Practicing Disaster Management on the Slopes of Mount Merapi

Examining how discourses are enacted by actors of the Resilient Village Program in Hargobinangun

Katja Dold s1058789

Master Thesis for: Anthropology of a sustainable world

Supervisor: Dr. R. Saptari Soetikno Slamet

Leiden University faculty of Cultural Anthropology and Development sociology

Final draft 4th October 2016

Word Count: 23369
Acknowledgments

Thank you, Ratna, for helping me through all the ups and downs of thesis writing. For taking the time and having patience with me even when it seemed like all hope was lost. Thank you.

With this I would like to thank all those without whom I would not have been able to complete this piece of work. Going to Indonesia was one of the most incredible adventures I have had the privilege to experience. Without the support of my family and friends I would never have made it to the airport, let alone through this whole process. So thank you to all of your support, your hugs, nagging, laughs and company. It was a roller coaster ride of emotions from start to finish and I could not have done it without you. You are are my hero’s.

In Indonesia I met some of the most wonderful people Thank you especially to my student counterpart Fathia without whom I would not have been able to do the research. I am so grateful for her translation skills but most importantly her friendship.
Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations i

Abstract 1

1. Introduction to the case study 4

1.1 Who is involved 7

1.2 What constitutes relevance of this topic 9

1.3 Theoretical framework 9

1.4 Methodology 16

2. Background and Training seminars 19

2.1 Surroundings of Hargobinangun 19

2.2 The Village 20

2.3 How the village is organised 22

2.4 Project goals and execution 23

2.5 Training seminars 24

3. Practice in development management 31

3.1 The organisers 32

3.2 Trusteeship 32

3.3 The practice of politics when creating the disaster management team 34

3.4 Politicising the technical solution 36

3.5 Positioning in terms of internal village affairs 37

3.6. The multiplicity of power in practice 39

4. Participants practicing critical politics 42

4.1 Who is being represented? 43

4.2 Which positions did the actors take 46

4.3 Comparison of opinions 47

5. Conclusion 51

Bibliography 54
List of Abbreviations

BPBD  Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah  regional disaster management agency

DRR  Disaster risk reduction

Forum PRB  Forum Pengurangan Resiko Bencana  Forum for disaster risk reduction

PKK  Pembinaan Kesejahteraan Keluarg  Empowerment of family welfare group

PRBBK  Program Pengurangan Risiko Bencana Berbasis Komunitas  Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction

RVP  Pembentukan dan pengembangan desa / kelurahan tangguh bencana desa Hargobinangun, kecamatan pakem, kabupaten sleman badan penanggulangan bencana daerah daerah istimewa yogyakarta tahun 2015  The establishment and development of villages / wards disaster resilient Hargobinangun village, district, Sleman district disaster management agency area of Yogyakarta special region 2015.

SOP  Standard Operational Procedure

Unit Lak  Unit Pelaksama Bencana  Plan Implementation Unit

UII  University of Indonesia

UNY  State University of Yogyakarta
Abstract

Natural disasters, such as hurricanes, draughts, earthquakes or volcanic eruptions amongst others are affecting the lives many people around the planet. They happen frequently and unexpectedly in most cases. One such event took place in 2010 when Mount Merapi, the most active volcano in Indonesia, erupted. Due to the reoccurring nature of eruptions at Mount Merapi and an active monitoring program, more than 19000 people were ordered to evacuate from the area prior to the eruption. Governments and help organizations deal differently with the aftermath of these events. Locally in Indonesia, a post disaster program that has been implemented is the Resilient Village Program (RVP) which focuses on the risk reduction and prevention of losses in case of future natural disasters. One of the villages especially affected by the 2010 eruption was Hargobinangun.

This thesis will be examining how discourses regarding the resilient village program are enacted by the different social groups in Hargobinangun. This is accomplished by analyzing to what extent the implementation of the program is influenced by different social factors and by looking at a number of sub questions.

The first of these sub questions examines in more detail how the Resilient Village Program is constructed and formulated. In order to answer this, I plan to examine what the Resilient Village Program actually is and how it is constructed by the organisers specifically in the context of the 2010 eruption. I will examine how they choose to frame this project based on interviews conducted with me and my Indonesian student counterpart. Although there a number of different agencies affiliated with this project, I chose to focus on those who were directly part of the training seminars I attended. The two organisers I will be focusing on in more detail are the Regional Disaster Management Agency of Sleman (Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah), hereafter referred to as the BPBD, and the NGO facilitating this specific project, known as Lingkar. By examining the theoretical framework behind these training seminars we can compare the plan and the practical implementation which will be the subject of a more detailed analysis under my third subquestion. Part of this construction and framing is the language and discourse used by the different actors in the various levels of the project, which leads me to my second sub question.

The second sub question will focus on the discourse used by the actors and how the project is perceived. Of specific interest is the discourse used by the participants of the training seminars and
their perception of the information. Additional aspects are the suggested actions provided by the organising party. Discourse is a key feature which will be explored in this paper because it is the way in which we as individuals communicate with other. This can influence as well as be influenced to varying degrees by a number of social factors. One of the factors that carries a lot of weight is perception. Perception is an integral part of understanding discourse and how it is used as well as having an impact on the implementation process of the training seminars. This is especially the case for the RVP as the project relies heavily on active participation. This is also the link to my third question, where I will address how the chosen implementation worked in practice and how the training seminars were influenced by a variety of social factors.

Perception is linked to a number of situational factors which I will be exploring with my final sub question. Perception itself is not a static concept and can depend on the context of the situation as well as on the person involved. The situation on the other hand also influences the discourse. Thus I will be examining how discourse influences perception and reception of information which in turn is influenced by the local power relations at play within the space of the training seminars both metaphorically and physically. Power relations are a key factor in the implementation process. This allows me to analyse who has the right to implement certain policies with the information received, enabling me to observe a dynamic relationship between power relations and how policies are implemented rather than a mere translation of perceptions. Finally, I will focus on the implementation itself in terms of the practical elements of the training seminars. This includes a closer examination of some of the participants as well as individual organisers. In order to do this I will establish who they are and what they do as well as their participation and use of discourse which can play a role in implementation. I will be examining how the differences in power relations shape the discussions and the discourses. I will also look at some of the debates about the resilience policies and how they are to be implemented. I plan to use a theoretical framework based on research of other authors discussing aspects of development and use this to reflect on my own observations.

In order to answer these questions I will be using the information I gathered during my field work in Indonesia. I will be using a theoretical framework to analyse my data. In the first chapter I introduce the case study and the organisers as well as participants involved. I then show its relevance to the academic field of study. Next, I discuss the theoretical framework, from which I distill the themes that are relevant for my study. These include the idea of discourse, power relations and space. Within the theme of power relations this thesis will be examining representation, the process of
exclusion, and the multiplicity of power and how these themes can influence perception. I take a
closer look at the idea of resilience and the way in which it is used in this thesis. I use this
framework to reflect on the data that I have collected during my research in the village of
Hargobinangun. Finally reflect on my own position within this framework and how this can
influence my methodology. Thus explaining the social factors that will influence the discourse and
perception of the training seminars.

In the second chapter I establish the context by highlighting some background information about the
village Hargobinangun. In order to gain a better understanding of both the participants and the
structure of the training itself it is relevant to look at the physical space and surroundings. Secondly
I look at the village itself and its various components that make up its community. Thirdly I
examine the community organisation as this gives me a clearer understanding of the power relations
that can be found there. In the fourth section of the chapter I examine how the project goals were
translated into reality. Finally I give a brief introduction into the training seminars and their most
important elements as I saw them as a neutral observer. Leading to my third sub question by
showing the practical implementation.

The third chapter focuses on the practice of development management in the case of
Hargobinangun. Here I expand on my theoretical framework in order to gain a better understanding
of the organisers of the program. This will help me to show how it affects the proceedings at the
training events themselves. It also addresses the first question of how the program is constructed
and implemented. I discuss my interviews with the representatives from BPBD and Lingkar as well
as their roles during the training. I then go into further detail about the proceedings of the training
seminars as I witnessed them. Specifically the elements I highlighted in the previous chapter. I use
these elements as tools to show the difference between the theoretical plan by the organisers and the
practicality of having active participants influence the training. I also show how the plan had to be
adjusted accordingly. Finally I link the elements of my theoretical framework to my observations of
the training.

The fourth chapter examines the participants and their practice of critical politics. Firstly, I analyse
who of the village community is in fact being represented. I highlight three participants in particular
and how they experienced the previous eruption. I then examine which physical positions these
actors choose to take followed by a inspection of their positions in terms of perception of the
trainings as far as I can interpret it.

Finally, the conclusion summarises my findings of the perception and implementation of the
Resilient Village Program and how discourses influence this, space being one of the key social
factors. I also highlight questions that could be expanded during further research.

1. Introduction to the case study

In 2010 Mount Merapi erupted on various occasions between late October and early November
(NASA 2010). This series of eruptions caused 343 people to loose their lives and 350,000 people to
be evacuated from their homes and lands (Pearl 2014). Many of those evacuated spent up to two
years in various shelters and temporary housing solutions struggling to regain economic and social
stability (Pearl 2014). Mount Merapi is considered to be one of the most active on Java. Its
proximity to the town of Yogyakarta makes it even more renowned. However, the main reason the
eruptions of Mount Merapi are so dangerous is its explosive nature. In the pre-eruption phase the
mountain forms a lava dome which collapses during an eruption causing a lot of loose, hot material
to cascade down the steep slopes. (Volcano Discovery 2015). Due to this large quantity of material,
as well as the size of the mountain and the proximity in which people have settled, many lives have
been impacted. As it is inevitable that Mount Merapi will erupt again in the future, a number of
programs for recovery have been set up since 2010. In particular the Community Based Disaster
Risk Reduction (Program Pengurangan Risiko Bencana Berbasis Komunitas or PRBBK). This
agency created the policy under which the Resilient Village Program (RVP) operates. The official
name of the project is: Pembentukan dan pengembangan desa / kelurahan tangguh bencana desa
Hargobinangun, kecamatan pakem, kabupaten sleman badan penanggulangan bencana daerah
daerah istimewa yogyakarta tahun 2015 Which roughly translates to: The establishment and
development of villages / towards disaster resilient Hargobinangun village, district, Sleman district
disaster management agency area of Yogyakarta special region 2015.

This thesis is concerned with the construction and framing of the program, which focuses on
prevention and risk reduction in order to create a safer living environment for those in danger
during a volcanic eruption like the one in 2010. This particular project took place over the period of
February and March of 2015 in the village of Hargobinangun in the subdistrict of Sleman in
Yogyakarta province. During this time a number of training seminars were held to raise awareness of the risks of multiple natural disasters. In addition to this, the project planned to create a risk reduction team that will be in charge of distributing aid funds, and perhaps more importantly, having an evacuation plan ready for the next eruption.

The main statements of the RVP can be found on various websites. One of which is the Lingkar website. Lingkar is the NGO chosen to facilitate the latest project and are also one of the subjects of this thesis. The central idea behind the RVP is that of community based disaster risk reduction. This idea has been a key feature in the planning of the regional disaster management agency, hereafter referred to as the BPBD (Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah) for a few years. The report of the International Organisation of Migration (IOM) in 2011 called: Community-Based Disaster Risk Management: Experiences from Indonesia, defines this type of disaster risk management as the ability of the community to manage the disaster without outside help. The main focus of “increasing local capacity and resilience and reducing vulnerability” (Farransahat, 2011, 8). This idea of capacity building and reduction of vulnerability is the main goal of the RVP. The increase of capacity through education and awareness is also emphasised by Lingkar. The community-based aspect of the statement is emphasised by the BPBD largely because it is a relatively low cost approach and allows for local government decentralisation. Natural disasters are generally large scale events so it makes sense for the community to be able to help themselves during a time when the government is overstretched and unable to gain access to the communities closest to the disaster due to damages to the infrastructure. Knowledge is therefore the first step in a larger scheme to make rural areas safer during a natural disaster. Raising awareness and capacity through socialisation is the main feature of this project. Socialisation is a term often used by Lingkar during our interviews. It is used to describe the training seminars in which knowledge is imparted onto the participants. In a practical sense this means creating community Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) teams as well as hazard and evacuation maps during workshops.

