang
2014-2016	Local community sued the government due to flawed license
Early 2016	The license of PT. Semen Indonesia for mining was formalized through the Governor's Decision Letter No 660.1/30/2016 about Environmental License for Mining Activities
Mid of 2016	As per October 2016, the Supreme Court accepted the lawsuit and forced the government to cancel the project through Decision No. 99 PK/TUN/2016
End of 2016	The governor Central Java province rejected to obey the Supreme Court's decision by arguing the decision was no longer applicable due to the changing of legal object of the letter through the change of the name of the company and the coverage area of the project
Early 2017	The issuance of Governor's Decision Letter No. 660.1/6/2017 on mining licenses dated 23 February 2017 to legalize the company's operationalization
Mid of 2017	The 1 and 2nd Strategic Environmental Studies (KLHS) was conducted with the inconclusive result and the national government's decision
2018	The 2 nd KLHS studies conducted
2018 onwards	Unclear decision of the project

Although Central Java governor insisted to continue the project, community's protests did not stop. Supported by their fellow regency neighbors from Pati, people from Rembang even visited Jakarta to communicate their protests to the President. In response to the continuing protests, the President of the Republic of Indonesia, Joko "Jokowi" Widodo, instructed the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources to conduct strategic environmental studies (Kajian Lingkungan Hidup Strategis/KLHS) to recommend whether the project should continue. The first study was completed in 2017 and specifically included Rembang as the location of mining. Dozens of scholars from various disciplines (environment, agriculture, economics, and social science) were involved in the study. After months of field research and analysis, the study concluded that mining activity in the area is not recommended for long-term economic, social, and environmental considerations.

Meanwhile, a second study covered all regencies including the mountainous areas in Kendeng, Tuban and Bojonegoro in East Java province, and Rembang, Blora, Pati, and Grobogan in the Central Java province. The second study was completed in 2018. This study did not recommend anything, but it asserted that crucial environment degradation exists in the Kendeng mountainous areas due to residential building, infrastructure development, and mining activities, within which the cement industry is included. Since the completion of the second study, there has still been no follow up from the government, making the future of the cement factory project uncertain.

Within-Community Conflict on Cement Mining Policy

During the up and down processes as explained above, conflict remains compelling to follow. On the pro-cement factory building (“pro-cement”) side, the players are the provincial government, the regency government, the sub-district government, some of the village government (Tegaldowo area), the company (PT. Semen Indonesia), some local community members (in Tegaldowo and Timbrangan) and some academicians from Diponegoro University, the State University of Semarang, Universitas Gadjah Mada, and the Technology Institute of Bandung. Meanwhile, on the anti-cement factory building (“anti-cement”) side, there are some local community members from Tegaldowo and Timbrangan, JMPPK (Jaringan Masyarakat Peduli Pegunungan Kendeng, the Network of People Who Care About the Kendeng Mountainous Area), WALHI (a national environmental NGO), LBH (Lembaga Bantuan Hukum, a non-profit legal assistance organization), university students, academicians from Universitas Gadjah Mada, Diponegoro University, Universitas Pembangunan National Veteran, and several other environmental NGOs. Based on media research and in-depth interviews, the areas of the argumentations being debated between the state, corporations, and the anti-cement community (consisting of NGOs and the local community) can be clustered into economy, environment, and politics.

On the side of the economy, both the regency and provincial government argue that they need a cement factory. They are concerned with the issue of poverty in the regency and the establishment of a cement factory, to them, is a catalyst to absorb unemployment and transform it into employment that will raise wages and decrease poverty (based on Interviews with government officers in March 2018 in Rembang) can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Position of Community

