

Conflict, political ecology and dilemma of reclamation: Analysis of power relation on Bay reclamation in capital city

Elok F. Mutia ^{1*}

¹ Independent Researcher; Central Jakarta, 10430, Indonesia

* Correspondence: efmutia@gmail.com

Received Date: Nov. 26, 2023

Revised Date: Dec. 12, 2023

Accepted Date: Jan. 20, 2024

Cite This Article:

Mutia, E. F. (2024). Conflict, political ecology and dilemma of reclamation: Analysis of power relation on Bay reclamation in capital city. *Interaction, Community Engagement, and Social Environment*, 1(2), 82-93. <https://doi.org/10.61511/icese.v1i2.2024.489>



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Abstract

The issue of the Jakarta Bay reclamation originated from conflict between two groups, institutions who support and reject the project. This shows that there are problems regarding the policies issued. Through political ecology, this research aims to explain the power relation conflict in Jakarta Bay Reclamation. Descriptive qualitative design is used in this study to clarify the phenomena both structurally and deductively. Through in-depth interviews, the data and information analysis results were gathered, as well as studies and policy analysis. The research will deeply elaborate on influence of power relations that shape Government policies' intricate planning and management of Jakarta Bay Reclamation.

Keywords: conflict; Jakarta Bay; reclamation; political ecology

1. Introduction

The issue of the Jakarta Bay reclamation that involves government institutions, the central government and the province of DKI Jakarta, does not only question who is authorized to make decisions, perform management, implementation and supervision tasks, but there are also differences in knowledge or point of view of the benefits and impacts of Jakarta Bay reclamation. This makes a conflict between two institution groups. First, a group that agrees with Jakarta Bay reclamation under the assumption that this is highly necessary due to the need of land for settlements and new economic sources. Second, the group that rejects the Jakarta Bay reclamation policy because they consider that the reclamation project is a project that does not solve the problem, it actually has a negative environmental impact on the water quality of the Jakarta bay and will marginalize groups of fishermen.

The influence of actors in each important institution is analyzed due to strong differences in the attitude of certain institutions when important actors are changed. This shows that there are problems regarding the policies issued. Therefore, it is important to see whether the making or canceling of Jakarta Bay reclamation policy does not only accommodate certain interests, but becomes a policy that accommodate environmental sustainability, economic benefits, and welfare of society as a whole.

1.1. Literature Review

Through the approach of political ecology, conflict arises between political units due to the influence of power relations, political economic processes, political knowledge on the interactions and relationships between the natural environment and the social environment (Biersack, 2006; Goldman et al., 2011; Meek and Lloro-Bidart, 2017). In other

words, political ecology describes the complexity of conflict by describing the interactions and relationships between human and nature. The problems that arise in Jakarta Bay reclamation are a matter of how the actors relate to reclamation as their objects. The interactions referred in this study are human and environmental interactions. Humans and the environment are components that regularly interact and depend on each other to form a whole entity to ensure the survival of both (Odum, 1997). The main concept of human and environmental interaction is the relationship of social and ecological systems. The human social system and ecosystem are complex adaptive systems because ecosystems and human social systems are connected with feedback to maintain their lives in an ever-changing environment (Scholz and Binder, 2004).

Human's interaction with the environment is very influential on man's own view of nature. The view of anthropocentrism where ethics, values and moral principles which only applies to humans makes interactions carried out to nature only to meet human's needs and interests and ignore the needs and interests of nature itself (Gammon, 2015). Humans and their interests are considered to be the most decisive in the ecosystem order, including in policies taken in relation to nature, both directly and indirectly. The interaction between humans and the environment has been studied from various scientific aspects. The complexity of human interaction with the environment is due to each region, the point of views, culture, traditions and customs, psychological conditions, and knowledge produced in different forms and levels of interaction.

The approach of political ecology is an approach that can describe the interactions and relationships that occur between humans and the environment. The approach of political ecology is a multidisciplinary approach which in its development is influenced by various disciplines. However, two disciplines that contribute to its emergence are anthropology and geography (Afiff and Lowe, 2007).

Initially, an approach was made to see culture as a unit of analysis to describe human and environmental interactions commonly called cultural ecology. Cultural ecology is defined as a process of human adaptation to the environment that is intended to meet the needs based on the culture of the community. In general, cultural ecology means the ability of humans to interact with the environment based on cultural elements (Winterhalder and Smith, 2017). Then, it develops into a unit of analysis that sees humans as a part of an ecosystem, which has an attachment to the surrounding environment which is often referred to as human ecology. One of the researches on human ecology that has an influence on the development of political ecology in Indonesia is the research on shifting cultivation communities in Kalimantan (Kartawinata et al., 1992). At that time, this study broke the opinion that the use of resources by local people was the cause of environmental damage.

