

RADICALISM THE RESISTANCE OF KEMUSU RESIDENTS TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF KEDUNG OMBO RESERVOIR 1985-2002

Ibnu Sodik^{1*}, Eko Santoso²

^{1*},²History Department, Faculty of Social Science, Semarang State University, Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia.
Email: ^{1*}fahmiakapml@gmail.com, ²ekosantoso280995@gmail.com

Article History: Received on 10th February 2020, Revised on 17th May 2020, Published on 6th July 2020

Abstract

Purpose: This research is a study that aims to parse the form of citizens' resistance in Kemusu Sub-district who commit the act of refusal toward government policies that do the construction of Kedung Ombo Reservoir.

Methodology: Research is done by historical method, namely starting with collecting the data, both written and spoken sources. Utilizing the archives from related institutions, scientific publications, reports and investigations, newspaper clippings, press releases and statements, and the last are observations and interviews. After the data has been obtained, they are analyzed and interpreted by referring to the theory of social movement.

The main findings: This study reveals the citizens' resistance in Kemusu Sub-district toward the construction of the Kedung Ombo Reservoir as an effort to preserve the habitat of its life. Therefore, the radicalization of the resistance is done in various ways, from the symbolic to the struggle to the realm of the law. Nevertheless, all forms of resistance are done in peaceful and nonviolent ways.

Application of the study: This research can be a reference for the perpetrator of the social movement to do action without any violence, but put forward substantial matters in the demands. For the government, this paper can provide suggestions and input to do the construction of infrastructure in a humanist way and accommodate the rights of its citizens.

Originality and Novelty of the study: The new matter in this study is to uncover symbolic actions in the resistance movement of Kemusu citizens that continue straight, even though the construction of the reservoir has been completed. This is what is missed to be recorded in existing research. In addition, most of the research related to citizen refusal toward the construction of the Kedung Ombo Reservoir has always been only seen as a reactive action and missed out in discerning the symbolic and nonviolent matters.

Keywords: Kemusu, Nonviolent, Radicalism, Reservoir, Resistance, Symbolic.

INTRODUCTION

Development was one of the sacred discourses in the political order of the Suharto government (1966-1998). At that time the development program was implemented with a top-down planning system, the government as the creator, planner, and executor of development, while the people were positioned as consumers (Salim, 1986, p. 29). Anyone who opposes the government development program will bear the consequences of dealing with state repression machines (Gultom, 2003, p. 95).

As Huskens said, in the events written in historical records, during the Soeharto era, the state often used violence to solve various problems at the local and national level. Meanwhile, officials tend to create their own laws to satisfy their desires (Adam, 2006, p. 167).

The Kedung Ombo case is a reflection of the state's dominance over society in the context of development. The construction of the Waduk Kedung Ombo in Central Java implemented without regard to the local community aspirations, which is coercive (Gultom, 2003, p. 29). This project is supported by The World Bank and Exim Bank of Japan, which reached a total of USD \$ 181.2 million or approximately IDR 453 billion (Muntholib, 2016, p. 3341).

The government claims that this project will have benefits and success (Hadiprayitno, 2009, p. 1). The reservoir project, in addition to flood control, aims to create a 22.5-megawatt power plant that will brighten 59 thousand residents' homes, irrigate 87,000 hectares of rice fields, and provide drinking water and industrial needs in the capital of Central Java, Semarang (Yulianto, et al., 2017).

The project sank 6,125 Ha in 3 Regencies (Grobogan, Sragen, and Boyolali) and displaced 5,391 HHs, and finally got rejection of the most affected residents, especially in the Kemusu subdistrict, Boyolali area (Krismono&Sugiyarti, 2007). They refused compensation given by the government for land that would be affected by reservoir construction. Some figures in Kemusu have even joined a movement and are determined to reject land data collection, compensation, and transmigration programs (Rahman, 1998, p. 68). The same case was written by Karmono, who revealed that the residents' rejection of the reservoir construction was because the residents were not involved in determining policies for nominal land compensation. The radicalism carried out by Kemusu residents is a form of resistance to state policies that do not accommodate citizens' rights. Rice fields, fields and gardens, and even dwelling houses that have been hereditary managed suddenly and easily taken over by the state. Residents in Kemusu must also lose the socio-culture building.