Issue	Pro-cement	Neutral	Anti-cement
Dominant Backgrounds	Teachers, Village, Religious Scholars	Lay Citizen, Village Government Apparatus, Religious Scholars	Farmers, Village Activists, Village Government Apparatus, Religious Scholars
Position	Project planning is good. It gives more advantages than the disadvantages.	We are not involved in the tension. We prioritize social harmony. There are drawbacks and advantages of the project equally.	The project does not give advantage to society. It will bring some drawbacks in the future.
Economy	Cement factory absorbed employment. Unemployment looks to decrease.	Some people may be able to get employed by the factory, but not all.	People re comfortable to work as farmers.
Environment	There has been a study proving that water supply is not affected. Cement factory has proven that their activity is safe for environment.	Anti-cement concerns on environment can be understood.	Facilities built by the company does not help to reduce environmental risks. The dust and water supply and quality have been problematic.
Politics	The government in regency and provincial level has facilitated dialogues. Governor, the head of regency government, even the Minister of State-owned Enterprises, including national parliamentary members have visited the community. As the company is state-owned, it must be built for the interests of the state, the public, unlike private companies.	The role of the government has not been significant. There is no clear follow up after the meeting with them.	All the local government heads (in regency and provincial level) are already pro-cement. They are manipulative. They backed the establishment of cement industry in this village. They never meet us.
Cultural/Religious View towards Cement Factory Building Planning	We are not afraid of the environmental risks because we have faith to Allah (God Almighty).	If cement factory establishment, then it is what Allah wanted. If not, it is not what He wanted.	We have reminded our fellow neighbors, and because they do not listen to us, we pray to Allah to send them reminder directly.

Below is interview with the government officers in the regency government.

"The area where the cement was supposed to operate is known to be amongst the poor. Rembang regency itself was also categorized as poor region in Central Java. The coming of the cement company is expected to lift up regency's economy. The government sees the planning as a miracle and the problem solver for the stagnancy of poverty problems in the regency" (An officer in regency government).

This view is supported by the company, which believes that their presence in Rembang will contribute to local development, not only through employment, but also through Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (Interviews with government officer in March 2018 in Rembang).

"This is very good opportunity. The operation of the factory can bring domino effect for the community surrounding the factory, as through CSR fund, so the local economy can grow better." (Another officer in regency government).

Instead of taking the argument for granted, the anti-cement community refutes the argument by saying that cement factory does not transform unemployment through absorption, but rather it causes loss of employment because it destroys the forests, agriculture, and springs that form the source of the community's life (Interview with a farmer on February 2018 in Rembang).

"Who says cement factory creat employment. It caused us lost of jobs due to the reduction of farming areas" (A farmer in Tegaldowo)

On the side of the environment, the regency and provincial government argue that a cement factory is environmentally friendly and safe, as explained in the regency government's website. The company explains that the company adopts safe mining technology with zero runoff to avoid flooding and by establishing a greenbelt to minimize pollution (as explained in Semen Indonesia's website). However, for the anti-cement community, all these arguments are just non-sense. For them, people do not need cement. They, instead, need water (Interview with anti-cement activist in March 2018 in Rembang).

"We grow corn, paddies, and vegetables. What we need to support our economy is water to support our farming activities, not cement factory, that will bring impact on the loss of water sources." (A farmer in Tegaldowo).

On the side of politics, the provincial and regency governments argue that it is common in policy making to expose disagreement. For them, sometimes people do not understand the policy. The movement protesting against the cement factory establishment policy, itself, is not original. They are driven from outside (as reported by Tirto on 4 January 2017). The company argues that they do not violate the law. They will obey whatever the law decides regarding the cement factory establishment (as explained in Semen Indonesia's website). For the anti-cement community, the policy is not deliberative. They are never involved or invited in the discussions of establishing a cement factory. There has even been unclear and limited information since the beginning stages of the cement factory planning (Concluded from interview with an activist in March 2018 in Rembang).

"What made me very disappointed is there is transparency of information. Somebody came to our village and said he was interested to buy our land for his agriculture business, while convinced us that while he was preparing for his business, we can still cultivate our land. So, we happy hearing that, because we can gain the cash, but still can harvest the planting. In fact, it is for cement mining." (A landowner)

In addition, the government seemingly serves elite politicians and the company. The local government and the company also cheat the law (Interview with an activist in May 2018 in Rembang).