Participation is a key feature in these projects and relies on the “community” as selected by the project organisers. The community is described as the main stake holder in an area and the goal of the project is to have a stronger flow of knowledge between the government and the community. This idea was extremely prevalent in the RVP where imparting knowledge through participation was heavily leaned upon in order to improve people’s decision making capacity during a disaster. Capacity building was another element that is focused on during the training sessions and the
descriptions thereof by both government officials and the Lingkar organisation. This entails the ability level a village has reached to deal with a natural disaster. By creating Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) teams the capacity is increased.

Lingkar formulates the project as a Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction project (PRBBK). Heavy focus on the idea of community can be found throughout the project. On the Lingkar website the project is described as being organised by the “community itself by developing the ability to identify and manage threats, reduce vulnerabilities” as well as increasing self reliance. In order to achieve this, the village must recognise and be able to adapt to threats. Adapting to threats means being able to organise community resources accordingly.

According to Lingkar there are key features of community based disaster risk reduction which are highlighted in the description of the RVP on the Lingkar website. These key features are the “development framework” to “Identify and manage” threats in a “systematic and integrated” way “without creating dependency”, “reducing disaster risks” (Lingkar 2016). Participatory disaster risk assessment is another main line for Lingkar in particular. Increased capacity and integration of disaster risk reduction (DRR) into development planning is a key feature. In order to successfully integrate disaster risk reduction into development planning, Lingkar and the BPBD decided to involve the prominent community groups that are part of shaping the community and its future. These groups include “farmers’ groups, empowerment of family welfare group hereafter abbreviated as the PKK (Pembinaan Kesejahteraan Keluarga), youth clubs, business groups, and the school community” (Lingkar 2016). From these groups a number of representative individuals would be chosen to create a new committee known as the Forum PRB (Forum Pengurangan Resiko Bencana, the forum for disaster risk reduction) and the action teams who are in charge of the institutionalisation of the disaster risk reduction and development planning (Lingkar 2016). The language used on the Lingkar website emphasises the community aspect as well as the responsibility and increased capacity of the local governing bodies to act during a natural disaster. Framed from a managerial standpoint it contains very few details though. It formulates the intentions of the program and Lingkar clearly, although how exactly the goals are to be met is not all that obvious from the information given on their website.

The statements made by the BPBD and Lingkar suggest that the focus of the responsibility in these projects is taken on by the community where the project takes place. The brochures are heavily based on the grass roots idea of closing the gap between government and locals by giving locals more power through knowledge and the ability to implement this knowledge. The very large top
down factor of the knowledge flow is kept low key, where as the active part of willing participants in the community is played up. As the expertise of the professional outsiders is imparted on the locals, much of the responsibility is placed on the villagers themselves to increase their capacity to respond to natural disasters.

1.1 Who is involved

There are a number of actors involved in this project. On the organisational level there are three different actors that fall within the scope of this research. Only Lingkar and BPBD Sleman will be discussed in detail however as they took an active role in the training seminars I observed. On the participation level there are at least 15 participants who are present during in the meetings. The funding for the project is the Disaster Management agency of Yogyakarta province (BPBD). They are responsible for the rescue and recovery during every natural disaster which occurs in the province. For the Resilient Village Program the agency selected the NGO Lingkar that would be facilitating the training. Lingkar would also have some input about the structure and the scale at which this project would take place.

The local Disaster Management agency (BPBD Sleman) is in charge of the region Sleman within the Yogyakarta province which includes the village of Hargobinangun where the training seminars took place. For this particular project the preparedness cluster of BPBD Sleman was enlisted to help. The cluster system is the way in which disaster management agencies and forums are divided, each cluster responsible for a different social aspect.

At the department of disaster preparation, they work with indicators to see whether a village needs more training or preparation. These indicators are target, threat, risk and potential. This indicates one of the ways in which this project was rendered technical. The practical outcome is achieved through the creation of a preparation committee in the village which would be in charge of preparations before the disaster, including the evacuation process and communications between different local actors on the village level. The interesting thing is that the creation of the committee was decided on the level of the Regional BPBD Yogya and the implementation would take place via Lingkar on the village administration level rather than the village community deeming the creation of another committee necessary.

The official goal of the seminars was described similarly to UNDP reports and official statements. These goals were to create awareness, to create management in the form of the Forum PRB, to
increase the capacity to handle a natural disaster by creating a Standard Operational Procedure (SOP) and a contingency plan in the event of an emergency on the sub-village level. Members of BPBD Sleman agency were active during part of the project and the training seminars by providing clarification as well as adding extra elements such as a brief first aid course at the end of some of the meetings. Lingkar were chosen due to their work in risk reduction and prevention during and after natural disasters through preparation and education. A key feature of Lingkar is their focus on participatory meetings and active engagement with the subject and the people they are trying to help. At the time of the seminars two members of Lingkar were always present in order to effectively answer questions during group activities. “The facilitator can help villagers identify disaster and solving problems encountered in development planning and implementation. They can also be a bridge linking government officials with the villagers” (BNPB 2014).

The agencies are promoting resilience in the face of natural disasters in order to reduce the amount of both human and economic losses. Lingkar as a NGO is focused on resilience as a broad spectrum. Their main aim is to provide more information to the members of the community most at risk and so create a safer environment. Their purpose within these meetings is to recommend a disaster plan village to government, escort and ensure the village disaster management plan implementation and aid the integration of disaster risk reduction in the country’s medium term development. All of this can be summerised under the umbrella of “facilitation” of meetings which the NGO does through participatory hazard risk assessment exercises.

In this particular project the aim was to allow a total of thirty participants in each training seminar. However, in reality there were between 15 and 23 people present. The organisers like to describe the participants as “representatives of the village community” as a homogenous group. Where as the participants themselves were invited through their various parties, who were invited by the head of the village. This included prominent figures of the various political groups that are active in the village as well as the sub village leaders, the village elders and of course the village administrative staff. During my time there, some groups stood out more than others. The most vocal were the village elders and occasionally one of the four women of the PKK. It is obvious that each actor holds a different position whether it is in the capacity of the group they are representing or as individuals who are representing themselves and their families. The participants therefore have a difficult job of balancing their own interests with those of the villagers who where not invited. This leads to an interesting dynamic of representation which I will be exploring throughout this paper.
1.2 What constitutes relevance of this topic

Disaster management is important because natural disasters can rarely be prevented, however, they can be managed and be prepared for. This philosophy can save lives and reduce the amount of people negatively affected by natural disasters. Thus in order to manage natural disasters, policies must be implemented to organise the population and the co-ordinate emergency services. Those policies must be adjusted to the society, as there can be multiple and occasionally conflicting policies. Their implementation and effectiveness must be examined. One way to do this is by reflecting on the different actors involved and the effects of the implementation on society. This is the subject of development anthropology. It is the hope that the policies will match the preferred outcome which is also beneficial to those it is meant to help. The Resilient Village Program, the project this paper will focus on, took place in part due to a change in policy.

1.3 Theoretical framework

The main focus of the theoretical framework will be the development concepts discussed by Tania Li among others. These concepts include: discourse and power relations. Within the subject of power relations there are multiple sub categories that all play a role in the interaction I witnessed and will be highlighted below. These are positioning, representation, the process of exclusion, the multiplicity of power and the individualisation of responsibility. The main concept that can influence all of the themes mentioned above is space. Below I will show how discourse and power relations fit together and how they are linked to each other and my own research by the concept of space in which social interactions occur. The reason why space has such a large impact in our social interactions has to do with the idea of performance and performativity. We all act or choose not to, according to our identity and our social constructs. This acting can be seen as a performance. We perform depending on who is around us and in what kind of a space we find ourselves. Performativity simplistically put is to act or perform an identity. This can be in rituals that can only be performed by a person with a specific identity. During my research the space being occupied was the Village Hall. There the members of Lingkar were acting performatively as the co-ordinators of the seminars ensuring the activities were being performed correctly and at the right time. The
participants were also creating a performance that was informed by their social roles within the power structure of the village. This performance can be seen in the interactions between the participants, in what is being said and what the responses are either through speech or body language. The performance can also be seen in what has been left out of the conversation and how actors navigate around certain topics of conversation. Finally, performance can manifest itself physically in the positioning that the actors choose to be in depending on who is present within the space.

**Discourse**

Firstly I will be discussing discourse, as it has a widespread function throughout social interactions. I will be distinguishing between discourse and power relations as two separate concepts. This will allow me to demonstrate what discourse means as a concept and what it represents. I will be examining how discourse and power relations can influence development. From there I will show that in my case study the discourse and language are important enough to know, in terms of how they are used as well as their meaning within the context and the weight of this meaning. What I will show by the end of this section is that language is a source of power which ties into the concept of power relations.

Discourse is a very interesting point of analysis because of its ability to frame as well as influence social interactions. It can is multifaceted in that it can be used as a tool for exclusion and inclusion. As well as being affected by power relations, it can also affect power relations depending on a variety of factors, one of them being the space in which it is used. It is important at this point to note that discourse, although versatile, does not hold the only key to power relations and to development as a whole. As Silvey (2010) and Li (2007) point out, discourse requires social relations and interactions to have an influence. Social relations in this instance refers to the changing positions of people during a social interaction and the language they use to accentuate their claims which then becomes the accepted language. Discourse becomes the language that is accepted in that social circumstance and is a part of many aspects of social interactions. Discourse can also be found in all the theoretical concepts I will be addressing below, therefore it is a highly versatile method of examining the theoretical elements in a real context. Discourse can be used subconsciously by the subjects of the study, or actively. In many cases of development projects the discourse is used by experts in order to maintain the role of the ‘expert’. This can be detrimental as a discourse can only be effective in its goal if it can be understood by its target audience which Marina Welker exemplifies in her study of rural Indonesia. In Welker’s account it is very clear that
the farmers grew tired of listening to the facilitators using words they did not understand. This was development language such as “productivity, commitment, management, money (monitoring and evaluation), and lab” (Welker, 2012, 399). It highlights the use of discourse as a form of re-affirmation of power. By using this language, the facilitators not only re-affirmed their role as experts but also excluded the people they were meant to be working for. It exemplifies that the language can be used in a social setting as a process by which different actors contest each other to show their social power.

**Power relations**

When we discuss power relations it is important to talk about Foucault and governmentality as this is linked to power and power relations. Governmentality produces subjects, it suggests that subjects exist in a network of relations within their own space. Power relations are irrevocably linked to the positioning of actors, be it via representation or the multiplicity of power. Below I will address these elements individually. There are a number of power relations that can be found within these training seminars. The first I will examine is the role of the expert and the participants. In Welker’s account the role of the expert was a source of power and did not necessarily focus on the transfer of knowledge in a productive manner. In Hargobinangun, where I conducted my research, the setting was comparable in that the seminars were designed in part, to transfer knowledge from the experts to the locals. In the case of Hargobinangun however the discourse strove to seemingly reduce the hierarchical divide between the roles as highlighted Tania Li (2007) and Welker (2012). Lingkar made use of the participatory discourse of the ‘facilitator’ who much like in Welker’s narrative “facilitated participants acquisition of knowledge and consciousness rather than teaching participants from a position of hierarchical authority” (Welker, 2012, 393). This is a key factor in the participation development discourse, much like the language. Words such as ‘capacity building’ and ‘socialisation’ were widely used by both participants and facilitators. Therefore the power of the facilitators was established less by the participatory development language but more by the use of space. This can be exemplified by Welker’s narrative where the transfer of knowledge was taking place outside the confines of the village thus the ‘experts’ held all the power. In Hargobinangun however, the power structure was not as easily defined. From what I observed, the facilitators had less social power in this interaction than the facilitators in Welker’s narrative, partly because the seminars in Hargobinangun took place in the village hall, a place where the village administration holds the power. The space in which seminars are held can influence the power which the
Positioning

Space has the potential to define the kind of power relations that can manifest. Another dimension additionally to the role of the expert and the participants is in the power relations between the participants amongst themselves. These power relations can manifest themselves through positioning. How one positions oneself in relation to others within a space can signify and strengthen the social power one has within the context of the situation. There is not only a physical position one can take up but also a philosophical or political one. By taking up these positions, actors are able to participate in the social and political sphere. Tania Li describes this in her book *The Will to Improve*. “In this book, I explore the positionings that enable people to practice a critical politics” (Li, 2007, 24). This suggests that the actor actively takes a position within a space or a social framework. However, that is not necessarily the case as one can also passively take a position. It is important to note, as Welker (2012) points out, that one individual can take up multiple positions within the setting. During the seminars at Hargobinangun, the participants could be representing multiple positions whether actively or implicitly, as individual village inhabitants, as members of the social or political group of the village and finally as the village ‘community’ among others. Whether the actor is active or passive within a social setting can be in part due to power relations with the other actors within the space or the space itself which gives more power to some actors and less to others. The reason why the position of each actor is important is because it creates the lens through which the subject is studied.