Research related to the issue of KedungOmbo reservoir development previously was also written by Stanley and Guntur Arie Wibowo who discussed the KedungOmbo problem in the temporal 1990s. While from the perspective of anthropology, this issue was also examined by Abdul Muntholib who examined changes in the social life of the people from dry land to Karamba. From a legal perspective, Abdul Hakim Nusantara and Budiman Tanurejo provided their analysis of the results of the Supreme Court's decision on the issue of compensation in Kedung Ombo. From these various studies, a very limited discussion that examines the issue of the Kedung Ombo reservoir in a historical perspective examines how the radicalism of the citizens' movement in Kemusu in dealing with the construction of the Kedung Ombo reservoir in the period 1985 to 2002. So based on the description in this study, **this research tries to reveal the reasons why the majority of Kemusu residents argued, as did the forms of resistance carried out.**

LITERATURE REVIEW

As a result, there are now many kinds of literature that report the issue of the Kedung Ombo Reservoir in various backgrounds and perspectives. From the law perspective, as written by Nusantara and Budiman Tanuredjo. The prime point of their book is the review of the law aspect of the Supreme Court's decision about replacement and damage of Kedungpring citizen land which was displaced by the construction of the Kedung Ombo Reservoir. The disputes of Kedungpring citizens in the court became the focus of this study and especially their analysis of cassation and reconsideration by the Supreme Court.

A different perspective by Aditjondro in his paper entitled *The Media as Development "Textbook": A Case Study on Information Distortion in The Debate about the Social Impact of an Indonesian Dam*, which discerns the Kedung Ombo conflict was caused by media role as a contributor to the government in obscuring and distorting the facts about social impacts that society accepted as a victim of the construction of Kedung Ombo Reservoir ([Aditjondro, 1993](#)).

In his other paper entitled *Large dam Fictions and Their Defenders: The Emergence of an anti-dam Movement In Indonesia*, which discerns the Kedung Ombo conflict from the perspective of developmental discourse and public importance. According to him, the Kedung Ombo conflict was heavily laden with the appearance of social envy between those who were the victim of the construction and those who benefited from the construction. Citizens whose lands were asked for the construction but they got distressed, assumed that the construction with prosperity jargon was a mere myth ([Isnaeni, 2012](#)). For those who got benefit are the people who were under the reservoir, while those who sacrificed were experiencing the opposite rather than getting prosperity, becoming the victim of the construction ([Aditjondro, 1998](#)).

Another opus that discusses Kedung Ombo Reservoir is Stanley's paper entitled *Seputar Kedung Ombo* which moderates the issue between the citizens and the government in the construction project of Kedung Ombo Reservoir. Stanley efforted to construct his writing from the viewpoint of social science, despite the political issue being the most major pressure. From the obtained various data, Stanley accommodated the Kedung Ombo conflict until the 1990s.

The study that also reviews the conflict issue of the Kedung Ombo Reservoir is by Prasetyohadi entitled *Democratic Actors in The Kedung Ombo Land Rights Struggle*. From the title, the main point is the actors who participated in the KedungOmbo resistance. Several actors that he analyzed are social society, Rama Mangunwijaya, mass media, and university students. This writing is interesting enough, not only dissecting what role the actors play but also see the values held by the actors. His analysis of each actor uses the concept of a new social movement. The issues such as political opportunity, framing, and cultural analysis by each actor are trying to be read. Nevertheless, this study is just descriptive without taking the conclusion about the symptom of the perpetrator who plays in the resistance movement of the Kedung Ombo Reservoir ([Prasetyohadi, 2004](#)).

Unlike that, other writings that appoint the question of Kedung Ombo is the work of EmhaAinun Najib entitled, *Gelandangan Di Kampung Sendiri: Pengaduan Orang-orang Pinggiran*. In understanding the Kedung Ombo conflict between government and citizens, Najib articulated his idea into a term called *lingam*. According to him *Lingsem* is a condition of social psychology, where there has been a transition of objective issues into social subjectivity. The intended subjectivity here is concerning self-esteem. Kedung Ombo issues have shifted from the problem of self-esteem instead of the issue of rill faced namely land acquisition conflict. Finally what appears is the condition of winning each other, a desire to beat the one against the other. In other words, problem-solving is essentially a zero-sum game, not a concrete solution or a win-win solution that might be achievable ([Najib, 2015](#)).

The concept of *Lingsem* that Najib constructs is essentially an ongoing result, where the base conflict in Kedung Ombo is in a government approach that is not sympathetic toward citizens. According to him, the problem in Kedung Ombo can be solved from the beginning if the government is willing to do negotiations to the public on the standard of compensation, but in a sportive and democratic way. Because there is no such approach that causes conflict and *Lingsem*. Therefore, even Emha Ainun Najib discerns the issue in the cognition perspective, the reluctance of citizens to leave as the cultural variable doesn't get any attention from him.