"We just knew that our sold land is not for agribusiness way later on, and we got mad at the politician. We feel manipulated." (A landowner)

"The process is not transparent. The company through the provincial government cheated the law." (An activist)

Finally, concerning the neighbors that support the policy, they argue it is because their neighbors do not understand the risk and have a short-term orientation (Interview with an activist in March 2018 in Rembang).

"We realized that our neighbors who support the mining do not understand the risks. They were tempted by short-term material benefit." (A farmer opposing the cement mining)

Interestingly, the debate between the state and corporation with the anti-cement community exactly reflects the debate within the community. The state is supposed to be the policy maker, corporations are the investors that run businesses, and the community is the policy beneficiary. The relationships between the three actors are more political than social and personal. Debates, as such, were also found among local community members at the grass-roots level. What makes discourse or argumentation between the state and corporations vis-à-vis the community and within the community different is that the first do not get involved in social and personal relationships. The relationships that connect the state, corporations, and community are more political (formal and legal) and economic. Meanwhile, relationships within and among the communities are social and sometimes personal. With the government planning to establish a cement factory in the villages, argumentative disputes over mining policies are unavoidable, which influence the community's daily social relationships.

Based on in-depth interviews completed during field research in 2018, this paper identifies at least three positions exposed by the community in response to the government's plan to establish a cement factory. The first position is that of the supporters of the cement factory establishment, or pro-cement. The dominant backgrounds of the members of this group are teachers, officials and representatives of the village government apparatus, religious scholars, and local businessmen. In this category, people believe that establishing a cement factory will bring positive results now and in the future. They are not afraid of the environmental risks of the cement factory operations because they believe the company will tackle them with its advanced technology. They are involved in a public strike supporting the government and against the anti-cement supporters. The second includes the protesters of the cement factory establishment. The backgrounds of these group members include farming, village activists, officials and representatives of the village government apparatus, and religious scholars. They do not believe that social welfare will automatically improve based on establishing a cement factory. They have strong concerns about the impact on the environment. The final position contains those who claim themselves to be neutral. In this case, there are people within this group who claim to be neutral, but also admit that the cement industry will bring more advantages than disadvantages. However, this group does not actively confront the anti-cement supporters. There are also others who can understand the protest from the environmental point of view. This group chooses not to get involved in public strikes. The backgrounds of these group members are lay citizens, officials and representatives of the village government apparatus, and religious scholars. Usually, people like this have great concern on social cohesion because they believe a healthy neighborhood, especially in rural areas, is vital.

What is interesting is the way pro-cement people see the impacts of establishing a cement factory establishment in nearly the same way as the elites (corporation, district and provincial governments, and national NGOs) see the project. For the pro-cement community, the project planning is generally seen as good. They believe it gives more advantages than the disadvantages. For the anti-cement community, the project does not give advantages to society, and it will bring some drawbacks in the future. For the neutral position, the cement factory establishment project must have equal drawbacks and advantages. They claim not to want to get involved in the tension because they prioritize social harmony.

In terms of economy, the pro-cement community sees the potential of the cement factory to spur employment. They saw that during the establishment of the factory, about 5000 workers were employed. People were also attracted to work in low-level positions in the company because it gave them monthly salaries; something village farmers did not have. For the anti-cement community, working as a farmer creates prosperity. The establishment of a cement factory, conversely, potentially reduces the productivity of rice fields. Meanwhile, the neutral people realize that although the factory may provide jobs for the village community, not all people can or will be hired. In terms of environment, the pro-cement community asserted that a study has proved that the water supply will not be affected. The cement factory has proven that their activity is safe for the environment. Meanwhile, the anti-cement community disagrees with that and says that the facilities built by the company do not help reduce environmental risks. The dust, along with water supply and quality, have been problematic. Those who are neutral said that the environmental concerns of the anti-cement groups are understandable. Finally, related to politics, the pro-cement community said that both local and provincial levels of government had facilitated dialogues. The Governor, Regent, and even the Minister of state-owned enterprises, as well as national parliamentary members, have visited the community. As the company is state-owned, the pro-cement community believes that it must be built for the interests of the state and the public, unlike private companies that focus more on private interests. Conversely, the anti-cement community said that all the local government heads (at the regency and provincial levels) are already pro-cement, manipulative, and backed the establishment of the cement industry in this village. Because they have dissenting opinions, the local government heads never show their willingness to listen to them. Meanwhile, for the neutral ones, they realize that the role of government has