The approach to political ecology was then used to analyze environmental changes in third countries. At that time, political ecology was influenced by the Marxist view of social relations that arose due to the system of capitalism. The work of political ecologists resulted in criticism to the previous approach which focused on the interaction of humans and the environment through culture and ecosystems that were not yet appropriate, because of one of the major influences on environmental change in the third country, namely political economy issues (Robbins, 2004; Watts, 2003).

Political economy as a unit of analysis has developed a broader scale for ecological political approach, which not only highlights how environmental damage is caused by the presence of landowners (Demeritt, 2002) in the local domain, but also how the first world domination of natural resources happened in the southern countries where there is a major role in the problem of the ecological crisis that afflicts much of the southern region (Douglas, 2014) because the regulation is regulated in accordance to the rules of development discourse, where nature is the raw material for economic growth activities (Escobar, 1996).

The political ecological approach that focuses on political economy produces a study of the relations and dynamics of power in both physical and symbolic that influence access to the use and control of local natural resources (Willhusen, 2004). Hence, the concept of power over natural resource control appears as a part of how humans interact with the environment. Although political ecology has evolved to a wider direction, the concept of

power that causes environmental damage is still relevant and widely used primarily to explore environmental issues in developing countries.

The access theory from [Ribot and Peluso \(2003\)](#) placed power in a political economy context that shapes the ability of people to use resources; where access is defined as the ability to benefit from something, including material objects, people, institutions, and symbols. This analysis is extended beyond bundle of rights towards a "bundle of power" approach, thus it can help to understand why some people or institutions benefit from resources, whether or not they have rights.

Range of power is inherent and implemented through various mechanisms, processes, and social relations, which affect people's ability to benefit from resources. This power is a part of material, cultural, and economic politics in bundles and power networks that make up access to resources. These parts are interpreted as processes and relations that allow actors to obtain, control, and maintain access to resources. In social relations between actors, conflict or competition occurs in obtaining benefits from resources. The competition will be won by actors who have greater bundle of power compared to other actors.

In many third world countries including Indonesia, there is a collaboration between politicians, bureaucrats and privates who have exacerbated the ecological conditions of the earth ([Saleth and Dinar, 2000](#)). This relation is because these actors feel that they have benefited each other, so, by resulting in Breaking a chain of interests and power ties, it will be difficult. [Bryant and Bailey \(1997\)](#) provided a deeper explanation of the analysis of actors, such as: the state, business, multilateral institutions, non-governmental organizations, and grassroots who have roles in the environment. The use of the actor-oriented approach is primarily motivated by concern to prioritize politics and beliefs related to understanding political interests and actors' actions which are political. This shows an environmental problem can be caused by the complexity of planning and management which is often reflected in government policies ([Walters et al., 2008](#)). In other words, power relations are complex because the actors involved in them produce the complexity of environmental problems resulting from policies that prioritize the economy, however ignore the sustainability of the environment.

In geographic research, a place-based approach to understand socio-environmental change or the role of the biophysical world in relation to environmental politics was carried out. The framework of political ecology remains a major approach in human geography and the environment which adopts a place-based approach to understand social and ecological dynamics ([Lave et al., 2014](#)). This is the main reason why ecological involvement remains as an important contribution of political ecology to environmental geography. The political ecological framework for city parks takes the fact that city parks are social and natural. This includes taking an approach to gain understanding of the ways in which the broader processes of political economy and political ecology work to structure certain types of human and non-human relations.

The political ecological approach is also used in sustainable tourism. [Douglas's research \(2014\)](#) stated that the condition of sustainable tourism is produced and reproduced through production relations. In other words, the exploitation of nature and society in the context of tourism drives people to the periphery. Through this paradigm of marginalization by race, class, and gender, these conditions have been reproduced in various contexts, especially in the global south. The material conditions of production are built on the premise that sustainable tourism projects depend on a capitalist political economy, where instrumental values are manifested in the global market.

The approach to political ecology also began to be used as a way of looking at the problems that exist in Indonesia. [Marcus et al., \(2011\)](#) in their research "Environmentalism and community: Connections and implications for social action" provided a conclusion that eco-friendly discourse is used as a tool by certain groups to influence patterns of community behavior, including behavior in the consumption of certain items. The research conducted by [Tarigan and Simatupang \(2014\)](#) used a political ecological approach to analyze agricultural transformation and the water crisis that occurred in Bali. This study showed

that the water crisis that occurred caused conflict between stakeholders and marginalized agriculture. This is due to the existence of tourism-oriented development politics that have a broad impact on the use of water resources. Their political ecological approach is to understand the relations between actors in the use of water resources. [Armitage \(2005\)](#) used a political ecology approach as a paradigm of equitable natural resource governance. According to [Armitage \(2005\)](#), natural resource governance must place humans and nature at the same degree. Community involvement also needs to be done in natural resource governance.