Representation

Power relations are of course also manifested through representation which can be seen from a number of different angles. As described above, subjects within a space will take up certain positions whether actively or passively. However, which position is being represented depends on who is there to take up the positions. Thus we come to the question of representation of the ‘community’ and how this is achieved. Firstly we must look at the process of inclusion and exclusion as this is the first stage in which the number of participants is narrowed down. When I spoke to Lingkar about the seminars, we discussed the village ‘community’, which was narrowed down during conversations to ‘prominent members of the community’ which in turn boiled down to the village administrative staff, the chief of police of the area as well as representatives of
recognised prominent social and political groups which can be found within the village community. The representation of the village becomes more implicit as only a maximum of 30 members of the village could attend the seminars.

**The process of exclusion**

We can examine the process of exclusion as a theoretical concept as it is the representation of the power dynamics at play during these social interactions. The process of exclusion can have an impact on the way policies are written and implemented (Silvey, 2010). In the case of Hargobinangun, the policy that is being affected is the evacuation plan as well as the team who is responsible for its implementation.

**Individualising Responsibility**

One of the aspects of the training seminars was the creation of the disaster risk reduction forum (PRB Forum); this group is in charge of organisation before the eruption takes place, and the Unit Pelaksama Bercana (Unit Lak), a team responsible for organising the evacuation. These two committees are responsible for how a natural disaster is handled by the local authorities and the people of the village, including the distribution and execution of an evacuation plan. With this in mind, I will examine the idea of responsibility and how, with the help of these training seminars, I would argue that it becomes de-politicised and therefore these seminars become a way to individualise responsibility Li (2007). I argue that through the use of the participation discourse the responsibility is framed on a community level and therefore becomes individual which in turn creates more agency. Although the members who bare the responsibility of the Unit Lak and the PRB Forum are prominent figures on the village political stage, I would argue that the language used during the seminars means that these participants represent the community. It is the socially prominent figures of the village who create an evacuation plan with Lingkar therefore they have agency in terms of organisation and management in their respective committees. Discussed by Li (2007) as one of the participatory strategy of ‘collaborative management’, the idea that practices desires are altered to create the individual responsibility that creates a more resilient and prepared village.

Thus disaster risk reduction has been framed at the ‘community’ level, assuming that the ‘community’ is accurately represented through the 30 individuals that take part in the seminars. The individualisation of the responsibility can be seen on multiple levels within the seminars themselves. In the first instance the actors were chosen to represent the ‘community’ as a whole in
order to pass down the knowledge of natural disasters and their consequences. At the second level, the participants of the seminars were made responsible to create a contingency plan for each of their respective sub villages as well as electing a small group of people who would then be responsible of enacting the SOP during an emergency. This shows that within the seminars the participants had to actively as well as passively take up multiple positions, some of which carried with them more responsibility than others. I can also analyse the types of positions which are allowed to be involved in the discussions. This can be extrapolated by examining the groups that are being represented at the seminars. This will indicate the type of responsibility as well as the power which each of these groups have within the social framework of the ‘community’ (Welker, 2012). Another level would be to examine who within those groups spoke up during the discussions in the seminars, which will be more closely examined in chapter 4.

**The multiplicity of power an elaboration of power relations and Space**

From the idea of individualised responsibility we arrive at an interesting social dynamic which can be explained by the multiplicity of power. This theoretical concept stems from the idea that where there are multiple positions there will also be multiple stakes and agendas, although one may not necessarily reflect the other, depending on the power relations between the different stakeholders. Contradictions and gaps between multiple agendas are the practical result (Li, 2007). The phenomenon could be seen on multiple levels amongst the participants and the organisers themselves during the seminars at Hargobinangun. The interactions shed some light onto the complexity of power relations within the community and will be discussed in further detail in chapter 3 and 4.

**Space**

All the concepts above are linked through the context of space. I observed the interactions between the actors because of the space in which the seminars took place. Power relations can manifest themselves differently depending on the space in which the actors find themselves in. One of the ways in which this occurs is through discourse, where certain language is accepted or used whereas others may not be. Terms and phrases may also have different connotations and meanings depending on the space, although that in part also has to do with language and the context in which the terms are used. Positioning whether active or passive, physically or politically can be affected by space. In some cases actors would choose a more active role where the actor has more power. On the other hand, if an actor has very little power in a certain space they might be more passive. This
links to performance and performativity which is influenced not only by the actors present and the power there but also the space in which certain behaviour might be expected or in which the actor is used to performing a certain identity. Discourse is influenced not only by the scale, level or time at which it is said but also where it is being said (Li, 2007). During my observations the language used by the facilitators became a lot more formal during seminars where the village head was present. The presence of the village head shifted the power relations. The village head held more social power in the space of the village hall than the facilitators. This also influenced the behaviour of the participants which I will expand on in chapter 4.

The problem of resilience

Resilience has been used in a variety of different ways over the years in many different fields of study. It has become one of the terms used during disaster management. One of the definitions of resilience is increasing the capacity for adaptability in the broadest sense of the term. The theories of resilience show the vast array of aspects that can be considered part of the resilience of a place. These can be anything from the social, economic and political aspects to name a few. Resilience can also be considered on the individual or the communal level. During my investigation of Hargobinangun I was able to witness one of the operational aspects of the idea of communal resilience. The terms of capacity and adaptability were translated into participant exercises and the creation of plans of action and groups to monitor these plans. The most important element are the continuous monitoring and the increase of the capabilities of the community to be able to help itself.

I believe that because the RVP used to be a UN funded project, that the definition of resilience was originally given as the capacity of a community to resist or to change in order to gain an acceptable level of functioning. This level of functioning is determined by the capability of the community to organise itself and its capacity for learning and adapting including the ability to recover from disaster (Klein et al., 2004). One problem with this definition lies in the fact that it is very broad and generic and the word resilience is part of the discourse that was used by all the actors I interviewed. This is interesting because it is not always clear what the actors meant by it.

In academia there is some debate as to what resilience represents as a concept in the social sciences as well as the very important question of how it is translated into operational practices. I will expand on these aspects below in order to arrive at a definition which I believe will be most applicable for this paper. The key aspect of resilience that Klein et al. (2004) describe is that it can be addressed in a number of ways. One of these ways is in terms of prevention which is the key
point that this thesis focuses on. One important aspect of the definition, when it is used for management and policy, is the capacity for learning and adapting. Therefore many would argue that resilience is not so much an outcome of a process but it is more an ability or a process itself (Norris et al., 2007). If we consider resilience to be a process, then I must also examine the practical aspects of this which I witnessed during my research.

The two elements that are most closely linked to this concept are participation and sustainability. This is especially true when they are discussed in terms of their application to a community. The participants that took part in the RVP represent the community of the village as a whole and according to Norris et al. (2007), resilience is a form of networked adaptive capacities. The fact that the participants are part of organisations that span across the community as a whole as well as creating new sub committees within the seminars shows that Lingkar tried to increase these networked capacities. The link between resilience and a sustainable community is an easy one to draw when one considers a natural disaster to be the prime reason for its implementation. Large scale natural disasters usually affect everyone in a smaller community where the geographical as well as social community overlaps. Therefore it makes sense to try to increase the resilience of the entirety of the community.

Texts relating to resilience juxtapose the idea of resilience and the idea of stability in the ecosystem. However, I believe that in order to be resilient as a community, we require a stable base in order to adapt. In the terms of participation this means that the stability comes from the power structure that is in place and the willingness of participants to create an adaptive strategy.

From the different elements listed above I will take the word resilience to mean the act of decreasing vulnerability by increasing the capacity, or ability for the village community to adapt and respond to a situation caused by a volcanic eruption. I therefore consider the RVP to increase the resilience of Hargobinangun.

1.4 Methodology

In order to answer my research question I traveled to Yogyakarta for three months. Once I arrived I was fortunate to be introduced to my student counterpart who would be helping me with interviews and translations during my research. I chose to conduct my research using participant observations and semi-structured interviews, as well as some internet research. During the interviews I wrote
down key points and for most parts I was able to gain permission for recording the conversations for clarification purposes.

I was very interested in the long term aid which was being given to survivors of the Mount Merapi eruption of 2010. In the first month I attempted to focus on villages that had been resettled entirely as I believed that these would require most long term aid in order to reorganise their lives after having lost everything. After having spoken to a number of its inhabitants about the type of aid they received and from whom they received it, most of which were government organisations or NGO’s under contract from the government and were economic in nature, some more successful than others, one leader suggested that it would take the village at least another seven years in order to return to its original economic standing.

As I interviewed residents of the Sleman region I realised that most aid programs had already been concluded and that many had not been able to have the impact desired by the community. Nevertheless I chose to interview a few NGO’s that had been part of projects after the eruption. During these interviews I also asked about NGO’s that were currently active on the Merapi slopes whether in a permanent resettlement or in a village that had been evacuated and repopulated after the disaster. As it turned out there were many families and villages that chose not to move out of the disaster zone after it was safe to return and were in fact very adamant about staying in on their land. After the villagers, with the help of local community groups, had cleaned up the aftermath of the eruption they began to ask what the government was doing in order to make their lives safer.

From one of these interviews I was able to get contact information for one of the NGO’s that is still active in this region, namely Lingkar. Lingkar was working with local schools and villages to create a safer environment. During my interview with one of the project leaders at Lingkar I was told they had been asked by the BPBD to facilitate the Resilient Village Program in Hargobinangun. I was lucky enough to be invited to these training programs and with my student counterpart we attended four out of the eleven training seminars and were able to observe and occasionally join in the proceedings. In future research I will try to ensure that I can be located as close as possible to my research location. My Indonesian student colleague and I lived in Yogyakarta city which was at least an hour away by scooter and caused some minor inconveniences at the time.

Through these training seminars we also met the participants and were able to arrange interviews where we discussed the idea of resilience and the training seminars themselves. The participants of the training were all members of the local community groups as well as village governing bodies, most notably the PKK, sub village and village heads and the young adults group. During the first training me and my student counterpart attended we were asked to introduce ourselves and explain
why we were there. After this most participants accepted us as being part of the training and we were asked to join in with the participation and ice breaker exercises. The women of the group seemed very welcoming and came to talk to us during the lunch break, during which we were also offered a packed lunch and drinks also provided to the other participants. The men were more reserved although I feel this is partially due to the fact that we were both female. They were open and friendly as soon as we would initiate the conversation. This was occasionally difficult. Due to the nature of their positions most participants left very quickly after the training was complete having busy lives with appointments to keep.

Naturally, the seminars as well as the interviews were conducted in Indonesian. My basic understanding of the language was not enough to follow these in detail and I relied heavily on the translations of my student counterpart. The Lingkar coordinator was also able to translate occasionally but the whole procedure of a two way translation was not ideal as participants continued to talk amongst themselves while the translation was ongoing. Often by the time my next question was translated the discussion had already moved on. Discovering the real thoughts of the participants this way was rather challenging and more time would have been required to interact with them on a more personal level. Since neither of us lived directly in the village itself during the research the interaction was limited to the visits.
2. Background and Training seminars

In order to gain a better understanding of the RVP and how actors worked and related to it within this framework, it is important to understand details of the project content. Amongst others it is crucial to understand how this was influenced by the location where it took place. The RVP took place in the village hall of Hargobinangun on the slopes of Mount Merapi, an active volcano. This influenced not only how the seminars were conducted but more importantly the power relations within the seminars as well as the responses and attitude of the participants.

First I will examine the location itself and the influence it has on the behaviours of the participants. Secondly, I will take a short look at how the village is internally organised to explain why this is a crucial element specifically for development projects. I will put this in context how it affected this particular project. Thirdly, I will re-examine the project goals and analyse how these were translated into reality by discussing the different elements that make up the RVP. I will show how these were influenced by the different elements of theory I discussed in chapter 1.

2.1 Surroundings of Hargobinangun

The surrounding landscape of Hargobinangun is dominated by relatively steep mountain slope terrain. Further up and in the proximity of the peak itself, the land also gets more fertile. The nearest town is Sleman which is connected to the main road down to Yogya city. This main road is the primary escape and evacuation path in the event of a large scale eruption. In the aftermath of the eruption in 2010 the volcano and surrounding areas have been divided into three different zones. Each zone is classified by a hazard level and therefore is associated with certain rules and regulations. The zones are especially important in this case because the village of Hargobinangun itself is sprawled across the whole mountain side. Hargobinangun consists of 12 subvillages.