not been significant in mediating pro and anti-cement views. According to them, there has been no clear follow up after meeting with them in the early phases of factory establishment planning.

Interestingly, all groups have their respective religious views toward the cement factory establishment policy. All the community groups believe that what happens to them in relation to the cement factory is the will of God. The pro-cement community said that there is nothing to be afraid of relating to the environmental risks of the cement factory because they believe in Allah. In other words, if we believe in Allah, whatever happens, Allah is giving us the best. Conversely, what the anti-cement community said is response to this is.

"We have reminded our fellow neighbors, and because they do not listen to us, we pray to Allah to send them reminders directly." Meanwhile, the neutral people said that if the cement factory is established, then it is what Allah wanted. If not, it is not what He wanted." (A farmer anti-cement mining)

As we can see from the above discussion, the issues being debated are diverse and cover issues ranging from the economy to the environment and religion. However, what is interesting is not only related to the range of issues being debated in the conflict at the grass-roots level, but the way people see others is no less crucial. The following part more deeply discusses this matter.

Conflict Implication in on Community's Daily Relationships

What this part seeks to do is not only to identify argumentations proposed by each party in response to the establishment of a cement factory and operation planning. It also tries to trace how each community group sees the perspectives and stances of the other groups. The way each group sees the other reflects the power dynamics in policy debate at the grass-roots level.

Dealing with the first, this article identifies inter-group responses from pro to anti-cement and vice versa, as well as from neutral to pro and anti-cement. Interestingly, there are relatively no significant responses identified from the pro and anti-cement groups towards the neutral group. The first question proposed to informants was related to their understanding of the other groups' stances toward local government policy on cement factory establishment planning. In this regard, both pro-cement and neutral groups had the same answer that was that the anti-cement community refuses the plan because of concern for the environmental damage as an impact of the mining industry activities. Dust and water supply pollution/depletion are among the crucial issues identified as greatest concern for the anti-cement group. Likewise, the anti-cement and neutral groups are aware of why some of their neighbors support the cement project. They realize there is an issue of the village's economic development, welfare, and employment opportunities that have long been a problem in the area that are now the concern of the pro-cement community.

The next important question to identify relates to whether a group's argument is sensible for another group in the community. For the pro-cement people, anti-cement's refusal of the project planning just publicly shows their lack of knowledge. According to the pro-cement community, the cement company has answered the anti-cement environmental concerns, for example, by building a greenbelt to filter and reduce dust pollution. Strengthening the position of the pro-cement community, the neutral group asserts that the cement company has given the village people many things including infrastructure, schools, food staples, medical check-ups, and so forth. Conversely, for the anti-cement community, the pro-cement group is not aware of the real politics. For them, the pro-cement group is not aware of the risks of mining. For them, cement will not improve society's welfare, but rather only makes politicians richer. Interestingly, the neutral group shares the same concern. One informant, who said that he is neutral in this case, asserts that he understands the anti-cement group's environmental concerns and that they share the same fear.