[Schubert \(2005\)](#) perceived that one of the political characteristics of ecology is that ecological politics is not a coherent grand theory, but rather a specific lens that can test the interaction between environment and society. The reason is because the approach to political ecology is more flexible through other theories. Even with different cases, political ecology is able to describe the interaction between human and environment. The main themes of political ecology include: access to and control over resources; marginality; integration scale analysis; the effect of integration into the international market; centrality of livelihood problems; ambiguity in property rights and the importance of informal claims to resource use and access; local, historical, meaning, cultural, and micropolitan importance in the use of resources; revocation of legitimate user rights and local use; the effects of limited state capacity; and linking all these with colonial and postcolonial inheritance and dynamics. This is arguably the presence of most or all of these themes as objects or components of case studies that define political ecology more than a consistent theoretical or methodological approach to them. This also means that political ecology cannot be separated from the influence of Marxism, dependency theory, world system theory, agrarian studies, ownership theory, and other theories that shape the development of political ecology.

In political ecology, two "contiguous" spaces are converged, namely the space of conflict in which the process of decision making and decision take place by involving various kinds of interests and spaces of power, where there are policy holders who carry out the decisions and policies that have been set in the conflict space ([Dharmawan, 2007](#)).

[Afiff and Lowe \(2007\)](#) added that environmental changes (both damage and improvement efforts) are the result of political and economic measures that arise based on the outcomes of the struggle of different parties within the framework of a nation, their interactions between countries, and in the context of the development of global capitalism. Each category of actors, be they community groups, civil organizations, government, and business groups not regarded as uniform and monolithic groups. This implies that endeavors, opposition, and disputes, encompassing collaboration and partnerships, are bound to occur between people or groups within each actor type as well as between actors. That's, among other things, making a study of conflicts over access and control over natural resources that need to be studied specifically in the context of a particular space and time. In other words, political-macroeconomic processes can have different implications in one place and another at different times.

Apart from interests, conflicts can arise because of power or authority. Power that causes conflict in political ecology is the power for access and control in the use of natural resources ([Sultana, 2011](#)). In general, the concept of power itself has two meanings, namely power that emphasizes the state and the individual. The concept of traditional power is oriented towards legitimacy. Power is something that is legitimized metaphysically by the state, which allows the state to require everyone to obey it ([Afandi, 2012](#)). While Foucault emphasized that patterns of power relations cannot be conceptualized as belonging to individuals or classes. Power is not a commodity that can be obtained or achieved. Power is a network that is present in all spheres of human interaction since it is distributed everywhere: family, politics, economy, society, religion, and so on ([Turama, 2014](#)). In addition, Foucault emphasized power with freedom. According to his research, the relationship between power and freedom cannot be separated. When someone defines the exercise of power as a way of acting on the actions of others, this is not power. Power is only

done on free subjects. Hence, attitudes and actions depend on individual freedom (Foucault, 1972).

One conflict that often occurs due to differences in authority and interests is the management of coastal resources. Management of coastal resources is inseparable from the relationship of knowledge and power conflicts from various actors (Obie et al., 2014). The conflict that occurred in Kalibaru, North Jakarta, was originated from differences in the meaning of the parties to the conflict, as well as the enforcement of improper rules. Conflicts consist of authority conflicts, territorial struggle conflicts and ecological conflicts that occur between green mussel cultivators and processors and fishermen, the government and industry (Kurniasari et al., 2017). Conflicts that occur in coastal areas are usually in the place coastal communities who usually work as fishermen as marginalized groups and have limited access to the utilization of coastal resources. Access conflicts that occur between fishermen and TNBB (West Bali National Park) were due to resource ownership factors and resource management factors while conflict of access between fishermen and tourism companies was due to resource management factors. In conditions of helplessness and unequal power relations, daily resistance such as theft, the spread of issues or rumors and non-compliance with conservation rules were steps taken by fishermen (Mahmud et al., 2016).

2. Methods

This research uses qualitative approach. This approach was chosen because this research emphasizes on the process and meaning of human and environmental interactions in real life. In addition, the researchers saw a need to explore and elaborate the phenomenon of the reclamation of Jakarta Bay deeper from the standpoint of political ecology. Descriptive qualitative design is used in this study to clarify the phenomenon, which is the outcome of facts and information, both deductively and structurally analyzed through discourse research, in-depth interviews, and policy analysis. Open-ended interview questions were used in-depth interviews for this study guidelines included in this study's appendix. Data and information gathered from texts or documents, such as official government press releases, news from print and online media, rules or legislation, and articles, make up discourse studies.