Six of these are located in the zoned off areas and four of them can be found in zone 3, the closest to the mountain top. Those six subvillages have a prepared contingency plan (SOP). The four sub villages in zone 3, Kaliurang Timur, Kaliurang Barat, Nipiksari and Buyong have already prepared a SOP prior to the implementation of the resilient village program. According to a member in Lingkar, it is expected that it might take about 5 years in order for all of the villages in zone 3 to become completely resilient. The fact that the villagers live so close to the direct danger zone and at the same time relatively far away from the city has meant in the past that the village is very
independent. As a consequence of that, the attitude towards outside help is somewhat ambivalent as one of the persons I spoke to remarked, that people in the area can be very stubborn.Officially people are no longer permitted to reside in this area because it is identified as the most hazardous location. One implication is that here people are no longer allowed to erect new buildings or homes. Old houses are allowed to be rebuilt. However, no financial aid was given to the people in Kaliurang Timur because their homes were only damaged by a lahar (mudflow). The government is also no longer granting money for infrastructure maintenance and repairs apart from those leading to tourist attractions. Tourist attractions are important to this area because a large part of the local economy is dependent on income generated by visitors. The income from the entry fees for the different attractions are divided with different shares between the village and the district based on the time of the day: between 8:00-3:00, 10% goes to the village and 90% to the district while from 3:00-12:00 40% goes to the village and 60% to the district. This is a prevention method designed to reduce the number of people residing in this area to a bare minimum. Those working in the agriculture or tourist industry were permitted to stay in their homes and many did.

2.2 The Village

Hargobinangun is divided into a number sub villages and neighbourhoods known as RW and RT respectively. There are multiple RT within an RW, and the way a RW is organised is influenced by the geographic location. Many of the RW are surrounded by steep hills in the north and rice fields in the south. This means that the RW are relatively independent. The majority of the population are farmers or active in the tourist trade. I received this is information from Pak Y, who’s wife runs a warong (eating establishment) in Kaliurang Timur. The participants I spoke to during the seminars were all involved in the organisation of the village, sometimes on a sub village level. This meant that many of the participants were leaders and organisers in their own right. This independence creates a certain attitude towards outside development aid. Although the aid is appreciated, it is not always well thought out by the planners taking the local peculiarities into account. The locals therefore have to make sure the aid is actually beneficial to them and the ones who need to most. This in part is why there are a large number of committees and social groups within the village. Those try to be active in the local community and help to organise the aid the village receives in a more structured and appropriate way.
During a weekend visit to the sub village I was able to stay at the house of Ibu B. She is an active member of the PKK and organises many activities, including the appropriate use of aid. An example of a project which was left to the villagers to maximise its potential was the local garden. The government had given Randu (an RW) soil in a large heap, without much else in terms of indication of use nor was it in a favourable location according to Ibu B. The ‘community’ of Randu (the PKK and the women’s group) decided to create a communal garden where work is shared every Sunday. This coincided with another sustainable project where each household that registered got the same number of plants and fertiliser from the local dairy farm. Ibu B was eager to show my student counterpart and myself the sustainable aspect of the community. The plants provided to the families would yield some form of fruit or vegetables. The women were working in the garden and tending to the plants while a number of men were working on building a bamboo fence for the communal plant nursery. On the particular Sunday I was present, I found that those I met were performing the role of ‘sustainable community’. I witnessed this by way of development discourse that had seeped into the everyday lives of the village members, especially in the form of ‘sustainability’ and the need for sustainable farming and planning which was clearly an important aspect to those taking part in the gardening activities. It is interesting to reflect on the concept of a “sustainable community”: In the practical sense it is what I was shown with the gardening and the experimentation with cow manure as fertiliser instead of other more traditional methods. I think that the villagers have come to link sustainability and resilience to the idea of independence from outside involvement. From the conversations I had with Ibu B and her family the emphasis was strongly on independence from outside help and how the sub village was able to organise the clean up of the volcanic ash by themselves. By coming back to their homes they showed resilience and with the planting they are finding new ways of sustaining themselves when there are no other options.

The performativity of the response to aid is a telling example of the dynamic between development aid and the ‘community’. The ‘community’ independently makes decisions of how to use the aid provided by the government, thus the role of the ‘expert’ is taken over by the ‘community’ itself and the responsibility of how the aid is used is individualised. This in part can be used to explain the attitudes in the training seminars, which were structured on a more ‘expert’ and ‘participant’ basis.
2.3 How the village is organised

The attitudes of participants can be in part explained by the location. A larger part however is the performance they were portraying within the seminars which can be examined further when one examines the power structure of the administration of the village. As all the participants were involved in the village administration or in a dominant organisation of the village in one way or another which influences the power and the discourse and the way the seminars are conducted. Part of the RVP is to implement a policy which is described by Li as “law and participatory procedures would become tactics of government, tools to educate the desires of the villagers and reform their practices” (Li, 2007, 196) in order to educate and inform the participants desires Lingkar was needed to facilitate. There seems to be a gap between development plans set out by the government and the implementation on a local level. According to Lingkar the policy at the district level is not the same as the policies at village level (Lingkar 2016) and through the participation in this project the problem would be reduced, at least for this sector.

The reason for this gap between government and local policies is two fold. The first reason is because ‘development’ as a concept provides the framework for discussion for managing the relationship between ‘the state’ and it’s citizens which automatically creates a gap between the developer, in this case the state and the receiver (Li, 1999). The framework which denotes ‘us’ and ‘them’ also denotes the receivers of development as ‘lacking’ something. Thus by defining positions, the participants of projects are placed lower in the social power structure than they were before, which is perpetuated through the use of discourse during these projects. The second reason is the disconnect between the populous and political structure. Indonesia has a very bureaucratic governmental structure. “There are five levels of government administration in Indonesia; national (pusat), provinces (propinsi), districts (kabupaten/kota), subdistricts (kecamatan) and municipalities (kelurahan/desa). A municipality encompasses several villages (dusun).” (Mei E.T.W et al., 2013, 2). Each of the villages has it’s own administrational staff with sub villages and neighborhoods having their own leaders providing input into the village administration. According to Lingkar this type of organisation causes very disorganised data management and record keeping as well as a clash of commitments and activity planning (Lingkar 2016). Between all these different administrative branches there are a number of committees which also have influence or at the very least input into some aspects of development programs. With this in mind we can already see that the power dynamic during the training seminars was constantly being re-evaluated depending on attendance levels. With the power dynamic the discourse also changed slightly in order to fit this
new dynamic, the effect of which will be described below.

2.4 Project goals and execution

The Resilient Village program was initiated in 2012 originally a project of the UNDP but was taken over fully by the regional disaster management agency (BPBD) later. The idea to increase safety through raising awareness is present, however, the engagement with the participants and the extent of the trainings has been reduced due to funding, the premise remains the same. The BPBD definition of a resilient village is that the village as a unit can be a part of actively assessing, evaluating, monitoring and reducing risks. As a consequence then being able to appropriately respond using local resources and finally recover quickly from disasters (IMDFFDR, 2013, 5). For the village of Hargobinangun the BPBD selected Lingkar to provide the village with the necessary platform to increase the resilience through the use of training seminars. From what I gathered, the people to participate were chosen by the village head who invited the various groups and committees to send a certain number of representatives. The incentive to attend for most participants I spoke to was the sheer motivation of making the village more resilient. In order to persuade people to follow the complete program there was mandatory monetary contribution that the participants had to place with the organisers in the first week and would be able to pick up again in the final session if they had attended enough training in between.

It was decided to hold eleven meetings which would provide enough information for the village to vote on an evacuation committee known as the Forum Pengurangan Risiko Bencana (Forum PRB) as well as an evacuation action plan known as a Standard Operational Procedure (SOP). Adjustments had to be made in practice as the village already had such a committee in place, the Unit Pelaksama Bencana (Unit Lak). It became the task of Lingkar to ensure that the committee was up to the required legal standards. The mission statement for this project on the Lingkar website is to create a “Critical civil society and demographic with a sustainable livelihood responsive and resilient to disasters” (Lingkar 2016). This is a very broad statement at best but lends itself nicely to being rendered technical. Tania Li describes this in her book as solutions that are constructed around ‘solvable problems’, meaning problems which have a manageable solution (Li, 2007). Translated to our case it means that the technical problem is achieving a pre-defined benchmark criteria which will create a more resilient village. Those were highlighted and made the focus of the
activities of the RVP seminars, in order to elevate Hargobinangun into stage one resilience from its current position at stage three. By rendering something technical one is able to have clear goals within the time frame allocated for a project. This can clearly be seen on Lingkar’s website when they describe what the RVP has achieved and highlight the evidence of this achievement in very concrete forms.

The concept of resilience as a whole is problematic which is why the necessity arose to render it technical in the first place. The concept is problematic because it is a subjective criteria which can encompass a large number of aspects of daily life. If one examines the idea of a resilient village in the face of a natural disaster the resilience cannot be tested until a practical event. Regardless of whether people have the capacity to leave their homes with minimal loss of lives, homes and fields will still be damaged and therefore in a practical sense full resilience can never truly occur.

2.5 Training seminars

Since 2012, five training seminars have taken place with more planned over the course of 2015. The training seminars are sponsored by the BNPD in Yogyakarta. It is then left to BPBD Selaman to organise them. Both these government agencies hope to achieve the trickle down effect of information. At a very minimum ideas and concepts what the kinds of hazards are need to be understood and how to respond to them appropriately. Knowledge of who is in charge of information during an eruption needs to be part of the education, but according to Mr X these agencies do not follow up on whether or not this has in fact taken place.

The flow of information during these seminars is in principle from the ‘expert’ to the ‘participant’, the provincial BPBD provide the incentive for the project. The total number of participants is set by the amount of funding given, usually enough for 30 people. BPBD Selaman then produce the information they want to have relayed to the participants of the seminars by Lingkar which in turn is responsible for facilitating and providing additional knowledge and explanations if required.

The goal of these seminars was to lead the participants on the path of discovering that the disaster management team would be a helpful addition to the village administration. This education started with the hazard mapping, then included risk assessments and finally leading to a hazard ranking which I will describe below.

The seminars were held in the village hall with the following layout of the room: there was one table in front of the stage, further back were two more tables, and behind those rows of chairs
effectively creating an isle down the centre of the room. On the table at the front was a projector for a screen where Lingkar could display any changes they made to the documents the seminars were generating. Even though the village hall also has a lectern, Lingkar chose not to use it and were often walking in front of the table at the front. This shows the approach and method Lingkar wanted to convey in these seminars. Although the setting of the village hall is a relatively formal one, the participatory methods Lingkar prescribes to led to a more informal setting. This is significant because it shows the way in which space can influence the proceedings. It shows that Lingkar had to choose to position themselves directly in front of the participants rather than talking at them from behind a table in order to reduce the gap between ‘expert’ and ‘participant’ and make it easier for the participation methods to be accepted.

During the first few seminars the participants learned about community hazard maps and vulnerability maps. Through participatory methods of making these maps themselves, the capacity and resilience of the village was increased. The capacity for the community and the resources that are available in the community were also discussed in question and answer sessions about what kind of hazards exist in each part of the village. Creating committees and updating the existing ones will increase the capacity to handle a natural disaster. Different elements of the seminars are addressed below, most of these were punctuated by a participatory group activity that built up the awareness and knowledge of the participants from the ground up. The focus was very much to make the participants actively think about the situations and come up with solutions for various natural disasters. This participation and active knowledge building is one of the key elements of creating a resilient village.