Another academic manuscript that raises the issue of Kedung Ombo is Abdul Muntholib's study. In his paper entitled *From Dry-Land Farming to Karamba: The Impact of Kedung Ombo Reservoir For Socio-Cultural Change in Wonoharjo, Indonesia*, Abdul Muntholib revealed that there was a socio-cultural change which experienced by Wonoharjo society caused the construction of Kedung Ombo Reservoir. From this paper, the authors are helped to see how socio-cultural change occurs. Although this paper is bound in investigating the socio-cultural change of dry-land agriculture to Karamba model and less including the social change of social life that is more complex. Using the same perspective by taking a different district carried out by Ardhi Setiawan Novandi, the impact of the construction socially and economically was also perceived by Grobogan society, especially for farmers.

Guntur Arie Wibowo also researched the issue of Kedung Ombo. The focus of the research is on the efforts of the farmers in the Kemusu subdistrict who commit the rebellion. Unfortunately, the meaning of the rebellion was only limited to the reactive and neglectful things to reveal the passive forms of the inhabitants of Kemusu as a form of protest. The research was also bounded in the 1990s so it was unable to describe how their lives still protested until the following years (Wibowo, 2014).

The authors also use the World Bank report entitled *Involuntary Resettlement The Large Dam Experience*. This report covers the experience in constructing dams in various countries, unexceptionally Indonesia which partly the process of the construction is fund by the World Bank (World Bank, 1998). From here the authors are helped, for example, this report contains the number of citizens caused by the construction of the reservoir. It doesn't stop there, there is also enlightenment about how the relocation efforts are committed and how the realization (Goodland, 2010).

The dialectical perspective about the positive and negative impact on the construction of the Kedung Ombo Reservoir is studied by Irene Hadipriyatno. The result of the research shows there was a debate between the funder World Bank with various media and social society who tried to tell the fact.

From the various studies above, very little literature examines the issue of the Kedung Ombo Reservoir, especially in Kemusu from a historical perspective that puts the victim of the construction of Kedung Ombo Reservoir as the subject of history. In addition, from the temporal scope of the various literature above, no one has reviewed the theme of citizen resistance in Kemusu in the face of the construction of the Kedung Ombo Reservoir in the span of 1985 to 2002. Various studies above are more concentrated on the 1990s. Indeed Stanley's writing moderates the Kedung Ombo problem, yet the study about Kemusu citizens is just as the complementary fact in his study that has a wider scope (Kedung Ombo). It is also confined to the temporal side in the 1990s.

Similarly in Guntur Arie Wibowo's paper, even he studies the issue of Kedung Ombo by taking the spatial scope in Kemusu, but bounded on the temporal side in 1990's so it doesn't present the life side after that year that is actually many important incidents occurred and unfortunately if it is not presented in the history. Similarly, the paper by Aditjondro, Abdul Muntholib, Nusantara, Budiman Tanurejo, and EmhaAinun Najib, that they construct their writings based on each of their own perspectives as outlined above. If this article contacts the studies above, it is limited to the use of facts. Therefore, even many writers make the conflict of Kedung Ombo as their theme of the study, yet this article is different toward those studies.

METHODOLOGY

The research method used in this paper is the historical research method. This method consists of four stages namely; heuristics, source criticism, interpretation, and historiography. Heuristics is the stage for collecting literature sources (Kuntowijoyo, 2013: 95). At this stage, data were collected in writing or verbally. Most primary sources were obtained from the Boyolali Regency Library, Archives and Documentation Office, and the Central Java Provincial Archives and Library Office. From these two locations, there were records about the relocation of residents in the Perhutani area and the decree on land compensation for residents affected by the construction of the Kedung Ombo reservoir. Other archive sources were also obtained from individual collections, as well as other agencies. The Kedung Ombo figures I met gave a large contribution to their archive collection and some clippings from newspapers and magazines. In addition, these figures also served as informants in this study which were used as oral sources. The search for oral sources in this study was assisted by several sources including Jaswadi, Sadi, Widarti, Jimin, Darsono, Karmono, Senen, Tulus, Suroto, and Parno.

The primary sources are also used as news in various newspapers such as Suara Merdeka, Justice Forum, JawaPos, Tempo, and Bernas. Meanwhile, various books used as secondary sources by Stanley, title *Seputar Kedung Ombo, Dua Kado Hakim Agung buat Kedung Ombo: Tinjauan Putusan-Putusan Mahkamah Agung Tentang Kasus Kedung Ombo* written by Abdul Hakim Garuda Nusantara and Budiman Tanuredjo and several other related books. As for the journals used by Abdul Mutolib and George Junus Aditjhondro and others.

The next step in this study is the criticism of sources. There are two criticisms that are committed, namely external and internal criticism. In this phase, I do research which one is relevant to be a reference and which one is not relevant. The purpose is to obtain the validity of the source and research data.

Kuntowijoyo said that in this phase was the spot of authors' subjectivity that is included in their writing. Actually, there are two things that can be understood by writing subjectivity. First, because there are importance and tendency.