The population used within this research were the central government and the provincial government of DKI Jakarta that relate to the reclamation of the Jakarta Bay. In this research, the central government was chosen, namely the Ministry of Environment and Forestry and the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries. As for the provincial government of DKI Jakarta, the agency chosen was the Office involved in the reclamation of the Jakarta Bay. The sample selection in this research used purposive sampling and snowball sampling to determine key informants.

3. Results and Discussion

As the state organizer, the government has the power to plan, carry out, and oversee matters pertaining to development that affect national interests. Rules, whether in the form of laws, decrees, rules, or other regulations, confirm this authority. Jakarta Bay Reclamation was formed through Presidential Decree No. 52 of 1995 concerning the Implementation of the North Coast Jakarta Reclamation, which gave authority to the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government for its planning, management, and supervision. However, this authority must also be coordinated with other institutions. One of the examples is management rights (HPL), which the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government must obtain permission from the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning / Head of the National Land Agency. However, the issue of authority overlaps when there are other regulations that also holds authority over "reclamation" such as the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries and the Ministry of Transportation. This overlapping authority will not be a problem if there are similarities in decisions, but in the case of the Jakarta Bay reclamation, this overlap of authority makes conflict.

Interesting things were discovered when the Maritime Coordinating Ministry was appointed by President Joko Widodo as the coordinator of the Jakarta Bay reclamation joint committee. During Rizal Ramli's leadership, there was a mutual agreement on the committee to cancel the reclamation of the Jakarta Bay, however sudden replacement of the Minister made this decision abruptly. The results of the interview show that the decision was canceled and now the decision for Jakarta Bay reclamation is in the hands of the new Maritime Coordinating Minister, Luhut Pandjaitan.

From a regulatory perspective, the Jakarta Bay reclamation joint committee coordinator, the Maritime Coordinating Minister, was appointed with the intention of resolving problems. Therefore, the Maritime Coordinating Ministry should not have the jurisdiction to decide whether to approve or cancel the reclamation of Jakarta Bay. Specifically, the outcomes of the in-depth interviews indicate that the joint committee's conclusions are predicated on a range of previously agreed-upon investigations carried out by committee members. But because the Minister was replaced, this agreement has never been formally decided. The joint committee's current role is limited to serving as a venue for institutional coordination; the Maritime Coordinating Ministry has the last say in all matters.

This demonstrates how the interests of the party seeking the continuation of the reclamation were able to gain a power relationship in this joint committee. Minister Luhut Pandjaitan had the final say because of the relationships between actors who share the same interests, even if the Maritime Coordinating Ministry's authority was not as strong as other institutions' despite the regulation. Despite the fact that Luhut Pandjaitan and Rizal Ramli have the same institutional power, Luhut's interests are greater. Thus, although there were some disagreements on the definition of the Jakarta Bay reclamation's authority, there are, in theory, several agreements.

Firstly, researchers concurred with [Afiff and Lowe \(2007\)](#) that environmental changes—in terms of pollution that happen as well as efforts to repair and influence—are the outcome of political and economic policies that result from the struggles of various actors within a nation and their interactions with other nations. As a result, each actor cannot be viewed as a single, homogeneous group. This implies that inside each category of actors, as well as between players, struggles, resistance, and conflicts, including cooperation and alliances, emerge between people or groups. This increases the complexity of government policy planning and management ([Walters et al., 2008](#)), which in turn may contribute to or worsen environmental conditions in Jakarta Bay.

Second, the researchers accepted the definition of power put out by Foucault, which holds that power is networked and dispersed over all spheres of human interaction and does not apply if it is only perceived as something granted by the state (Turama, 2014). This is seen in the case of the reclamation of Jakarta Bay, where the state has granted the Maritime Coordinating Ministry the same authority. However, due to Luhut Pandjaitan's stronger economic ties than Rizal Ramli, the policy Luhut Pandjaitan adopted had more sway than Rizal Ramli's.

Third, despite his agreement with power relations, Foucault held certain slightly divergent views, such as the idea that power is an individual's unrestricted freedom of action ([Foucault, 1972](#)). This study did discover, however, that there is something that influences the interests of individuals who rise to power; thus their actions are not totally determined by their own free will. It was discovered that similar interests form power interactions. As a result, those involved in policymaking use their expertise and power to further their own agendas and, eventually, change the course of current government policies.

The Central Government and the Regional Government had different perspectives, which led to conflict in the Jakarta Bay Reclamation. Conflicts over the use of resources are a common result of competing interests and values ([Gray, 2003](#)); in this instance, the interests and values take the form of attitudes. Conflict can arise from an inappropriate attitude or reaction of one institution towards another ([Fisher, 2000](#)), but the problem is made worse by the assumption that each party's knowledge is accurate and sanctioned.

According to the A01 Informant, conflicts occurred because of the governance system that makes the government a passive participant. The government finally gave access to developers to be able to form reclamation in accordance with their wishes.