There is a tendency for each group, especially the pro and anti-cement groups, to belittle the other group's strength. According to the pro-cement group, there are not that many anti-cement members. They saw that many who used to be against the cement factory changed their stance because they needed jobs and saw that the company brought advantages to society. Meanwhile, the anti-cement group claims that the number of people who are anti-cement is significant. They said that those people are aware of the environment and their land. However, just because they are paid, or follow their relatives, they do not speak up. Among the neutral people, the number of people who are either pro-cement or anti-cement is actually not many. Most of them chose to quit because they do not want to get involved in the dispute.

In terms of orientation, for pro-cement people, the anti-cement group always looks to talk about long-term orientation and environmental preservation, however, as they think that the project is impossible to postpone, they optimally want to press the company to maximize social development contributions. Conversely, for the anti-cement people, the pro-cement group only looks for today's benefit, which is short-term oriented. The pro-cement group, according to anti-cement people, do not think of tomorrow for their

descendants. Meanwhile, for neutral people, the anti-cement community is never willing to negotiate; therefore, it is difficult to build an agreement or middle way between them and the pro-cement group.

Another absorbing issue to elaborate is the perception of the motive of each group, whether for or against the project. Pro-cement people do not believe the anti-cement movement is genuine or coming from a true awareness of environmental degradation. For them, the anti-cement community only wanted the land back that was sold to support the establishment of the company. Additionally, for pro-cement people, the anti-cement group needed jobs, but they were too shy to admit it. Alternately, for anti-cement people, the pro-cement group supports the company just to get money. According to them, the cement company paid pro-cement people every time they went to the capital city to participate in pro-cement strikes as a public proxy to show that not all the people in the village agree with the protest. For neutral people, the pro-cement group has high expectations to get jobs in the cement company, but, it is not easy because the company requires highly skilled workers.

Further, relating to the issue of autonomy, pro-cement people believe that the anti-cement group is driven by outside actors, perhaps it is national NGOs or a community organization in Pati called JMPPK (Jaringan Masyarakat Pecinta Pegunungan Kendeng) that had a similar experience some years ago in protesting against a cement company. Thus, for them, the anti-cement movement is not an independent movement. For the pro-cement community, the participation by some people in their village in the anti-cement movement is just motivated by familial or neighborhood relationships (groupthink). They would feel awkward if not actively supporting their relatives and neighbors in the movement. On the other hand, the anti-cement community sees that pro-cement people are backed by the company. The fact that there is no movement from them today is enough for the anti-cement people to prove that the company no longer gives them material support. Meanwhile, the movement against the cement factory establishment and operation never stops. Anti-cement people claim that they know exactly what is happening behind the establishment of the cement factory, they said:

"There are too many manipulations in the process. We must stop this" (Anti-cement group).

Further, pro-cement people also see that anti-cement people are mostly not real farmers. They are labor in rice-fields, which implies that they do not have direct interest and competence to reject the policy. Similarly, anti-cement people also see that pro-cement people are not true farmers. Most of them, according to the anti-cement community, are teachers or from the village government apparatus. For the anti-cement community, if the pro-cement group consisted of real farmers, they would struggle for the sustainability of their land, environment, and freshwater springs.

Finally, related to social life, pro-cement people tend to see that the anti-cement group is exclusive. They said, "We, as the supporters of the cement company, have no problem with them. We feel we have already won (the case)." In addition, they also criticize their female neighbors who are involved in the anti-cement movement because there were found to change their daily appearance from wearing a veil or hijab (as an identifier of being Muslim) to wearing black Javanese clothes, adopting the Samin tribe identity (a traditional tribe in Pati regency), who succeeded in kicking PT. Semen Indonesia out of their land. They also pointed out an activist who married a Samin girl, but with unclear tradition, specifically as to whether it was done the Islamic way or not. Conversely, anti-cement people say that they are excluded. They said:

"We were not invited when a pro-cement neighbor had a commemoration. Yet, we keep trying to maintain good relationships with neighbors." (An anti-cement group)

Dealing with black Javanese clothes, they answer that:

"We do not leave our faith. We pray and recite the Qur'an every Friday, as do the other community members. We dress in black in solidarity with our fellow farmers who share the same environmental concerns with us." (Anti-cement woman)

Meanwhile, according to the neutral group, tension was strong previously and people not directly supporting or opposing the project were always afraid of violent conflict breaking out in their village. In their opinion, both parties strongly insisted on their arguments. Now, things are better because people from both parties are willing to attend social events together. Even so, they believe that nothing will be the same as in previous times.