The first of the participation exercises was to create a community hazard map. This is achieved through a series of participatory risk assessments allowing the participants to get involved with the training seminars. For the risk assessment, the participants were divided into groups, each group dealing with a different scenario of a risk that could occur on the slopes of the mountain. The groups were divided such that there was one female per group. During the group discussions it was mainly the older gentlemen who had the word and the females who were writing the information down. To chooses hazard topics the different groups were asked to discuss included: Lava Flows, Lahar Dingin (a cold mud flow), a hot mud flow, an earthquake and a typhoon or heavy storm. The groups had to fill in a table about the risk, mitigation, preparedness and rehabilitation that would have to take place in case of such an event. When each group was finished, results were shared with the whole seminar again mainly articulated by the older gentlemen of the group and collected to be
written up into a document by Lingkar for a copy for the village office. I witnessed this group dynamic on multiple occasions. Although it was clear that the women had just as much to say as the men, they often chose not to speak out, or to speak out only at very specific occasions when the discussion was not leading anywhere. Accepted local social behavior and cultural history is here leading to suboptimal results. A further more proactive integration of female participants could have maybe been achieved by forming female only groups or having the facilitator play a more active role in encouraging verbal contributions from females. The clear plan by the facilitators was to manage the ‘desires’ of the participants and actively steer them towards the need for a preparation team, which was part of the new government policy. Disaster management discourse was used to accentuate the severity of the problem. The difference in thinking and by extrapolation also the difference in the use of discourse could be found when the participants were asked to create a contingency plan for different scenarios such as land slides, eruptions and storms. They were given tables with columns they needed to fill in such as problem, action to be under taken and result among others. Everything was going well until the question of the result. Many of the participants took the result to mean who would be in charge of the recovery project and put the names of the NGO’s, government services and community organisations. However, the question that Lingkar was actually asking was what these projects and actions would intend to achieve. This lead to some debate among the participants and the members of Lingkar. What this anecdote shows is that miscommunication can occur easily and even if we speak in the same language it does not mean that we speak with the same discourse.

To make additions to the hazard map, another seminar involved a risk and hazard ranking where the hazards used were the ones discussed and highlighted in the previous meeting. The objective of this exercise was to rank the hazards in terms of their impact from most severe to least. The different forms of impacts considered included: How many and which people are affected, the geographical area of the impact, from historic observations and future predictions the frequency of the occurrence, the potential economic loss in turns of livelihood, livestock, land and homes and the capacity to cope with and recover from such a hazard. In the second part of the seminar discussion groups debated factors that affect losses based on data and observations from the 2010 eruption. Once again the participants were divided into groups and asked to fill in a table that focused on the resources, losses and cost of the rebuild.

The resources discussed were divided into five clusters, a typical way by which most disaster management is organised in Yogyakarta: Those include first and foremost human related aspects:
Listing specifically the number of people injured or killed as well as vulnerable groups within the community, such as the elderly, the children and the sick. Secondly economic aspects: the economy suffered tremendously due to the eruption as much of the local revenue is generated by agriculture. Thirdly social factors: In which the focus is on religion, education, public administration, cultural capacity, (meaning cultural activities such as dances and festivals) and health. Finally natural resources and infrastructure are considered.

The availability of village contingency plans, including evacuation plans, also known as a SOP was the proposed solution to the technical problem that the hazard maps described. By discussing this during one of the seminars the participants were shown what the expected behavior (Li, 2007) during an eruption would be according to the SOP. One of the main focus points of the discussion was which resources would be needed in the case of an eruption and what is currently available. This is a very important aspect as the current shortcoming was to become the problem of the PRB Forum as they would be in charge of stocking up and preparing for the disaster.

The goal of these training seminars is to create the Forum PRB as well as focusing on some of the indicators highlighted by the BPBD. According to Lingkar, the Forum PRB is meant to bring together the different village stakeholders and “recommend a disaster plan village to village government” (Lingkar 2016). Thus the Forum PRB is designed to reduce the pressure on the emergency services during an eruption as it allows villages that are relatively difficult to reach to organise and evacuate themselves. The Forum PRB is an evacuation committee to coordinate activities before and during the disaster. The reason behind creating the PRB was that since 2015 the BPBD on the district level pushed a legislation for all evacuation committees to have the same standard. Thus the training sessions are held to create the Forum PRB. During the seminars it became clear that the village already had a disaster management team in place known as the Unit Lak. The theory of the BNPD was that the Unit Lak should only be responsible during and after the eruption. However, because the Unit had been put in place earlier than the government proposals it was responsible for the time before, during and after the event. This caused confusion as the two committees duties would overlap. This was not acceptable in the bureaucratic as well as in the current social structure of the village administration thus the performative priority became to keep the current power relations in tact.

The Forum PRB also works with the cluster system, In this case there are three levels: Preparedness and prevention, emergency response and recovery. The preparation and prevention cluster take an active role in the Forum PRB. The evacuation plan, SOP amongst other things, is only used by the
Forum passively as they are there to advise the Unit Lak on events during and after the eruption as well as for the recovery.

Unit Pelaksama Bercana (Unit Lak)
The Unit Lak therefore, plays an active role during and after the eruption. This committee utilises the SOP in order to minimise casualties and loss of livelihood. The only people who can be part of this unit are the villages leaders and the staff members of village management. The Unit Lak was created in 2010 just after the eruption, however according to Mr Y the management team needs to be refreshed.

Standard Operational Procedure (SOP)
Refreshing the Unit, and increasing the preparedness and resilience of this village is done by creating a SOP on the sub village level and a contingency planning on the village level. It is the Unit Lak that puts the SOP into practice during and after the eruption. The SOP is the action plan during a worst case scenario such as an eruption. It lists the names of those in charge and what their respective tasks are. Contact information as well as steps that must be taken can also be found in the SOP. Four sub villages of Hargobinangun already have such a SOP from previous seminars.

In the sub village of Kaliurang Timur the procedures are as follows: The first stage, the normal stage, a census is done to ensure that everyone is registered and can be accounted for. This is important as during the eruption aid is supplied only to those who are officially registered. Care is taken also to list the most susceptible members of society, these are the pregnant, very old, very young and the sick. A regular inventory of livestock is also done. During this time the SOP is evaluated to make sure that it is still suitable and up to date, with the help of a training seminar.

In the Waspada (caution) stage the head of the RT (forty households) informs the community that the volcano is starting to become active again and could become dangerous soon. Then an appeal is sent out to all those living in the danger zone that certain activities should no longer be undertaken. During this time the sub village starts coordinating with the Unit Lak and the community is told to prepare in case of an evacuation with a preparedness bag, This bag includes essential things such as documents and other items that secure the future of the family.

Occasionally the volcano will reach the Siaga (alert) stage, this is divided into stages one, two and three. Again it is the head of the RT who informs the community that the alert stage has been increased. The coordination with the Unit Lak should be ongoing. This is the stage in which the
susceptible members of the population and the livestock start being evacuated to safer areas down the mountain.

In the final stage Awas (danger) the head of the RT as well as the volcanic observatory in Yogya inform the community of the imminent danger. Now the rest of the population is evacuated. It is the responsibility of the Team Risk Reduction to check who has been evacuated and who has not. The leader of the RT is responsible for the clean up after the eruption has taken place.

During the previous eruption not all these stages went very smoothly as many choose not to evacuate their homes until there is imminent danger as there is a high level of uncertainty as to if a volcano will or not erupt.

In each sub village the SOP should be slightly different depending on management and geography. However for general information and planning the SOP is very important therefore the goal of these training seminars was to combine all eight of the SOP’s from the different sub villages into one.

During the training seminar the SOP was introduced and built from the ground up. This was done through risk and hazard ranking. The hazards had been discussed and decided upon in previous meetings. The object of this exercise was to rank the hazards from most to least impacts. The impacts include: people affected, the area of impact, frequency of occurrence, economic loss and the capacity to cope and recover from such a hazard. From the result of this ranking the seminar leaders want to make an Standard Operatinal Procedure (SOP) in this case for an explosive volcanic eruption like one which occurred in 2010.

The making of the SOP took longer than expected and over several seminars improvements were suggested. Mr Z wanted to have a SOP with the same structure as another RT that already had a SOP in place, namely Kaliurang. The only thing that would need to be changed were the names in the management and coordination positions. This could potentially reduce the accuracy of some of the descriptions of tasks within the SOP. A major change that Mr Z would like to have in the SOP is the guarantee of shelter in UII (Islamic University of Indonesia) in the event of an eruption that causes damage up to 10Km from the peak. The guarantee of shelter is an important issue that a number of participants spoke about during interviews. As a volcanic eruption causes vast amounts of damage it can be months or even years before people can return to their homes. In order to reduce the concern the government has started implementing a sister village program. During an eruption the households of the sister village are informed if there is a chance of evacuation in order to make the move as harmonious as possible. Hargobninagun’s sister village is Candi which can be found further down the mountain. Next to the sister village there are also the sister school, economy
and social programs. Many however still say that it is too close to the peak and would therefore prefer evacuation to the city of Yogyakarta.

This chapter highlighted the technical side of the RVP, it shows that the interactions between the different parties during the seminars had many performative elements took place during the seminars. I have also shown that the participatory procedures can influence the desires of the ‘community’ to a certain extent, the SOP and the Unit Lak as well as the Forum PRB all had to be created due to the new government policy, yet once again the independence and individualisation of responsibility of the village stood out as it was up to the participants to decide who would take which role, how seriously the government demands would be taken. I have also shown that the bureaucratic structure is not only part of the administration but also part of the social fabric of the village. The conflict caused by the Unit Lak and the Forum PRB in the early stages of the seminars was caused by the need for structural order and social stability as the village head could not be told what to do by anyone else in the village. How these seminar elements were interpreted and framed by the various actors involved will be shown in the following chapters.
3. Practice in development management

Power relations are an intrinsic part of human interaction especially during training seminars with multiple organising parties. Discourse is an element of these power relations. Discourse in and of itself does not give power in a direct way. It can be a useful tool to establish power through establishing positions which become exclusive through the language and communication used by actors in these positions. In this chapter I wish to highlight the positioning of the representatives of the two organising parties which I came into contact with during this project. In order for me to examine the positioning, I will first discuss the practice of government, which occurs on the level of development programs. This is where the concept of development is problematised and rendered technical (Li, 2007). From the concepts of governmentality and rendering technical I will move on to discuss the idea of trusteeship. As this is the main position that Lingkar takes during these seminars it creates interesting dynamics and interactions which will be discussed later in the chapter.

Governmentality is the idea that one can create a subject by conforming the subject to the ‘right’ way to behave to specific goals (Li, 2007). This is the way in which many development projects operate including this resilient village program (RVP). I will look more closely at the ‘experts’ or the ‘trustees’. First I will examine the BPBD Sleman (the local disaster management agency of the Sleman region) and their relationship with Lingkar, the NGO picked by the regional disaster management agency of Yoyga.

Lingkar members were not oblivious to the fact that participation has its drawbacks. One of the items specifically mentioned by Lingkar members was that the discussions during the training seminars were occasionally one sided. Lingkar suggested that this is because some participants of the seminars may not want to speak out when others were present due to existing power dynamics of the village. This shows that although participation as a concept may be depoliticised, it will always in some way perpetuate the existing power relationships (Kothari, 2001, 5). Which is why it is so important to examine the different positions the actors take. With these positions we can examine existing power relations and navigate them effectively.
3.1 The organisers

I am choosing to focus on Ibu A who works at BPBD Sleman. The reason I am discussing Ibu A specifically is because she was the representative of the BPBD Sleman who was present at the seminars. I therefore took her positioning to be representative of that of the agency. BPBD Sleman were charged with organising the resilient village program in Hargobinangun, a village within the district. Ibu A works in the preparation cluster of the agency and was therefore chosen as the representative who occasionally sat in the seminars to ensure a smooth information flow. Her role was to co-ordinate with the village administration to ensure a smooth running of the seminars. Her presence was also to ensure that the policy changes, which include having an up to date disaster management team present in the village, were executed during the seminars.

Lingkar as an NGO was chosen by the provincial BPBD due to their connection with the cluster of education and their mission to increase awareness of natural disasters and how to respond. In order for proceedings to go as smoothly as possible, discussions about structure and techniques were held prior to the seminars between BPBD Sleman and Lingkar. This shows the multiplicity of power in action, specifically in terms of positioning and the politics of scale. Lingkar does not have the same stakes as BPBD Sleman. Although both parties are working on improvement, the slight difference in position caused some friction. The focus of Lingkar was the educational aspect and the spreading of knowledge. This meant that the Lingkar team was keen to get more time in the form of more seminars, as well as a larger and more diverse group of participants. The multiplicity of power could be seen most clearly during the times after Lingkar had concluded their part of the seminar and BPBD Sleman chose to add some extra information which did not fit thematically with the rest of the seminar. Although it was their ability to do so as co-ordinators of the seminars, BPBD seemed to use their power loosely which undermined the authority of Lingkar in front of the participants.

