Earth System Governance: Theories and Strategies for Sustainability
2007 Amsterdam Conference on the Human Dimensions of
Global Environmental Change
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 24-26 May 2007

Promoting Participatory Earth System Governance on Emergency Program:
Case of Earth Disaster in Indonesia

Aluisius Hery Pratono

Abstract

While earth system governance can be understood as a political project that engages more and more actors who seek to strengthen the current architecture of institutions and networks at local and global levels, call for participation has emerged in the last two decades as one of the most important topics in development policy and theory debates. While natural disaster comes over, good governance is a prerequisite to elevating disaster reduction on the earth system management need to highlight on the importance of political commitment, multi stakeholder participation, and financial resources to achieve good governance in disaster risk reduction, and presented voluntary targets for governments. In fact, the policy-making in any area is not merely a question of 'rationally' choosing the 'right' decisions in a technocratic, value-free manner, but is more fundamentally shaped by contests between competing interests.

This essay assesses some of the major premises of neo-institutionalism explanations of earth system governance and participation practices with regard to the recent and ongoing Indonesian experience with many natural disasters, such as earth quake, mud volcano, and Tsunami. Decision making under natural disaster was challenge for good government as a prerequisite to elevating disaster reduction on the earth system management. The need for accountability, coordination among donor agencies, and participatory approaches; and the role of national and regional platforms will become obstacles while decision making needs to be done as soon as possible. There after, environment devastating will be the excuse under the name of emergency.

The research tries to find new ways to learn democracy and to live democratically through participatory budget which environmental friendly. What accounts for the ideological and political ambiguity of earth system governance' activity in promoting democratic process? To what extent are the business institution implicated in environment policies?

Keywords: participatory, rational decision, accountability, coordination

Aluisius Hery Pratono
Faculty of Economics, Universitas Surabaya
Raya Kalirungkut Surabaya Indonesia
Email: hery_pra@ubaya.ac.id or momojogja@yahoo.com

I.   INTRODUCTION

Along with the scale-up of environment degradation, each year many Indonesian communities are affected by natural hazards such as floods, cyclones, forest fires and severe land sliding. What is, unfortunately, already evident is that people and the natural environment have been seriously affected. In recent years, the frequency and impact of natural disasters in Indonesia has increased not because natural hazards occur more frequently but because more people are choosing to live and work in locations that put them and their property at risk. For instances, the earthquake on 26 December 2004 resulted in increased stress on the plate boundary immediately south-east Banda Aceh and almost certainly triggered the Nias Island earthquake on 28 March 2005. Still struggling to bounce back following the December 2004 tsunami, Aceh was getting the worst hit that thousands of people have been forced to flee their homes due to floods and landslides on 24 December 2006. A great social and economic cost comes for the massive relief operation to rebuilding affected people lives and livelihoods.

It seems a never ending "nightmare" for emergency program when rehabilitation and possible reconstruction of affected zones of devastated regions was tempted to sacrifice the environment. The Forestry Ministry blamed the authorities' inability to halt illegal logging for the devastating floods and landslides that have killed at least 118 people on Sumatra Island in the end of 2006 following the deforestation in Aceh to provide timber for housing construction, sped by post-tsunami reconstruction activities. In the other areas, the forest fires have global impact by extinguishing biodiversity to the atmosphere (the 1997 fires released an estimated 2.67 billion tons of carbon dioxide). The country's neighbors, such as Singapore and Malaysia, were clamoring for action due to mounting haze-related health problems, traffic accidents, and associated economic costs but ultimately the fires burnt until they are extinguished by seasonal rains in coming months. On the other hand, at its present rate, Sumatra's forests could vanish by 2005, while Kalimantan would be bare by 2010. The office of the state minister of environment estimates that deforestation has been sustained at an annual level of nearly 2.4 million hectares. The destruction is mainly caused by illegal logging, forest fires and mining activities. Data from the National Institute of Sciences (LIPI) shows that only 6 percent of the 75,000 square kilometers of coral reef in the country's oceans are in good condition. Scheper (2006) pointed out that unsustainable mining practices, illegal logging and destruction of protective mangrove forests for commercial shrimp farming have resulted in environmental degradation. Economic investment has been hampered by protracted conflict.