The changing relationships between the people in the two villages in Rembang (Tegaldowo and Timbrangan) that have different political stances on the planning and establishment of a cement factory (pro and anti-cement) reflect the significant influence of the grass-roots mining policy argumentations on

social cohesion. In fact, a neighborhood is the key for the village people to do their daily activities through mutual sharing and help (*gotong royong*).

When asked about whether there has been dialogue between pro and anti-cement groups, informants from both sides explain that it is impossible. One informant said:

"It is impossible because people have said pokoke ("must," meaning "must continue or must stop"). If people do not want to sit together to engage in dialogue, an agreement, or at least an understanding, will not be reached," (an interview with a village leader in February 2018 in Rembang).

One informant said:

"People gather in warung kopi, share their views and discuss the other groups' perspective on cement. In previous years, warung kopi had even been divided into warung pro or anti-cement." (A neutral group)

Another informant said:

"Today, the situation is better. People from both sides are willing to fulfil neighbors' invitations even if they have different positions on the cement issue. Nevertheless, I think things will never be the same again." (A village activist).

Given that the government has not yet made a clear decision on the cement company after the second environmental study was completed in 2018, it seems as if the argumentation battle will continue soon, although perhaps without the strong social tension that emerged in previous times. Responding to the social dynamics as discussed above, it is then crucial for the policy makers to consider thoroughly the implication of their decision making towards mining that will change social structure in society. Otherwise, community will always be in a weak position in that matter, because whether they agree or disagree with the project, they will have to face hard relationships with their surrounding neighbors. From the discussion above, we can see that conflict within community on mining policy is often unavoidable in the context of mining policy. This is what policy makers often do not consider when pushing the community to approve their plan to mine the location surrounding the community's areas. In the academic discussion, conflict within community as happened in Rembang is also often overlooked, that conflict is often explained as in binary explanation, as between the community and the company or the community and the government.

The experience of the Rembang community in the case of the cement factory establishment and operation has shown us interesting dynamics of discursive politics at the rural level conflict. As in the case of Rembang, the community's role is not only important in political participation, in the sense of being informed about and involved in policy making, but also in the discursive process of questioning why they should agree or disagree and in rejecting the definition of development (Hilhorst, 2003) put forth by the company and the local government. Despite the use of daily forums, as in *warung*, and simple language to construct, disseminate, and maintain the alternate development argumentation in the community, based on the Rembang experience, we can see that community may be in conflict due to government's lack of policy transparency, yet, community also can play a crucial role in the formation of alternate views in policy making.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the study we conducted, the conflict due to mining policy planning, can happen for several reasons. First, community has different interest dealing with mining. There is difference amongst community in seeing whether mining can result higher benefits or risks for them. Those who can get involved in supplying raw materials or taking part in the project are often amongst the supporter of the policy. Meanwhile, those who lost their land or bought with the very low price and get manipulated, are amongst those opposing the policy. Second, the conflict can also happen due to differences in perceiving environmental impacts of the mining activities, although this is clearly related to the first point mentioned above, namely interest. Based on our research findings in Rembang, we can see that argumentation battle is open to parties affected by the policies. Another issue needs to consider is how the conflict and discourse making in community affects daily relationship. As in the case of Rembang, people's daily life is deeply affected by the conflict, and that they were later segregated based on their views towards the mining policy. For rural community, in which neighborhood is crucial in supporting daily life, fragmented neighborhood really matters in disrupting the social cohesion. In this regard, there seems to be a little concern of policy makers to consider implication of their development plan on social life. Social impact is not what policy makers truly look when imposing policy in grassroot level.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors would like to thank Ministry of Education, and Diponegoro University, especially Faculty of Social and Political Science for providing funding for conducting this research. Appreciation is also directed to all informants, who have willingness to share their thoughts and experiences during field work.