Second, subjectivity as an academic interpretative. For the first one, a scientific study should be able to separate itself from any various importance, prejudice, and personal emotion of the author. The only one that is defended is the truth itself. Of course, the intended truth is the subjective interpretation of the authors based on the data and concept held. For the second one, the study of history is academically valid, as it is based on the methodology. In this stage, I begin to practice interpreting facts derived from the selected data.

The final stage of this study is historiography, in which I do the historical study that is manifested in this paper. In terms of writing, the use of narrative presentation is a thematic form. However, as much as possible it is written based on time relationships so the change aspects in which construct continuity inter parts could be well understood.

Besides using the methodology of historical study, this research also uses the approach of social movement theories to parse the issue discussed. It is mainly caused this study to see how the forms of resistance from a group of citizens in Kemusu in being opposed to the construction of Kedung Ombo Reservoir, so that social movement theories help the author to analyze behaviors, preconditions, and conditions that occur during the resistance process.

RESULTS/FINDINGS

Construction of the Kedung Ombo reservoir occurred during the reign of President Suharto. Suharto was the second president of the Republic of Indonesia to replace Sukarno after going through an extraordinary humanitarian tragedy in 1965, which came to be known as the G30 S movement ([Cipta, 2013, p. 176](#)). During the Soeharto government, or what is familiarly known as *Masa Orde Baru*, all political activities were controlled by the government on the grounds of maintaining national stability, and all the people were silenced by it ([Bachriadi & Lucas, 2001](#)). The government also runs authoritatively, which in every policy determination is made without involving and oriented to the interests of the community ([Nugroho, 2018](#)).

Besides using the developmentalism paradigm, the government applies the concept of development trilogy which is considered as a keyword to realize the prosperity of the people. There are three things emphasized in this concept, the first is the maintenance of dynamic national stability; high economic growth; and the occurrence of equitable development ([Sulastomo, 2008, p. 91](#)). This concept is manifested in the annual 5-year Replica program which is a legal protector to carry out development projects. All policies regarding development are then strengthened by a centralized model of governance, in which all policies are regulated, planned, and controlled by the center ([Fakih, 2011](#)). The face of government at that time was more a manifestation of an authoritarian, uncompromising and decisive authority ([Vatikiotis, 1993](#)).

Project development policies then impact on the exploitation of increased land use ([Smith, 1991](#)). The act of seizing land and displacing people by only providing low compensation for land was clearly manifested when Suharto built various reservoirs or dams on Java. In the case of the construction of the Kedung Ombo reservoir, where most of the construction funds loaned from the World Bank and Exim Bank of Japan, for example, the community was forced to move from their land which would be used for project needs ([Stanley, 1994, p. 79](#)). Under the pretext of Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs No. 15/1975 concerning Provisions Regarding Land Acquisition Procedures, the government feels it is legal in forcing people to surrender their land to the government as an object of development ([Karmono, 2005, p. 21](#)). They only have one choice, which is to transmigrate or move to a new settlement. The people were not given the opportunity to bargain or represent themselves in the deliberation process, because they were immediately given a statement letter to receive compensation for money that had been determined ([Isdiyanto, 2003, p. 4-5](#)).

The construction of the Kedung Ombo reservoir must eventually displace Kemusu residents, the majority of which are farmers. This is understandable because the Kemusu region is a fertile region because in the south there is an active volcano ([Stanley, 1994, p. 43](#)). Using BPS data in Boyolali Regency in 1983 there were 8,398 farmers, they were able to produce 7,075 tons of lowland rice, 607 tons of upland rice, 7,700 tons of corn, 5,717 tons of cassava, 150 tons of peanut, 179 tons of soybeans. means that on average one farmer in a year can produce 0.85 tons of lowland rice in one year; 0.073 tons of paddy fields; 0.92 tons of corn; 0.68 tons of cassava; 0.02 tons of peanuts; 0.02 tons of soybeans. This result is even more than enough for daily consumption.

Meanwhile, this project needs large land. Inundation area of Kedung Ombo Reservoir when the water level reaches 95.0 m elevation is 6,125 Ha. That is, 6,125 hectares of land that must be acquired for the needs of the KedungOmbo reservoir project ([Stanley, 1994, p. 43](#)). In Boyolali District, the Kedung Ombo Reservoir Project will submerge 1503,6792 Ha of land which affected the existence of 9 villages. The villages are Wonoharjo, Ngrakum, Watugede, Nglanji, Genengsari, Kemusu, Sarimulyo, Bawu, and Klewor which are administratively included in the KemusuSub-District ([Muntholib, 2016, p. 3342](#)).