3.2 Trusteeship

As mentioned above Lingkar took the role of the trustee during these seminars. The position of the trustee has an important element that other development positions may not have. This element is the idea of empowerment through mobilisation to become politically active (Li, 2007). There are two elements of power relations which play on different levels that have to be navigated by the
facilitator of Lingkar that I will be addressing. The first is the positioning of the Lingkar towards the participants. “The will to empower others hinges upon positioning oneself as an expert with the power to diagnose and correct a deficit of power in someone else” (Li, 2007, 275). This creates a disconnect between the participants and the NGO, because it limits the space in which discussion can take place (Li, 2007). The type of empowerment reduces the disconnect slightly as the idea is that Lingkar is here to provide a space in order to create a disaster risk reduction team. Thereby increasing the village capacity to help themselves. This is the way responsibility is individualised as I stated in chapter one. The individualisation of responsibility of the village leaders has been subjected to the process of governmentality. This has created subjects who are then deemed acceptable to take on the responsibility of being a trustee for the general populous of the village. The process through which the participants were transformed into trustees was through discussions during the seminars and hazard mapping. It is therefore important to reflect on what and how information was transferred which I will discuss later in the chapter.

The second position Lingkar had to take up was in the relationship to the BPBD Sleman and their different relationships to the participants. During the seminars there seemed to be a disconnect between the two parties, in that Lingkar seemed to be trying to empower the participants more so than BPBD Sleman. However, when taking a step back I would argue that both parties are working on empowering the participants in their own ways. The tasks for the two organisers were simply divided appropriately in order to reach the technical goals of the project. BPBD Sleman was there to push the idea of the disaster risk reduction team. Whereas Lingkar was there in order to provide the details. This included providing the knowledge for the participants to become empowered and therefore to increase their own capacity within the context of the disaster risk reduction team. The disconnect appears in their approaches to complete their goals and the extent to which they wanted to expand on their roles. Lingkar chose to use the participatory approach to the imparting of knowledge, which in the broadest of strokes can be seen as a bottom up approach. Lingkar did this by providing a solid foundation to the reasoning why the village needs a disaster risk reduction team and highlighting the different risks and solutions involved while leading the participants to these conclusions in a way that would make participants feel involved. In comparison, BPBD Sleman approach was very top down in its imparting knowledge to the subject. These different approaches as well as the gap between government officials and local villagers could have been the reasoning for BPBD Yogya to use Lingkar as a facilitator in the first place. This is why positioning whether active or passive is an important aspect to consider when practicing development. As it not only
affects the way in which people receive the development but also the way in which the participants are approached and viewed in the first place. Although the organisers had fairly clear positions, in that Lingkar was the facilitator and BPBD Sleman was the co-ordinator, the interaction between the two actors was still impacted by the politics of scale. The BPBD Yogya had recruited Lingkar to facilitate the meetings, however BPBD Sleman were the co-ordinators. This meant that BPBD Sleman had to get into contact with the village head who would not only allow access to the village but also be in charge of inviting the participants. Even though the village head was part of the organisational process he was also a participant within the meetings. This jumping of scales made it difficult for Lingkar to maintain their role as trustees especially in the selection process for the board of the disaster management team which I will be discussing below.

3.3 The practice of politics when creating the disaster management team

The goal of the disaster management team was to create the committee which would control preparation funds as well as act as organising body before an eruption. This meant that only the people with an active role in the governing body of the village had to be present and the information they needed to be given would have to be just enough to vote on who should be on the committee board. Although their goal was to create participants who would become trustees/experts within this village setting, the contradicting approach of the two organisers gave way to discussions. This allowed the participants to voice their own critical analysis of the situation and needs in order to reach the goal. The participants criticisms were shaped by the existing power structure within the village. Neither the BPBD nor Lingkar had considered this within their technical plan for the village which was depoliticised and did not include local hierarchy as a potential problem. Below I will discuss how the two elements dealt with the puncturing of their technical structure.

The original technical plan was to establish a disaster risk reduction team by the village staff and leaders. The team would preside over funding as well as be responsible for the contingency plan of the village to be updated and put into effect during a disaster. As soon as this was suggested the first problem arose. The village already had a committee of this nature, similar but not quite enough to be up to the latest policy standards. This prompted Lingkar to shift their position to accommodate the issue leading to the creation of the Unit Lak and the Forum PRB.
I am examining the creation of the PRB Forum and the Unit Lak here again because this is an example of where the structure of the development project has to be reshuffled as the technically rendered solutions do not fit with the reality. It is important to see how both Lingkar and BPBD Sleman responded as this gives some insight into the structure of the organisation of the seminars, as well as showing the negotiating ability that must be present for the policy to be put into practice. The more the participants develop their own ideas, the more gaps and contradictions there will be as stated by Tania Li (2007). During the previous chapter I highlighted how a regular training seminar took place and the kinds of activities within them. It was during the creation of the Forum and the Unit Lak, that the multiplicity of power really shone through and the gaps and contradictions caused frustrations among all involved. I recognised the ways in which Lingkar had to adapt to the vocal discussions lead by the participants, because the creation and distribution of tasks of these committees caused some dispute amongst the participants and the organisers as well. I chose to address these issues here because it is part of the organisation style. It also shows how discourse is used differently by two parties and how this affects communication. The top down approach highlighted by the BPBD was used actively as a way of forcefully interjecting into the discussion which was largely held by Lingkar and the elder gentlemen and the village. This was in part to cement her role as an expert but also as a method of keeping the discussion on the technical path that had been previously agreed upon with Lingkar.

During the sixth meeting of the training seminars the creation of the Forum PRB led to a lively debate which I will describe in more detail below. It allows an interesting insight into the social dynamics of the participants. I believe one of the reasons that there was a more open debate with a higher number of people speaking up and asking questions was due to the presence of the village head. During the beginning of the debate he was giving suggestions and asking questions. From what I could tell this also changed the way in which people asked questions and gave suggestions. It seemed that the longer the discussion went on the more candid the participants and Lingkar seemed to become with one another, as temperaments increased, so did the volume. However, I believe that without the village head being present and asking questions which undermined Lingkar’s authority on the subject, this discussion would not have taken place.

To deconstruct the debate that continued over multiple seminars I have divided it into a number of sub headings to highlight the different elements that I witnessed. As mentioned before the reason for this debate was the existence of the Unit Lak which would have had similar tasks to the Forum.
PRB. The reason for the misunderstanding which was eventually cleared up was the apparent power of the Forum over the Unit which was satisfied by using the language terms consultants and advisors. This is an example of using language in order to keep the current power relations in tact. It also shows the effect words can have when the meanings are different depending on the parties present and the positionality of them. The discussion was so relevant because the village head would be positioned under another member of the village if the two committees would have the same task. This is why the term ‘consultant’ was used in an appeasing measure, only ‘suggestions’ would be made to the village head, these would not imply the superiority of the other council members. The act of performance and saving face is an important factor when considering the position one chooses to take.

3.4 Politicising the technical solution

During the sessions of six seminars, the space and setup of the room remained the same. The women and youth groups sat in the right isle while the village elders sat at the left isle. I am not sure if this was on purpose or whether it was a sub-conscious choice. It was only during group activities that members were evenly distributed between the groups. The beginning of the seventh seminar started with the topic of the Forum PRB being reopened for discussion. In the previous seminar it had been introduced as a committee for the disaster risk reduction of the village through preparation and organisation of potential evacuation. This included being in charge of a number of aid funds, as it was explained by Lingkar. After this explanation the head of the village, who is sitting towards the centre of the room in between the two isles but close to the other village elders, states that “The staff and head of village will support the forum but will not take over the management of it. Some of the elders of the seminar will be chosen for this task. (He) hopes that there will be a lot of participation from the sub village leaders”. The village head was diplomatically phrasing that he and his staff are busy enough with other administrative tasks. One of these tasks is managing the Unit Lak He was using his position both in the physical sense, as he situated himself more or less in the centre of the room unifying both sides of the participants as well as keeping his distance from Lingkar. He was using his social position of power to exemplify that the village administration would not be in charge of any extra funds. By opening the floor to discussion Lingkar instantly re-politicised their carefully rendered plan.
Due to the fact that the members of the committee would be in charge of money, another issue arose namely what the exact job descriptions of the committee members would be. These job descriptions had been discussed in the previous seminar and been put into a presentation which was projected onto a screen. During this seminar the job descriptions were laid out and opened to discussion once more. During this discussion it is mostly the village elders who are providing suggestions for the job descriptions of the individual committee members. Eventually Pak V, who is a sub village leader, suggests that the accountant of the committee should be in charge of the distribution of the funds and the secretary should keep a record of where the funds are coming from and to whom they are being distributed. There are murmurs of agreement from the other participants. This seems to be a step towards accountability and transparency which is deemed necessary by some sub village leaders. A decision is about to be made when another village elder points out that there are not enough participants to vote in a committee board. It is put to a vote, whether or not to vote now or during another meeting with more members present and the vote for the committee board is postponed. From what I could tell, the creation of the board was taken very seriously and immediately bureaucratic steps were naturally taken by the participants.

3.5 Positioning in terms of internal village affairs

The second main discussion point was the creation of the Forum PRB itself and how this would affect the Unit Lak which is already in place. Originally Lingkar only wanted one disaster risk reduction team to be in charge of organising the evacuation and everything that would come after. Due to a similar committee (the Unit Lak) already being in place however, Lingkar had to compromise. This brought the suggestion to spread the new responsibilities over the two disaster risk reduction teams. It soon became clear however that simply dividing the tasks would not be as easy as originally hoped. It was important to the participants to create clear and distinctive boundaries between the two committees. In the first response to these concerns Lingkar suggested that both the unit and the forum would be active during the emergency response to an eruption. The Unit Lak would be active during the disaster as a sub committee to the PRB forum. It took a number of questions from various elders and occasionally a member of the PKK talking over each other asking for clarification before it became clear why this was not a satisfactory solution. The question that made this problem clear was raised by one of the elder men of the seminar: “Where would the unit be positioned as compared to the PRB”. Here we get to the core of the problem, the
head of the village is the leader of the Unit Lak. If the unit would be integrated into the forum then he would be subordinate to the leader of the PRB Forum. Effectively the question became whether one committee would be the trustee to the other, automatically reducing the later to a diminished social role. After establishing that this was in fact the problem, the suggestion came from the village head to make the Unit Lak and the PRB Forum one entity in charge of before, during and after an eruption. This solution would eliminate the need for the PRB forum and leave the Unit Lak as it was before. This suggestion had most members of the seminars nodding in agreement. They did not see the need to create a new disaster risk reduction team. As they already had one in place and there was no need to over complicate the situation in their eyes.

Lingkar however explained the different clusters of the Forum PRB again in an attempt to make the members understand that each of these criteria had to be addressed and filled. This was once again a complicated process as both the parties, by which I mean the organisers and the participants, were not able to communicate in an effective way. The criteria had been adapted slightly since the previous seminar to accommodate concerns that had been raised by the participants. This adjustment to the concerns of the participants is an example of the project plan being put into practice. As I described above, the technically rendered plan cannot gloss over the power relations already in place on the local level and will have to adjust its position on certain aspects in order to achieve success. In this case Lingkar chose to respectfully disagree with the village head because creating an up to date disaster management team was the main goal for which they were hired and would therefore not be able to merge the two units into one.

With this in mind Lingkar chose to turn the discourse away from the clarifying of the boundaries of the two committees and instead focussed on trying to explain the internal structure of the disaster risk reduction forum. As with many committees under the Disaster Risk Reduction umbrella, the Forum PRB works with clusters rendering, as is so often the case, the act of disaster management a technical act. Thus creating clear boarders as to where one task ends and the other begins. These are: Prevention, mitigation and preparedness, emergency response (the original plan had been to give this responsibility to the Unit Lak) and recovery & rehabilitation. However, even with the division of labour the participants still wanted to make the Forum and the Unit a combined committee. At this point during the seminar everyone was getting a little frustrated. It seemed that the information was being misinterpreted on both sides. I could notice this through the body language as well as the general volume and the speaking over one another that had not occurred
during the beginning of the seminar. Although the head of the village spoke most often during the first part of the seminar, he left the floor more and more open to the other participants. As he had stated before, he and his staff would not be chairing this new disaster risk reduction team. As he became quieter the discussion around him became louder and more passionate. It was two or three of the elder gentlemen who required multiple explanations until they were fully satisfied with the proceedings. During this debate the women, although occasionally asking clarifying questions when they felt the conversation had stagnated, kept mostly out of the debate. At the end of the seminar one of the women commented “sometimes you have to let the men vent their frustrations”. Towards the end most participants had chosen to distance themselves from the heated debate that was going on around them.