"... the governance system, so it's not e, the main thing is to make it, then the cooperation will do first think later. I don't, that's how it is. Isn't the government itself opening up its space to the drive developer right? If it is too like that, automatically the local government will become a passive participant, so if they want to make a hotel, they don't want it from the local government, but from the developer. Well, what about the concept of carrying capacity? Even though there are limited capacity being carried, maybe if the developer considers it only in terms of investment, I have already crumbled like that, I have to go back and forth, meaning that it is out of control. Now the biggest criticism and lesson learned is that the driver must be by government, not driven by developer." (Informant 01)

This statement was also strengthened by informant 02 who questioned the importance of Jakarta Bay reclamation.

"... actually the role of the state here is weak, the role of the state as a driver is weak, so where are the interests of the community and fishermen now?" (Informant 02)

The statements of informants 01 and 02 reaffirm that in Jakarta Bay reclamation there are 3 interests, namely economic interests, social interests and environmental interests. The big question is which interest is more dominant? Conflicts of interest according to [FAO \(2000\)](#) often occur in the use of natural resources. However, the Jakarta Bay reclamation, which is considered as a necessity because of the national interests, must be monitored and fully controlled by the government. If the function of the state in overseeing the reclamation of the Jakarta Bay is weak, then developers will definitely prioritize economic benefits than social welfare, especially environmental sustainability. Informant number 02 added that economic interests are more dominant than social welfare.

"...even if the land is lacking, I don't think it is a reason, in fact it is discovered for whom it is, come on, who can afford to buy it there?" (Informant 02)

An interesting thing was discovered during the interview when the informant B02 kept mentioning the nominal value that would become Regional Income if this reclamation was successfully carried out. Informant B02 also added that the provision of settlements did not look at race or wealth, because all of them hold equal rights as citizens of DKI Jakarta. In fact, according to him, it is the middle class that provides a large tax for the region. When questions about the welfare of fishermen were raised, he stressed that there is always a risk in development, taking example of a road construction that induces traffic jam, it is already a risk, just the matter of how fishermen can innovate to maintain their livelihoods.

Such view then strengthens the argument that the conflict strengthened in the Jakarta Bay reclamation is due to the perspective on reclamation of the Jakarta Bay and the authority utilized to achieve desired interests. Similar to research by Turner (2004), this conflict occurred because of differences in interests in the struggle for access and utilization of Jakarta Bay reclamation. In this instance, public-private partnerships (PPP), which are the idea of collaboration between the public and private sectors in project creation and implementation, grant access to the developer as part of the funding. The existence of power relations with the actors making the decisions may be the reason behind the exclusion of too-free developer access. This demonstrates how access to and ownership of natural resources and useful materials can be influenced by power dynamics ([Ribot and Peluso, 2003](#); [Willhusen, 2004](#)), which are exploitatively carried out in order to promote economic growth ([Escobar, 1996](#)).

Uncertainty surrounding policy, activities that pull on moratoriums, violations of building and environmental licenses, and other factors demonstrate if developers have rights. Developers believe they own what [Ribot and Peluso \(2003\)](#) refer to as a "bundle of power," which constitutes resource access, where these programmers possess bundles and networks (webs) that enable programmers to engage in illegal activity.

The Jakarta Bay reclamation conflict requires an immediate solution. If these conflicts are not addressed, this can result in greater environmental and social problems or

which [FAO \(2000\)](#) referred to as causing environmental degradation, disrupting development, and destroying the order of life. Conflict resolution is carried out by establishing a committee called the joint pantura reclamation committee in Jakarta. However, the formation of this committee is considered failed to resolve the conflict, it actually shows the pressure of interest that plays an important role in the reclamation of the Jakarta Bay. The relations and dynamics of interests that are seen clearly or clandestinely have interactions between actors that can lead to conflict or competition. However, the competition will be won by actors who have a greater bundle of power than other actors ([Ribot and Peluso, 2003](#)), or in the case of joint committee of Jakarta Bay reclamation, it will be won by a group that wants Jakarta Bay reclamation to take place.

According to [Saleth and Dinar \(2000\)](#), the researchers, the interaction between politicians, bureaucrats, and the corporate sector creates a hard-to-break web of power relations and interests, that if included in an environmental policy, will deteriorate the planet's ecological circumstances. This is due to the fact that the policies implemented will only help those with power dynamics who are typically associated with political economy concerns. Developer dominance over the reclamation of Jakarta Bay has persisted until recently, as evidenced by policy research and interview data.

The authorized actor inside the institution and the dispute that arises are inextricably linked. [Douglas \(2014\)](#) referred to these players as stakeholders in situations where social relationships result in conflict. In any decision-making process that is available, these participants are crucial. Changes in attitudes, practices, and discourses formed by actors in the Jakarta Bay reclamation policy are visible. This demonstrates that this conflict must be viewed as a dispute between interested parties in addition to being considered as a fight between institutions. Therefore, the study concurred with [Bryant and Bailey \(1997\)](#) that it is critical to monitor the role and impact of actors in conflict, as well as the reasons behind their political objectives and activities.