6. REFERENCES

- Aspinall, E. (2017). The Construction of Grievance: Natural Resources and Identity in a Separatist Conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 51(6), 950–972. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002707307120>
- Banks, G. (2008). Understanding “resource” conflicts in Papua New Guinea. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 49(1), 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8373.2008.00358.x>
- Basedau, M., & Roy, V. (2020). Sleep, bark, or bite: Do natural resources make the difference regarding peaceful or violent conflict? *International Area Studies Review*, 23(1), 73–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2233865919895859>
- Crost, B., & Felter, J. H. (2020). Extractive resource policy and civil conflict: Evidence from mining reform in the Philippines. *Journal of Development Economics*, 144, 0–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2020.102443>
- Durkheim, E. (1984). *On the Division of Labor in Society*. *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* (Vol. 3). London: Macmillan.
- Faruque, M. O. (2018). Mining and subaltern politics: political struggle against neoliberal development in Bangladesh. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 26(1), 65–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02185377.2017.1384928>
- Gallemore, C. T., Harianson, R. D. P., & Moeliono, M. (2014). Discursive barriers and cross-scale forest governance in central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Ecology and Society*, 19(2). <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-06418-190218>
- Hilhorst, D. (2003). *The Real World of NGOs: Discourses, diversity and development*. Zed Books. London: Zed Books. Retrieved from http://books.google.co.uk/books/about/The_real_world_of_NGOs.html?id=kRAFAQAIAAJ&pgis=1
- Horowitz, L. S. (2009). Environmental violence and crises of legitimacy in New Caledonia. *Political Geography*, 28(4), 248–258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2009.07.001>
- Karim, D. B. (2012). Whose development? The Need for Conflict-Sensitive Development in Papua, Indonesia. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 7(1), 95–100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15423166.2012.719407>
- Lavaux, S. (2016). Natural resources and conflict in Colombia, 62(1), 19–30.
- Lujala, Paivi. (2009). Deadly combat over natural resources: Gems, petroleum, drugs, and the severity of armed civil conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 53(1), 50–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002708327644>
- Lujala, Päivi, Gleditsch, N. P., & Gilmore, E. (2005). A diamond curse? Civil war and a lootable resource. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 49(4), 538–562. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002705277548>
- Ross, M. (2006). A closer look at oil, diamonds, and civil war. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9, 265–300. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.9.081304.161338>
- Ross, M. L. (2003). Oil, drugs, and diamonds: How do natural resources vary in their impact on civil war. In K. Ballentine & J. Sherman (Eds.), *The political economy of armed conflict: Beyond greed ...* (pp. 47–67). London: Lynne Rienner Publisher. Retrieved from [http://www.libertyparkusafd.org/Hale/Special Reports%5CNatural Resource Wars%5COil Drugsand Diamonds -- Resource Wars.pdf](http://www.libertyparkusafd.org/Hale/Special%20Reports%5CNatural%20Resource%20Wars%5COil%20Drugs%20and%20Diamonds%20--%20Resource%20Wars.pdf)
- Ross, M. L. (2015). What have we learned about the resource curse? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18, 239–259. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-052213-040359>
- Taabazuing, J., Luginaah, I., Djietror, G., & Otiso, K. M. (2012). Mining, conflicts and livelihood struggles in a dysfunctional policy environment: The case of Wassa West District, Ghana. *African Geographical Review*, 31(1), 33–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19376812.2012.690089>
- Tönnies, F. (2001). *Community and Civil Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Welker, M. (2014). *Enacting the corporation: An American mining firm in post-authoritarian Indonesia*. *Enacting the Corporation: An American Mining Firm in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.