The legal issue at the heart of this debate was the goal of the seminars and the hardest point to bring across to the participants it seemed. The goal was to have a disaster risk reduction team with an up to date committee and a management board with updated tasks. This meant that the position of secretary, the accountant and the manager as well as which clusters they are responsible for, had to be updated. A task that had not been done since the Unit was created in 2010. To reduce the difficulties the participants then suggested to the keep the board members as well as positions the same but update the clusters and the responsibilities of each position while still wanting to merge the two committees. However, if this were to be the outcome and the revision would have taken place during one of the seminars according to Lingkar, they could not leave without their primary objective being met. The discourses and discussions become a little intertwined at this point as the participants were discussing multiple topics at once. In order to get the seminar moving again Lingkar wanted to clarify whether participants wanted to create the Forum (disaster management team) at a later date which returned the discourse to the questions about what the position of the Unit and the Forum would be and whether there would be a combination of the two.

3.6. The multiplicity of power in practice

There are a number of other suggestions and discussion points until BPBD (BPBD Sleman) joins the debate. The explanation is as follows; The Unit Lak is only open to village leaders and the staff members. They are responsible for what co-ordinating during and after the eruption in terms of evacuation and rebuilding. The Forum PRB is open to members of the Unit and organisations within the village, meaning the participants of the seminars. They are responsible for Pengurangan
(reduction of risk) before the eruption, thus prevention and preparedness. This seemed to clear some of the confusion until a participant pointed out the overlapping nature of the two committees. The theory of the BNPD was that the Unit Lak should only be responsible for the time during and after the eruption. However, because the Unit had been put in place earlier, it was responsible for the time before, during and after the event. This caused confusion as the two committees duties would overlap. Eventually however it was agreed that the original clusters of the Forum would be divided as such: The forum PRB: Clusters, prevention and preparation of actions before an eruption, plans (such as SOP) and recommendations and have a passive role during and after a natural disaster. Where as the Unit Lak would take an active role during and after an eruption.

It is also important to reflect upon who was making the suggestions and joining in with the discussions as Lingkar noted, some people may not want to speak due to issues of hierarchy within the village community. As an outsider this is very hard to reflect upon. However, during the discussions it was clear that the village administrative staff as well as the sub village leaders had most to say about the different discussion points. Although occasionally members of the PKK as well as other organisations within the village did speak up, the bulk of the conversation about clarification came from those who’s position could be affected.

The anecdote above shows the need for the power structure to be in place which means that the discourse provided by the BPBD is largely irrelevant as the village has their own discourse in the administration rather than the development discourse used by Lingkar and BPDB. It also shows how discourse, if not fully understood equally by both parties, can cause miscommunication and misunderstandings. The positioning of the expert throughout the debate was constantly shifting between Lingkar/the BPBD and the participants. The positioning and performance throughout the debate affected the way in which the discussion flowed.

There were a number of elements that became clear throughout the discussions. Firstly, the new system would not interfere with the current power structure of the village. Secondly, the new committee would have to be transparent, especially when handling finances. Although both the BPBD and Lingkar had the same objective in the beginning of the seminar, Lingkar tried to shift the position slightly to accommodate the already existing unit in place. Arguably within the discussion above it is clear that during a part of the seminar Lingkar’s change of position caused some confusion between BPBD and Lingkar which damaged the clear technical structure and caused even more confusion to the participants as the role of the trustee was compromised.
This chapter is to show that the social factors that had been highlighted previously all play a role to some degree and that negotiation between the technically rendered policy and the reality must occur for the solutions to be effective. It also shows that there are multiple positions that can be used and that the different positions create their own method of contribution. Capacity building and raising awareness seems to be the central theme with all of the reports and interviews of the organisers of the Resilient Village Program beyond the contingency plan and the Forum PRB (the preparation committee). The capacity is measured by the ability of the village to organise itself before the event as well as the ability to achieve similar economic and social status after the event. By having a well organised evacuation plan much of the livestock and more importantly people can be saved which allows for quicker recovery. Using the technical discourse of capacity there is quantifiable evidence of success. Using this kind of discourse also allows the BPBD and Lingkar to position themselves as experts as well as individualising responsibility at the same time. By raising awareness it becomes the responsibility of the participants to increase the capacity of the village as they are now officially equipped with the knowledge. Thus turning some of the participants into the trustees of village welfare during a natural disaster. What creates a complication is of course the fact that the participants are experts themselves because they are the representatives of the village community and therefore already responsible for the village even before the time of the Resilient Village Program.

Because they do not use the same discourse as the organisers, we can see that discourse is not the only aspect of social interaction that plays a role in this situation and that existing power relations can be a bridge between two discourses and that positioning perhaps more so than discourse affects interactions.
4. Participants practicing critical politics

I find it important to reflect on the terms of participation and empowerment in more detail before I continue to discuss the participants of the Resilient Village Program. Lingkar uses the concept of participation and empowerment of participants as the very heart of their organisation. However, even these elements are part of a greater social network of power and the effect of such can be the drastic opposite of the original intent. “To the extent that empowerment does exist in participatory processes, it has been largely depoliticized and individualized” (Kothari, 2001, 12). Kothari goes on to state that empowerment should be seen as an individual feeling rather than a collective attribute. Therefore there can never be structural change and so in essence the idea of empowerment through participation is not possible (Kothari, 2001). What Kothari means by this is that the individual gains power and agency by learning to use the current structure to their advantage, which does not change the structure being used but rather the individuals using it. This idea is strengthened by Li (2007) with her examples about the participants who chose to become active in politics. In her example the man in question did not come to a collective realisation with other members of his community. Instead he became a single individual who learned the discourse required to practice politics. He had become an ‘unruly subject’. Interestingly, this individual becomes a paradox, in that as soon as he mobilises fellow participants to become politically active his action turns into collective action and therefore is no longer individualised. Thus the motivator essentially starts toeing the line between being a ‘participant’ and ‘trustee’. The point the authors are making is that through these methods the power relations between participation and empowerment of the development process will never change and continue to perpetuate the status quo. From a theoretical standpoint this would make sense, if we assume that there are no other factors which can play a role in the struggle for empowerment.

The previous theory assumes that participants are merely subjects to be moulded with no individual agency. These assumptions are based on a certain way in which the terms are perceived and used. As Paley (2001) points out, discourse can alter the very meaning of participation, thus completely altering the debate. In Paley’s case participation is used to describe the involvement in development politics, rather than merely being subjects of said politics. This participation in politics also allowed to some degree for participants to hold the government accountable (Paley, 2001). The point why I highlight these two different approaches to the concept of participation and empowerment is that the concepts do not necessarily have to mean the same thing everywhere because of the different
discourses used to frame the issue. The participants of my case study have been chosen by the government as subjects. The training seminars however are designed to change the role of the participants to that of trustees. In doing so the system invites the idea proposed by Li (2007) of an unruly subject. By becoming trustees however, the participants are suddenly able to participate in the politics they are being presented with. Therefore for this thesis I will be using participation as a situational concept. In some cases the participants are subjects or trustees and in others participation means involvement and therefore also empowerment to change the structure.

From the organisers I turn my attention to the participants, who feel the effects of policy implementations. In some cases limitations of policies exist. Li (2007) discussed the limitations of policies by examining the effect of the policy on the community they are trying to develop. Thus she investigated “What happens when these schemes entangle the world they would regulate and transform” (Li, 2007, 270). I have been examining a similar situation during this thesis. Limits of government posed by a number of different factors including the “dynamic nature of the relations to be optimized” (Li, 2007, 270). Meaning that the relationship of people to natural occurrences as well as culture and resources. One of the possible limitations I observed was the relationship between people and natural occurrences that can limit the practice of policies and implementation. In Hargobinangun the villagers who experienced the natural disaster and are more likely to be aware of the dangers. The participants of the project hold different positions within the power structure of the village community. This translates to the fact that way projects are implemented depends on the level of influence. The power relations within the community therefore can lead to differing or even competing interests. In this chapter I will introduce some of the participants and highlight their relationship with the natural disaster as well as their positioning to practice politics. I will also examine the representation of the different groups within the space and the social positions they take.

4.1 Who is being represented?

The participants are labeled by the organisers as ‘the village community’. This description homogenises the participants into one group, which was not the case in practice. The participants were chosen by the village head specifically for their positions on the various large committees and organisations within the village. The resilient village program is one which animates its participants to practice politics. The practicing of politics refers to the creating of the disaster risk reduction
team. However, as I have shown in previous chapters, there are only certain times in which the participants are supposed to do this and more importantly the goal is not for the participants to practice critical politics by questioning the training itself and their position within that. The participants nonetheless engaged in critical politics and I will examine which positions these were.

A total of thirty people were invited to take part in these training seminars. For Lingkar’s purpose of education and knowledge transfer this was too little. However, when asked about the attendance and the general attitude of the participants Ibu A responded that BPBD Sleman was happy with the number of people that joined the seminars and the way how they responded to the information presented.

With only thirty members of the village ‘community’ present one starts to wonder about the process of exclusion and how this affects the power relations during the program. A number of the biggest organisations were chosen to send representatives to the seminars. Out of the thirty people there were only up to maximally eight women present. Additionally a number of young adults took part largely because of political party membership. However, during the discussions and the participatory exercises most of the talking and attention was left to the older men. This was also found by Welker “The participants in the trainings were also overwhelmingly male, despite the emphasis in participatory development materials on the significance and benefits of women’s involvement” (Welker, 2012, 396). Having said this, during the course of the meetings it did not seem like the men were talking over the women. It seemed to me more that the women were choosing not to be as vocal as the men unless there was a pressing issue to discuss. The interaction I witnessed shows the importance of positioning within the social framework and the social interactions that stem from this. These interactions can impact the way information is transferred in the community.

One reason for the exclusion of other members of public other than the funding could be connected to the goal of the seminar itself. The Unit Lak and the disaster risk reduction team were committees only intended for the village administration and representatives of the most important social groups. Not only because they would be handling finances, but also because the committee would have the capacity of advising. Advice can be seen as a method of undermining authority. Therefore members had to be chosen which would not undermine the social status of those they are sharing the information with. This is an example of how the process of exclusion was used in order to keep the current social and power structure in tact while adding another dynamic to it. Creating a committee which in the eyes of BPBD Sleman was not relevant to the rest of the general village populous.
I was able to interview three participants who were active during the seminar discussions. Each of them lived through the previous eruption and was representing not only the administration or the organisation but also themselves as part of the village community. I will be discussing their evacuation stories of the previous eruption because it gives an insight into the thought process and motivation to attend the resilient village program.

Ibu B is the only woman of the seminars I was able to get a full interview with. She is a member of the PKK leading the ‘marketing and safety in the home’ cluster. She lives with her family in the sub village of Randu which is located in zone 1. Thus the furthest away from the mountain peak. During the eruption of 2010 she and her husband initiated and lead the evacuation of three of the surrounding neighborhoods (Kampung) which included roughly 300 people. She did this using mass text messages. First they moved only slightly lower down the mountain to the Office Democrat, the headquarters of the local political party. There it took one day and night in order to organise and collect the personal information from everyone in order to officially register them. This information was required in order to be able to receive official government aid in the aftermath. She then moved everyone to the Islamic University of Indonesia (UII) campus using her connections to the army to gain access to busses for transportation. They stayed at UII for two days, and upon her request The State University of Yogyakarta (UNY) sent three busses to pick up the survivors and brought them to the UNY campus where they would stay for another three months. The volunteers of NYU then helped to move all 300 people to Harjobinangun. This is the sister village of Hargobinangun where they stayed for another month before finally returning home. During the stay in Harjobinangun the villagers of Hargobinangun received aid, food and trauma healing from different NGOs and PMI (the Indonesian red cross).