The size of the reservoir building that has a large water capacity, will drown the forest area, rice fields, moors, and residential areas. This means that the construction of these reservoirs will eliminate the ecosystems in these areas and also threaten the population entities that have already lived in the prospective reservoir water reservoir location. The total population affected by the Kedung Ombo Reservoir Project is 5,268 patriarchs. More than half of them namely,



3,006 patriarchs in the Kemusu District area. If one patriarch has an average of 5-6 family members, the population in Kemusu affected by the construction of the reservoir is around 15,000 people ([Stanley, 1994, p. 44](#)).

This development will displace Kemusu residents from their surroundings, which means forcing them to renounce everything they have. The release of kinship between relatives and neighbors so that they could not undergo the cultural rites they used to live such as *Ziarah Kubur*, *Sedekah Bumi*, *slametan*, *apitan*, *nyadran*, and others. All socio-cultural structures that were originally developed will be lost and displaced by the existence of reservoirs ([Hasanah, 2016](#)). Not only does it have an impact on the lives of Kemusu residents that must be displaced, but the construction of reservoirs will also make them lose the main source of life dominated by farmers ([Nusantara & Tanuredjo, 1997, p. 8](#)).

The process of land acquisition for the purpose of constructing the Kedung Ombo reservoir itself is carried out by forming a Land Acquisition Committee as stipulated in Clause 2 of Minister of Domestic Affairs Regulation (PMDN) No. 15/1975 which involved the Regional Government and was determined as part of the *Indus BBWS Jratunseluna Project* ([Isdiyanto, 2002, p. 19](#)). This process began in 1985. Kemusu residents were invited to the village hall to hear an explanation of the reservoir construction plan. In Ngrakum, Nglanji, and Genengsari the village officials immediately carried out without prior explanation. In the villages of Kedungcemplung and Kedunglele, residents were immediately told to put their signatures or thumbprints and were forced to accept compensation ([Forum Keadilan, August 4, 1994](#)). There was no deliberation in determining the nominal compensation for land owned by the residents, they were invited not only to sign an agreement and without any dialogue to carry out a bargaining process. Finally, the nominal compensation was determined by the Decree of the Governor of Central Java I No.593 / 135/1986 dated August 25, 1986. The nominal compensation was Rp 380 per square meter for rice fields, while the plots of land were valued at Rp 633 per meter square ([Stanley, 1994, p. 86](#)).

DISCUSSION / ANALYSIS

"We also have to move ordinary people in a radical movement that is as volatile as a flood, embodies the mass movement that was newest and only the grapes become a bewust and radical mass movement, that is, mass-actions that are aware of the road and its purposes." - Soekarno, Reaching Independent Indonesia (March 1993)

The quote from the sentence shows us that understanding the radical meaning which has a negative connotation is a form of exploration. Etymologically, the term "radical" comes from the Latin word, "Radici" which means "root". In its history, the word radical was born since the French Revolution (1787-1789) which opposed the status quo of the King at that time. Meanwhile, in the UK the term radical refers to activities that demand the expansion of fundamental rights for citizens. During the Indonesian struggle for independence, radicals were interpreted as a struggle for independence that was uncompromising and opposed to the nature of the comparator and opportunist.

Radical action does not arise from a vacuum. In the context of the construction of the Kedung Ombo reservoir, the subordination of the Kumusu residents carried out by the state by depriving them of living space in the interest of building reservoirs is the cause of the emergence of a radical resistance movement.

The radicalism of Kemusu residents' resistance to the construction of reservoirs is manifested in the choice of residents who refuse compensation and choose to stay in reservoir locations. Not only was that, but the resistance of Kemusu residents to the construction of the reservoir also carried out symbolically by refusing to take fish from the reservoir waters. According to Parno, taking fish in the reservoir location is the same as they agree with the government action which has forced them to evict from their land and house. Not only that, Parno, Jaswadi, Darsono, Senen, Tulus, but also the residents who survived voiced abstentions in every election as a form of disappointment towards the government who neglected their rights. They do not care who is chosen, because their fate remains the same ([Bernas, June 1, 1997](#)).

Besides the issue of low compensation, the refusal to build reservoirs is also supported by ingrained cultural values and is believed by residents that land which is inherited from ancestors occupied and cultivated for generations is legitimate property of the population so it must be maintained at all times ([Mulder, 1985](#)). The expression of *sedhumukbathuksenyaribumiditohingantipecahing dada wutahingludiro* ignited enthusiasm to maintain every inch of land owned when there were parties, including the government, who wanted to expel the citizens of Kemusu from their homeland ([Wijayati, 2008, p. 75](#)).