Every actor is fully aware of the relevant laws, the overlapping authorities, and the potential positive and negative outcomes. But the actor's mentality is dominated by curiosity, leading each actor to frame knowledge as a means of achieving his objectives. Often, the actors involved in this conflict look for shortcomings in studies, rules, and comments as a defense and place the responsibility on the opposing parties, rather than settling overlapping regulations and equating conceptions. Therefore, to answer questions about this conflict, identification of the interests and authority of actors is needed.

The results of the analysis of in-depth interviews and literature study have identified the interests and authority of government institutions. Institutions analyzed were institutions that are in conflict and involved in the development of Jakarta Bay reclamation. The Ministry of Transportation is one of the authorized institutions, but does not included in the conflict. This happened because the Ministry of Transportation did not have any interest in the reclamation of the Jakarta Bay, even if it is viewed from the regulations, the authority of the Ministry of Transportation in Jakarta Bay reclamation is quite strong. Furthermore, the same authority, but with different interests can produce very different attitudes and decision making. Conflict then arises when the interests of the institution collides with the interests of other institutions.

First, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK). In the interview, A01 informants were repeatedly emphasize their authority limits, namely the assessment of the administration process of environmental permits, AMDAL and mitigation monitoring carried out by the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government which has the authority over the management of Jakarta Bay reclamation. These results are also validated by policy analysis and discourse studies where MoEF emphasized environmental interests. The actions taken by the moratorium on the development of several islands were also based on investigations and violations of environmental permits.

Second, the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (KKP). Based on the results of interviews and policy analysis, KKP made various efforts on the basis of technical studies that have been carried out. This closed study concluded that the form of 17 islands from Jakarta Bay reclamation must be canceled. In addition, this institution also has an interest

to protect the interests of fishermen who live and depend on the waters of Jakarta Bay. KKP considers that the Jakarta Bay reclamation policy does not accommodate the interests of coastal communities, especially fishermen. Therefore, until now KKP's attitudes and actions have remained consistent.

Third, the Coordinating Ministry of Maritime Affairs (Kemenko Maritim), during the reign of Rizal Ramli. The results of the discourse and policy analysis, were Rizal Ramli act on Jakarta Bay reclamation after being appointed by President Joko Widodo to coordinate a joint Jakarta Bay committee, namely a committee that aims to produce joint agreements regarding regulatory issues, technical issues and environmental problems that arise in Jakarta Bay reclamation. Before being appointed by the President, in the media or officially as the Minister, Rizal Ramli did not comment much. However, a clear and firm attitude was shown when the results of direct investigations and studies in the joint committee showed that the Jakarta Bay reclamation carried out various types of violations ranging from mild to severe. But this firm and clear attitude actually caused more chaotic conflict. The conflict went on until finally the position of the Minister was replaced by Luhut Pandjaitan.

Fourth, the Maritime Coordinating Ministry (Kemenko Maritim), during the reign of Luhut Pandjaitan. Political pressure was seen when Minister Luhut Pandjaitan was elected to replace Rizal Ramli as the Minister. Few moments after being summoned to the State Palace, Luhut Pandjaitan immediately decided to continue the reclamation of the Jakarta Bay. In addition, the calling of Sandiaga Uno to listen to Luhut's "suggestions" regarding the Jakarta Bay reclamation also showed that political pressure was also given to the new DKI Jakarta Provincial Government.

Fifth, the Provincial Government of DKI Jakarta, during the Basuki-Djarot period. The corruption case involving Basuki-Djarot, the desire for a 15% incentive as the inclusion of the Regional Government, close relation to the developer, ignoring the aspirations of fishermen who demanded justice, and the occurrence of violations of environmental permits showed that during this administration period, the priority efforts were economic interests.

Sixth, the Provincial Government of DKI Jakarta, during the Anies-Password period. This study categorizes political interests during this period of government were because at the time this research was conducted, the refusal of Jakarta Bay reclamation was used as a political tool to win the Regional Election, where at that time his political opponent was Basuki-Djarot who in the previous government sought the implementation of Jakarta Bay reclamation. Further analysis is needed in the future, when a policy has been issued regarding the reclamation of the Jakarta Bay.

Research with this political ecology approach emphasizes that each actor has a choice of how knowledge and authority are positioned. Central and regional government institutions do not know or understand the regulations governing the authority of the Jakarta Bay reclamation. However, they only quote and use regulations or regulations that can strengthen what they believe is right. This also occurs in knowledge of the effects of good or bad, each institution will use studies that support its interests, and ignore other studies.