In the aftermath it turned out that the house of Ibu B and her family was damaged by falling rocks and everything was covered by a thick layer of ash. Over the next few weeks 150 volunteers joined to help with the village clean up. The house was the centre of operations with thirty volunteers staying at one time. This shows the active position Ibu B takes in the community activities. Her position is very much that of the concerned PKK who takes her family and her role very seriously. She was especially interested in the evacuation plans and having a guaranteed shelter within Yogyakarta city. During the training seminars she became the secretary from the disaster risk reduction team.
Pak Z was born in Randu. He has lived there his whole life and has been its leader for 24 years. His position as the sub village head includes to co-ordinate with the village head in administrative issues. There are also a number of government aid projects which became his duty to coordinate. He has a similar evacuation story as Ibu B, although he chose to leave during the final alert stage of the volcano. He was able to return home on the 25th of December. It took one month after the eruption to let people back to their homes and farms. During this time the people were only allowed to work on the slopes during the day and had to leave the area of risk again in the evening. To ensure that this would actually happen, the police would take the ID cards from everyone entering and only return the cards when people left the area again in the evening. Throughout the whole process it took the economy roughly 3-4 months to recover because no farming and planting could take place. Finally Pak Y, in comparison to the other participants, lives in Kaliurang Timour, situated in zone three located closest to the mountain peak and therefore at highest risk of danger during an eruption. He studied at UNY and now works as the administrator for the village legislation. His wife runs a restaurant at a local tourist destination in Kaliurang Timour. During the eruption of 2010, his family as well as many others in the subvillage chose to stay in their homes during the ‘danger’ stage of the volcanic eruption. It was not until an ash rain set the trees on the nearby ridge on fire that they chose to evacuate. The reasoning behind their thoughts was that during past experiences the mountain was in the different stages on multiple occasions but the final explosive ‘danger’ stage never occurred. Consequently they saw no reason to evacuate until it was clear that the mountain was erupting and they were about to be seriously harmed.

4.2 Which positions did the actors take

Li explores the way in which “subjects were formed within power matrices” (Li, 2008, 228). With this quote Li suggests that the agency of a subject is build within the framework of power. Therefore, in order to act on the agency, subjects must position themselves in the relation to multiple fields of power (Li, 2007). In order to highlight the different aspects of power one must first examine the position of the actors.

Positions can be political as well as physical, conscious or subconscious acts in response to power. Firstly I would like to examine the idea of physical space and the impact it has on positionality and by extension on development discourse. The program itself was held in the village hall, a large open room with a stage at one end. A table was set out at the front where Lingkar were able to set up their
laptop and microphones. In front of this were two more tables set up to start two Columbus with a path through the middle. The rows of chairs were set up behind these two tables in rows of six. The setting seems rather formal and it was to begin with. This changed as the seminars progressed and it became a more relaxed atmosphere, which could also have contributed to the passionate debates. The sitting arrangement can also tell us about the power relations interacting between the participants. I was not present at the first seminar to see if the sitting arrangement had been assigned. However, in all the subsequent seminars the seats were almost always occupied by the same people. Those who were more actively involved could be found furthest towards the front. On the left sitting directly behind the table were the women of the PKK. Behind them chairs would fill up haphazardly with the members of the young men of the youth organisation. On the right hand table Pak Y would sit more or less in the centre of the table and the other village elders would sit around and behind him. Simply from the way in which Pak Y interacted with the other participants I would suggest that he is a social authority figure, or at the very least a well liked member of the administration. During the few times the village head attended the meetings he chose to sit more or less in the centre of the isle between the two rows of chairs. He also sat more towards the back of the set up. This is interesting because it can suggest the type of performance he is giving towards the organisers and his fellow participants. The fact that he sat in the middle between the two halves suggests the unifying power he creates with his presence. Secondly, and perhaps more significantly, he chose not to sit at the front of the room. Keeping this distance between himself and Lingkar suggests the rejection of Lingkar as the authority figure in terms of who has the lead in the way his village should be organised. Thus his positioning within the space exemplifies his social power. Another interesting point is that during the interactions with him, the participants as well as the organisers used more formal language as well as stiffer movements.

4.3 Comparison of opinions

The best way to examine the political position of the participants is by examining their opinions about aspect of the seminars as well as the seminars as a whole. The different political positions are highlighted when opinions diverge. Both Pak Z and Pak Y were happy with the training seminars as it provided new insight into educational methods and clear information about the evacuation procedure. Interestingly the opinions of the contingency plan is where the opinions diverged slightly from each other.
According to Pak Z, the training is very useful because they now know who has to coordinate the evacuation and the seminars would help to create structure during the disaster. Having learned from the discussion groups, Pak Z said that he learned how to bring a lot of information to large groups of people.

The contingency plan (SOP) caused a little bit of trouble however, as each sub-village would have their own. Pak Z wanted to have a SOP with the same structure as Kaliurang the sub village further in the North. The only items that would need to be changed are the names in the management and coordination positions. On one hand this is an inconvenient idea as there is slight but significant difference in geography which could potentially cause the contingency plan to be inaccurate. This assumes that there are contingency plans for multiple natural disasters. On the other hand, having a standard template for a contingency plan would be helpful for relief and evacuation helpers alike.

One of the key features that both Pak Z and Ibu B wish to push, is the guarantee for shelter at one of the many universities in Yogya city. Especially because Ibu B does not feel that the evacuation to the Sister Village (a program connected to this one) has been properly thought out. She believes that the village of Harjobinangun is still too close to the mountain peak to be a viable evacuation settlement during a larger eruption. Ibu Titik is therefore pushing to create a contract with one of the universities UGM, UNY or UII for guaranteed shelter in the event of an eruption. This contract should be included in the SOP created by the seminars. She already has agency and therefore she did not need Lingkar to give her this agency specifically because of her position in the PKK.

Pak Y seemed to be slightly less enthusiastic about the training seminars as multiple of these activities had already occurred in his sub-village. Other training seminars had preceded the current ones. One was a training seminar including the four subvillages in KRP 3 (zone 3) with government agencies. In 2013 each subvillage had to make their own set of SOP for different natural disasters. When I asked to compare the previous trainings to the current ones he responded that the principle of the previous training was the same as the current one. The previous training had consisted of six days in one week. There were thirty people present including: Pak Duku, LPMD Duku, Ketua RT, Ketua RW, and public figures (people who have responsibilities within the village community). In these trainings they also created something similar to the PRB Forum, known as the Team Risk Reduction or the Unit Lak. Thus the committees have to coordinate with each other during an eruption.
The reason for the discussion in the previous training seminar was that the BPBD wanted to make a SOP for the simulation of an evacuation only. The Forum PRB wanted to make a SOP that can be used in the case of an actual eruption. However, the BPBD was “pushing” so that the other sub villages just want to copy the SOP from Kaliurang Timur, according to Pak Y. If a proper SOP is not made during the training seminar sessions, Pak Y (as leader of the Forum PRB) will possibly revise the SOP to fit the need of the people. The ideal situation would be that the Unit Lak knows and works with the people’s needs in mind when dealing with an eruption.

There seemed to be some divide between participants who live geographically closer to the volcano than others. This was suggested to me multiple times, which could have been caused by other economic or political factors which I was not privy too. From the information I did gather it would seem that the further up the mountain one travels, the more politically independent the people become. The difference in zones can also affect attitude towards the mountain. The villagers in zone three had already taken part in a number of similar trainings before and already created a SOP. From my observations it seemed that those who lived close to the mountain top were eager to make the SOP plans more official although they did not enjoy being told how to co-ordinate and organise their evacuation. They felt they had been told before and were therefore now capable of handling such situations by themselves.

In contrast the members of the lower zones seemed less focussed on making a detailed and accurate SOP. In fact, they simply borrowed the template that had already been made in zone three to claim as their own. Partially because the concept of a SOP was not explained with enough detail or maybe because the importance of having an accurate system in place has not been stressed enough. People simply do not feel that they are in danger.

In these training seminars geography is not taken into account in order to create a SOP that encompasses all of the village. However, even for one village the geographical location makes a difference as to how the project is perceived and welcomed. “Vanguard-activists can drift from conceptualising utopias to prescribing and enforcing particular programs upon designated groups of people” (Li, 2007, 279). Many locals did not pay attention to the trainings because it was an outsider presuming to tell them what to do during an emergency taking away their own authority over their safety and lives. At the same time different authority is created for them by giving the
responsibility for other lives into their hands. According to Ibu A the people from KRP 3 (zone 3) could have been a little less attentive because they already had many similar seminars. The reason why the whole village was invited to the seminars was to clearly state to the lower village that in case of an eruption the upper village will be coming down the mountain.

What I have demonstrated here is the process of creating individualised representation within a ‘community’. “From their technical domain and focus on an incarcerated ‘local’ in which properly guided villagers are expected to improve their own conditions by their own efforts.” (Li, 2007, 275-76). It is expected that the locals are to take responsibility for their own evacuation and possible accommodation should there be another natural disaster. This has been taken up by the ‘community’ and is expressed in the way they position themselves within the program in order to navigate the multiple powers of social status and responsibility.
5. Conclusion

Throughout this paper I have shown development discourse in action within the framework of the Resilient Village project. The enacting or performance of discourse is translated through a number of different aspects in human interaction ultimately becoming a method of establishing power relations. Discourse then is used as a mode to include and exclude speakers and mode of thinking. However, this process of exclusion can be mitigated through the space in which the interaction takes place and influenced by the positions that the actors take. Therefore I argue that discourse can also be read in the manifestations of space and positionality, rather than language and communication alone.

Firstly, I examined the social theories and how they link with each other and my own research. Notably focusing on discourse as a central theme and highlighting the links between the other themes of social interaction which I picked out of Tania Li’s work. The key aspect of this is the link between the different theories and that they are for all intents and purposes intertwined with each other. The umbrella theme is the idea of space, whether be physical, political or social. Without the space the other social interactions cannot manifest and more importantly the type of space influences the type of social interactions that will take place. This is most clearly seen with discourse and the way in which it is used by the actors to position themselves within the space.

Secondly, I took a closer look at the village itself and how the geography can influence the participants actions. I analysed the organisation of the village as this gives a clearer indication of the positioning of the actors. The other items covered here were the practical aspects of the seminars not only to get a better understanding of proceedings but also to show the flow of information. In this chapter I highlighted the participatory methods used throughout the seminars.

Thirdly, I examined the positioning of the organisers and the interaction between them and the participants. Here I looked more closely at the idea of development discourse. Development discourse by definition renders any situation technical. This can be problematic when dealing with social factors which are influenced by many other factors outside of the discourse and its paradigm. I used the disconnect in positioning that caused a minor struggle between the two organisers to illustrate the effect of positioning on the practice of politics. I examined the position of the trustee
vis a vis the animation to practice politics by way of the resilient village program effectively Lingkar was paving the way for the disaster risk reduction team in which ever form would become the trustees of the village populous.

Finally I examine the positioning of the participants themselves and their motivations for attending seminars. As Tania Li pointed out the concept of development is to create obedient subjects of the current rule. However, by giving people information or access to information this can cause the subject to become much more independent and allow the subject to use the rules to their advantage. In the case of Hargobinangun it would seem that the social factors of positioning, power relations and preformativity created partly what the program intended to do in that it created subjects with individualised responsibility.

According to Tania Li the developed world has a habit of framing the itself as the trustee to the local underempowered community. This framing can cause problems for the organisers when they find that this is not that case and that they have given the participants the tools to actively engage in the politics of the development process. This was not the case in Hargobinagnun, as most participants already had the tools to engage on the same level as the organisers. Therefore the ‘unruly subjects’ had the domain of positioning and space which they used to convey the power relations at play when engaging in discussions. Discourse is enacted through the positions people take and changing ones position can cause one to adapt one’s discourse. The space in which these positions and discourses are enacted can affect the way positions are held and with this I have shown that discourse is used in to solidify positioning in order to influence power relations.

A specific question that I have not been able to answer is the impact and effectiveness of this training and whether the participants had become effective trustees to the village populous. One way in which to test this was devised by the provincial disaster management agency through an evacuation simulation with 200 villagers that would be held a few weeks after the ending of this project. This evacuation would be witnessed by a number of important provincial officials. It would have been interesting to examine the positions the participants of the project would embody and how this influenced the evacuation itself.

Having examined the Resilient Village program in its execution I can only glean a small part of the result of an extensive process of development which is not only heavily entrenched in bureaucracy
but also in navigating the different and occasionally contradicting positions in politics. Development in a nutshell then is an utterly complicated social and political minefield which can cause the carefully rendered project to fail for whichever of the many countless reasons there are. There is however a glimmer of hope, by examining and reflecting on development projects from multiple scholarly and interdisciplinary stand points we will be able to create methods of development that do not loose sight of the reality they are trying to improve. The ‘Witches brew’ of scholarly methods as Li (2007) likes to put it. The key to create a more balanced development plan lies in the open communication between the different parties and actors involved. I believe that ethnographical research is a good bridge to start the communication.

I believe that I have started the communication by examining the response to the resilient village program by the different actors. Through the social tools they employ to position themselves within the discourse of the project framework. With this knowledge further research can be undertaken to allow a better understanding of the participants and organisers positioning and so create a space in which both parties can interact on an equal footing.
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