A total of 3,006 HHs in Kemusu that had to be relocated until 1988 there were still 1,916 HHs who chose to stay and refuse compensation ([Tempo, March 25, 1989](#)). They get acts of intimidation and repression from government officials. Starting from being stigmatized as sympathizers of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI), it was affixed with the ExsTapol (ET) code when extending KTPs and was threatened with suspension from work as a civil servant, as experienced by Sadi Dwijowiyoto from Guyuban, Genengsari Village who worked as a PNS teacher (Sadi, interview, July 13, 2018).

In the midst of the conditions, there were still many residents who survived, on January 14, 1989, the inundation of the reservoir was carried out, even though it was delayed for 2 days. ([Suara Merdeka, January 13, 1989](#)). Minister of PU Ir Radinal Mochtar accompanied by Central Java Governor HM Ismail, Chairman of Central Java DPRD Ir Soekorahardjo, Chair of Commission V of the DPRRI, and three regents whose regions were affected by the dam construction project, inaugurated the inundation. The inauguration was done by burying the dam and releasing balloons, which was then

followed by pressing a button as a sign of closing the reservoir tunnel door by Governor HM Ismail (Stanley, 1994: 115). In his remarks, Minister of PU Ir Radinal Mochtar expressed his gratitude to the government for the successful development of the Kedung Ombo project which had taken a long time and a huge sacrifice. Meanwhile, Central Java Governor HM Ismail stated that it was appropriate that residents of Boyolali, Sragen and Grobogan regencies included in the Kedung Ombo reservoir area, which had given up and sacrificed their land were called "Heroes of Development" (Whitelium, 2003: 272).

The symbolic resistance of Kemusu residents, which was shown by surviving in the reservoir puddle area, made them have to take various methods to be able to survive. One way is to move the house to a higher area that has not been flooded by reservoir water. They also try to be as close as possible to their original area which is calculated will not sink. Thus, in the area around the green belt (green belt), they survive by cultivating the land of the Indonesian State Forest Company in the Kedung Ombo area which is close to where they live in the green belt area. When the reservoir water level goes down, they are determined to go down to a reservoir whose soil is dry and planted with rice. However, harvests that are only once a year, because tidal land can only be planted when the reservoir water is shrinking can still make them survive.

The radicalism of the resistance of Kemusu residents chose a different way by not engaging in acts of violence and aggressive behavior. They fight symbolically and put forward substantial ways that comply with the law. This can be seen when 34 residents in the Kedungpring hamlet, Nglanji Village, Kemusu oppose the government through legal means by suing two government agencies, namely the Governor of the Central I Level Region of Central Java and the Director-General of the Jratunseluna River Basin Development Project. This lawsuit is related to the issue of compensation for land acquisition which was deemed inappropriate (Howe, 2002). The lawsuit was submitted to the Semarang District Court. The lawsuit produced results when on July 28, 1993, the Panel of Judges of Cassation through the decision of regno 2263 K / Pdt / 1991 consisting of Prof. Asikin Kusuma Atmadja, M. AM Manrapi, RL Tobing granted the lawsuit of Kedungpring residents (JawaPos, July 7, 1994). Through this decision, the Central Java regional government must pay compensation of Rp 50,000 per square meter. Plants amounting to Rp 30,000 per square meter (Abdul and Budiman, 1997, p. 79). Unfortunately, this decision was never followed up. The Asikin verdict only applies on paper. Not until the execution was carried out, Chief Justice Purwoto suspended the execution, and through Judicial Review (PK) later canceled the Asikin verdict through the decision of Reg no 650 PK / Pdt / 1994 (Suara Merdeka, July 26, 1994). The ruling stated that the cassation of Kedungpring residents was not acceptable.

Until the year 2000, the struggle of residents who still survive in the reservoir puddle location continues. Those who lived in the green belt area while continuing to plant crops in the reservoir waters were able to intervene in the government when they succeeded in forcing the government to postpone the closure of the reservoir gate in 2001. Kedungpring residents sent a letter to Governor H Mardiyanto. In the letter, it was said that the residents would soon enter the rice harvest season. On average, each resident grows rice in a land of around 1 ha. Every year Kedungpring residents can only plant rice in the dry area. The same thing was done by residents in Mlangi, Klewor, and other areas (Suara Merdeka, January 18, 2001). This effort was successfully granted by the government and finally, residents could harvest rice. Based on the results of interviews with Jaswadi and Darsono, in 2002 residents who survived and lived on the outskirts of a pool or green belt area recorded that there was still 612 patriarch.

In the context of the Kemusu people's resistance, the actual resistance was humanitarian resistance; because the scope of their lives (houses, land, rice fields) is both a source and a live bet for Kemusu residents who are affected by reservoir development. In fact, the land is not only a symbol of self-existence but rather that, the land or rice fields become self-esteem for people in rural areas whose lives are sourced from the agricultural sector. Land grabbing is considered by residents in Kemusu whose majority are farmers as deprivation of their rights to live so that they are not afraid of fighting even a military-equipped state.