The influence of the capitalist system where capital owners still gain access because of the existence of power relations is still one of the problems that exist in Indonesia. This causes environmental issues to be the only reason in the development of an economy, but in its implementation, environmental interests are the most ignored issue. The increasing concern over the exploitation of natural resources for economic development at the expense of the environmental quality presented by [Enger and Smith \(2010\)](#) still does not apply in Indonesia.

The power dynamics that shape the intricacy of government policy formulation and management are observed by the researcher ([Walters et al., 2008](#)). This, in the end, may contribute to or worsen Jakarta Bay's environmental conditions. Therefore, the researchers concurred with Facoult's definition of power, which states that if something is primarily perceived as something the state grants, then it does not qualify as power or authority, but the power that plays a role here is a relationship formed between actors because of

interests. Conflicts that occur between government institutions are dominated by elements of interest. This causes the conflict to be more complex and forgets an important element of environmental policy, namely the principle of sustainability. Pollution that occurred in the Bay of Jakarta requires an action. However, the current Jakarta Bay reclamation policy does not prioritize the principle of sustainability. This protracted conflict ultimately not only caused financial losses but also added to the environmental damage in Jakarta Bay due to the omission of reclaimed lands.

Political ecology becomes the paradigm of environmental management understood as a common view and equality of access in environmental management based on an equitable environment. A public policy regarding the environment must accommodate 3 elements, namely social, economic and environmental. The Jakarta Bay Reclamation has failed to become a public policy. This policy will continue to be a conflict between government institutions until there is an awareness of equalizing knowledge and balancing authority for the common interest, namely sustainable environmental management for both humans and the environment itself.

4. Conclusion

The conflict that occurred in the Jakarta Bay reclamation was caused by differences in interests among the actors concerned in government institutions. This conflict between government institutions will not be resolved if the chain of power relations involving political and economic actors is not broken. In addition, a shared understanding is needed until there is awareness to equalize common interests, namely sustainable environmental management for both humans and the environment itself.

Acknowledgement

Not applicable.

Author Contribution

Conceptualization, E.F.M.; Methodology, E.F.M.; Software, E.F.M.; Validation, E.F.M.; Formal Analysis, E.F.M.; Investigations, E.F.M.; Resources, E.F.M.; Data Curation, E.F.M.; Writing – Original Draft Preparation, E.F.M.; Writing – Review & Editing, E.F.M.; Visualization, E.F.M.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Ethical Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Afiff, S., & Lowe, C. (2007). Claiming indigenous community: Political discourse and natural resource rights in Indonesia. *Alternatives*, 32(1), 73-97.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/030437540703200104>
- Armitage, D. (2005). Adaptive capacity and community-based natural resource management. *Environmental management*, 35, 703-715.
<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s00267-004-0076-z.pdf>