CONCLUSION

The emergence of resistance from Kemusu residents to the construction of the Kedung Ombo reservoir is still related to the arrogance of the government which alienates the rights of local residents in the development process. This can be seen from the government policy which since the beginning acted uncooperatively by not involving citizens in determining policies to repressive actions and intimidation that officials did not hesitate to do against citizens who chose to stay in the reservoir puddle location. The radicalism of this resistance is increasingly justified by the low compensation of land for affected citizens who have given the government. In contrast to the radical movement of resistance in general, the radicalism of the resistance of citizens in the future chose non-violence, using symbols and obeying the law.

LIMITATION AND STUDY FORWARD

Besides the historical and social studies, this research is also bounded to the span of 1985's to 2002's. Yet until now, the issue in the context of the construction of the Kedung Ombo Reservoir is still continued. It is seen from several citizens who now still maintain and live on the periphery of the reservoir and green belt. Moreover, there are still many who refuse compensation from the government. This reality shows that the construction of the KedungOmbo

Reservoir still has problems, not as a psychological problem, but also as an economic problem. This condition becomes an interesting study for further investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This paper and the research behind the construction will not be possible without any extraordinary support from various parties. Our study, in the beginning, is started from the concerns of recent days about reservoir construction being done by the government in several areas which are actually reaping some protest from society. Therefore, we are indeed from history science trying to reflect reality by committing the research related to the refusal of the construction of the Kedung Ombo Reservoir that occurred in the 1980s.

Thank you to employees of Kantor Dinas, Arsip dan Dokumentasi from Boyolali Regency, and also to Dinas Arsip dan Perpustakaan from the Provincial Government of Central Java that helped us to find various archives. In addition, the opened attitude from 10 informants as the historical perpetrators who are involved in the resistance of Kemusu citizens in refusing the reservoir construction, giving important contribution so that we can obtain the data and also an overview of the current situation, the emotional charge from the actors, and what they have taken to convey their own aspirations.

Thank you to Universitas Negeri Semarang that supports us in this research. To academic colleagues on campus who also contribute to giving feedback and comments that eventually become meaningful inputs in this research. The author should present a list of acknowledgments at the end. Any financial or nonfinancial support for the study should be acknowledged.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

The second writer contributes to the presence of research ideas. Meanwhile, the first authors contribute to developing a theory to contribute to verifying the analysis method. The first writer also encourages the second writer to commit the investigation toward a particular aspect and supervise the findings of this study.

While for research on the spot, the second writer plays more because he has more time rather than the first writer. Therefore, the first writer helps financially to streamline the process of research on the spot that takes up to 6 months. For the results of the research on the spot and also the findings data in archives and newspapers, the first writer contributes more because he has more experience in the field of research.

The second writer also contributes more to leading the scriptwriting. While the first writer contributes to the interpretation of research results. Nevertheless, all authors provide critical feedback and help research, analysis, and manuscript of the interview. To this end, all authors discuss the results and contribute to the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Adam, A. W. (2006). *Soehartosehat*. Yogyakarta: Galang Press.
2. Aditjondro, G. J. (1993). *The media as development "textbook": A case study on information distortion in the debate about the social impact of an Indonesian dam*. Cornell University.
3. Aditjondro, G. J. (1998). Large dam victims and their defenders: The emergence of an anti-dam movement in Indonesia. In P. Hirsch and C. Warren (eds), *The Politics of Environmental in Southeast Asia: Resources and Resistance*. Routledge.
4. Bachriadi, D. & Lucas, A. (2001). *Merampastanahrakyat: Kasustaposdan cimacan*. Jakarta: KPG.
5. Cipta, H. D. (2013). *Kontroversi G 30 S*. Jakarta: Palapa.
6. Fakhri, M. (2011). *Runtuhnya teoripembangunan*. Yogyakarta: Insist Press.
7. Goodland, R. (2010). *Viewpoint—The world bank versus the commission on dams*. *Water Alternatif*, 3(2), 384-398.
8. Gultom, S. (2003). *Mengadili korban praktekpembenaranterhadapkekerasan negara*. Jakarta: ELSAM.
9. Hadiprayitno, Irene. (2009). Hazard or right? the dialectics of development practice and the internationally declared right to development, with special reference to Indonesia. Utrecht: Intersentia.
10. Hasanah, H. (2016). Implikasipsiko-sosio-religiustradisinyadranwargaKedungOmbo zaman OrdeBaru (tinjaunfilsafatsejarahpragmatis). *WahanaAkademika*, 3(2), 17-35. <https://doi.org/10.21580/wa.v3i2.1142>
11. Howe, C. W. (2002). Policy issues and institutional impediments in the management of groundwater: Lessons from case studies. *Environment and Development Economics*, 7(04), 625-641. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X02000384>
12. Isdiyando. (2002). *Menyelamikedungombo: investigasiwartawan*. Semarang: KelompokDiskusiWartawanJawa Tengah.
13. Isnaeni, H. F. (2012). *Reformaagraria: Konflikagrariaterjadikarenaaupatidakdijalankan*. Jakarta: Historia.
14. Karmono. (2005). Pelaksanaan pemberiangantirugidalamrangkapengadaantanahuntukprojekpembangunan Waduk Kedung Ombo di wilayah Kabupaten Boyolali (kajiansosio-yuridis pada efektifitashukumgunamelindungigolongan yang lemahdalamasyarakat). *Thesis*, Diponegoro University.
15. Krismono&Sugiyarti, Y. (2007). Distribusi plankton di WadukKedungOmbo. *JurnalPerikananUniversitas Gadjah Mada*, 9(1), 108-105.

16. Kuntowijoyo. (1999). *Pengantarilmusejarah*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan BentangBudaya.
17. Mulder, N. (1985). *Pribadi dan masyarakatJawa*. Jakarta: Sinar Harapan.
18. Muntholib, A. (2016). From dry-land farming to karamba: the impact of kedungombo reservoir for socio-cultural change in Wonoharjo, Indonesia. *The Sosial Science*, 11(13), 3341-3347.
19. Najib, E. A. (2015). *Gelandangan di kampung sendiri: pengaduan orang-orang pinggiran*. Yogyakarta: PT BentangPustaka.
20. Nugroho, W. B. (2018). Konstruksisosalrevolusi hijau di era ordebaru. *Journal on Socio Economics of Agriculture and Agribusiness*, 12(1), 54-62. <https://doi.org/10.24843/SOCA.2018.v12.i01.p04>
21. Nusantara, A. H. & Tanuredjo, B. (1995). *Duakado hakim agung buatkedungombo: Tinjauanputusan-putusanmahkamah agung tentangkasusKedungOmbo*. Jakarta: ELSAM.
22. Prasetyohadi. (2004). *Democratic actor in KedungOmbo land right struggle*. <http://democracyandpeace.blogspot.com/2004/11/democratic-actors-in-kedung-ombo-land.html>
23. Rahman, I. R. T. (1998). *Protespetani di Kecamatan Kemusu Kabupaten Boyolali Jawa Tengah (1985-1993)*. *Skripsi*, Universitas Sebelas Maret.
24. Salim, E. (1986). *Pembangunan berwawasanlingkungan*. Jakarta: LP3S.
25. Smith, N. (1991). *Uneven development: nature, capital and the production of space*. Oxford: Ideas – Basil Blackwell.
26. Stanley, A. P. (1994). *SeputarKedungOmbo*. Jakarta: ELSAM.
27. Sulastomo. (2008). *Hari-hari yang panjang: Transisiorde lama keordebaru*. Jakarta: Kompas.
28. Vatikiotis, M. (1993). *Indonesian politics under Suharto, order, developmentand pressure to change*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203279809>
29. Wibowo, G. A. W. (2014). Pemberontakanpetani di KecamatanKemusu-Boyolali 1985-1993. *Journal Seunneubok Lada*, 1(1), 8-14.
30. Whitelum, B. (2003). Rhetoric and reality in the world bank's relationswith ngos: An Indonesia case study. Australian National University.
31. Wijayati, P. A. (2008). *Pemilikan dan penguasaan tanah (desa di jawatimur)*. *Forum Ilmu Sosial*, 35(1), 75-81.
32. World Bank. (1998). *Recent experience with involuntary resettlementIndonesia -KedungOmbo*. Report No. 17540.
33. Yulianto, D., Suwitri, S., Sundarso., & Krismartini. (2017). Police implementation management of kedungombo reservoir in central java province towards continuity development perspective. *IJSER*, 8(11), 913-935.
34. Golput ala wargakedungombo: palangsepurdilumpati, ajurmumurdilakoni. (1997, June 1). *Bernas*.
35. Hari-hari penting menujukasasi. (1994, August 4). *Forum Keadilan*.
36. MA menangkanwargakedungombo, gantirugidarirp. 250 menjadi rp. 50 ribu. (1994, July 7). *Jawa Pos*.
37. Menunggu sang air menyentuh. (1989, March 25). *Tempo*.
38. Pintuwadukkedungombo janganditutup. (2001, January 18). *Suara Merdeka*.
39. Presidentanyakankasuskedungombo, pemerintahcariupayahukum, ketua ma: pengadil bebas. (1994, July 26). *Suara Merdeka*.