- Biersack, A. (2006). Red river, green war: the politics of place along the Porgera river. *Reimagining political ecology*, 233-280.
[https://books.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=Dx9u9cIXtvkC&oi=fnd&pg=PA233&dq=Biersack+A+\(2006\)+Red+river,+green+War:+the+politics+of+place+along+the+Porgera+River.+Reimagining+political+ecology+233%E2%80%93280&ots=LriADr0kvE&sig=Dy6hHNj0erAisQFFggW5r_fWGPp](https://books.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=Dx9u9cIXtvkC&oi=fnd&pg=PA233&dq=Biersack+A+(2006)+Red+river,+green+War:+the+politics+of+place+along+the+Porgera+River.+Reimagining+political+ecology+233%E2%80%93280&ots=LriADr0kvE&sig=Dy6hHNj0erAisQFFggW5r_fWGPp)
- Boelens, R., Hoogesteger, J., Swyngedouw, E., Vos, J., & Wester, P. (2016). Hydrosocial territories: a political ecology perspective. *Water international*, 41(1), 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02508060.2016.1134898>
- Bryant, R. L., & Bailey, S. (1997). *Third world political ecology*. Psychology Press.
https://www.academia.edu/download/58020782/_Sinead_Bailey_Third_World_Political_EcologyBookZZ.org.pdf
- Demeritt, D. (2002). What is the 'social construction of nature'? A typology and sympathetic critique. *Progress in human geography*, 26(6), 767-790.
<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=725011e3e74061f8f5f6fef86a1c9d04b7b0349>
- Douglas, J. A. (2014). What's political ecology got to do with tourism?. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(1), 8-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2013.864324>
- Enger, E. D., Smith, B. F., & Barker, B. W. (1998). *Environmental science: A study of interrelationships*. McGraw Hill.
<https://www.mheducation.com/unitas/school/program/ap/enger-environmental-science-16e/sample-chapter.pdf>
- Escobar, A. (1996). Construction nature: Elements for a post-structuralist political ecology. *Futures*, 28(4), 325-343. https://www.academia.edu/download/47325549/0016-3287_2896_2900011-020160718-3734-vjq460.pdf
- FAO. (2000). Conflict and natural resource management. Rome: FAO.
<https://www.fao.org/forestry/21572-0d9d4b43a56ac49880557f4ebaa3534e3.pdf>
- Fisher, S. (2000). *Working with conflict: Skills and strategies for action*. Zed books.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44829631_Working_with_Conflict_Skills_and_Strategies_for_Action
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge: Translated from the french by AM Sheridan Smith*. Pantheon Books.
https://monoskop.org/images/9/90/Foucault_Michel_Archaeology_of_Knowledge.pdf
- Foucault, M. (1980). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977. New York: Pantheon.
https://monoskop.org/File:Foucault_Michel_Power_Knowledge_Selected_Interviews_and_Other_Writings_1972-1977.pdf
- Gammon, A. R. (2015). From Mastery to Mystery: A Phenomenological Foundation for an Environmental Ethic. *JBSP: Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 46: 336-338.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00071773.2015.1060736>
- Goldman, M. J., Nadasdy, P., & Turner, M. D. (Eds.). (2019). *Knowing nature: conversations at the intersection of political ecology and science studies*. University of Chicago Press.
<https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.7208/9780226301440/html>
- Gray, B., & Putnam, L. L. (2003). Means to what end? Conflict management frames. *Environmental practice*, 5(3), 239-246. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1466046603035634>
- Kartawinata, K., Jessup, T. C., Vayda, A. P., Riswan, S., Mackie, C., & Peluso, N. E. (1992) People and forests in East Kalimantan. In: Conrad EC and Newell LA (eds). Proceedings on the session on tropical forestry for people of the Pacific. Berkeley, CA: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, pp.37-41.
- Lave, R., Wilson, M. W., Barron, E. S., Biermann, C., Carey, M. A., Duvall, C. S., ... & Van Dyke, C. (2014). Intervention: Critical physical geography. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien*, 58(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cag.12061>

- Marcus, B. J., Omoto, A. M., & Winter, P. L. (2011). Environmentalism and community: Connections and implications for social action. *Ecopsychology*, 3(1), 11-24. <https://doi.org/10.1089/eco.2010.0069>
- Meek, D., & Lloro-Bidart, T. (2017). Introduction: Synthesizing a political ecology of education. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 48(4), 213-225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2017.1340054>
- Odum, E. P. (1977). The emergence of ecology as a new integrative discipline. *Science*, 195(4284) :1289-1293. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1743749>
- Ribot, J. C., & Peluso, N. L. (2003). A theory of access. *Rural sociology*, 68(2), 153-181. https://www.academia.edu/download/48700774/A_Theory_of_Access20160909-19319-56t3x8.pdf
- Robbins, P. (2004). *Political Ecology: A Critical Introduction*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Saleth, R. M., & Dinar, A. (2000). Institutional changes in global water sector: trends, patterns, and implications. *Water Policy*, 2(3), 175-199. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1366-7017\(00\)00007-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1366-7017(00)00007-6)
- Scholz, R. W., & Binder, C. R. (2004). Principles of Human-Environment Systems (HES) Research. *International Congress on Environmental Modelling and Software* 116. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3345&context=iemssconference>
- Schubert, J. (2005). Political ecology in development research. *An Introductory Overview and Annotated Bibliography*, 2. [https://nccr-north-south.ch/Upload/Schubert_NCCR_Dialogue_13-\(1\).pdf](https://nccr-north-south.ch/Upload/Schubert_NCCR_Dialogue_13-(1).pdf)
- Schubert J (2007) Political Ecology in Development Research: An Introductory Overview and Annotated Bibliography. Switzerland: NCCR North-South.
- Sultana, F. (2011). Suffering for water, suffering from water: Emotional geographies of resource access, control and conflict. *Geoforum*, 42(2), 163-172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2010.12.002>
- Tarigan, H., & Simatupang, P. (2014). Impacts of the Water Resource Act on existence of subak institution in Bali. *Analisis Kebijakan Pertanian*, 12(2), 103-117. <https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20163220309>
- Walters, B. B., Rönnbäck, P., Kovacs, J. M., Crona, B., Hussain, S. A., Badola, R., ... & Dahdouh-Guebas, F. (2008). Ethnobiology, socio-economics and management of mangrove forests: A review. *Aquatic Botany*, 89(2), 220-236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2008.02.009>
- Winterhalder, B., & Smith, E. A. (2017). Evolutionary ecology and the social sciences. *Evolutionary ecology and human behavior*, 3-24. <https://api.taylorfrancis.com/v4/content/chapters/edit/download?identifierName=doi&identifierValue=10.4324%2F9780203792704-1&type=chapterpdf>