While natural disaster comes over, good governance is a prerequisite to elevating disaster reduction on the earth system management need to highlight on the importance of political commitment, multi stakeholder participation, and financial resources to achieve good governance in disaster risk reduction, and presented voluntary targets for governments. Participatory earth system government, such as forest management is generally recognized as the most effective method to meet the objectives of sustainable forest management and forest resource utilization, and so support the demands of local-dependent people (Sakumoto, 2002). However, sustainable development cannot be achieved by means of a participatory framework alone. Without the establishment of a comprehensive framework of earth system governance for the sustainable management of earth and the sustainable use of earth products in a broader sense, the protection of both

the earth resource itself and the livelihoods of those dependent upon it cannot be achieved in the long run.

The earth management system calls for political commitment, multi stakeholder participation, and financial resources to achieve good governance in disaster risk reduction, and presented voluntary targets for governments.[1] In this regard, relevant authorities are urged to consider a holistic approach to planning for this region, taking the area catchments as the terrestrial area for consideration and closely linking plans for this with future coastal zoning and management. Communities, too, expressed a strong desire to become more involved in and responsible for local environmental management. An emerging need from discussions with survivors of the tsunami is a desire for stronger local governance regarding natural resource use and management. Participatory earth system governance includes community-based-disaster risk management in which at risk communities are actively engaged in the identification, analysis, treatment, monitoring and evaluation of disaster risks. This means that at-risk communities are at the heart of decision making and implementation of disaster risk management activities in order to reduce their vulnerabilities and enhance their capacities.

This paper organizes the discussion as follow: Section II will review the related literature, followed by Section III that discussed the participation pattern of the earth system government in Indonesia. Section IV presents the challenge of earth system governance, while section V concludes.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

The inability of mainstream economics to tackle prominent problems of the environment degradation (Stiglitz, 2002) has been raising the standard emphasis on methodological individualism, which gradually being eased in favor of studying the institutional structures necessary for economic development (Reinert, 2006, Niggle, 2006). In short, economics seems to intensify the necessity for change without suggesting how it may be brought about, and organization sociology seems to reinforce the difficulty experienced in bringing about change, which itself is considered unpredictable and non-linear by nature (Savall et all, 2002). From the recent rediscovery of old institutional economics come the idea that the economy is shaped by enduring collective forces, include habits, norms, cultural, future development (Amin, 1998). Reagan (2006) point out that human living in development countries tend to be global in their viewpoints and to accept the concept of patriarchic dominion over nature through intensive agriculture, exploitation of minerals, fisheries, forest product, and industrialization.

Among those who speak in classical liberals, contemporary classical liberal, laissez-faire conservatives, and libertarians, one paradigm is centered on the individual, who is assumed to be the agent, the choice maker, and the foundation of liberty (Etzioni,

---

[1] Part of the International movement, the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) was held on 20 January 2005, 27 days s after the Tsunami (24 December 2004) in which the committee agreed to refer on encouraging the sustainable management of ecosystems, such better land-use planning and development activities. Indeed, a couple month before (May 2004), a forum of Asian Disaster Preparedness Center was held to share knowledge and experience of a range of organizations from governments, NGOs, private and public sectors, from seven countries in Southeast Asia and India Ocean Basin, in which the large Tsunami impacted most of them.

2002). In essence, the neo-institutionalism[2] seems predicated on applying neoclassical economic theory to analyzing social institution (Zafirovski, 2003). In conjunction with the assumptions of neo-liberalism assumption about the existence of a homogenous, the school of development thinking of neo-institutionalism explain the history, existence and function of a wide range of institution, whether government, law, markets, and the family (Hadiz, 2003). Under the fundamental premise that the state is an organization run by self-seeking politician and bureaucrats, and not only limited in their ability to collect information and execute policy but also under pressure from interest group, neo-liberal economists argue that the cost from these government failure are typically greater than the cost of market failure, and that it is usually better for state not to try to correct market failures, because it may make the outcome even worse.

In contrast to the neoclassical economic theory, the interventionist theory identified a horde of market failure and argued that active state involvement was necessary in order to correct the failure (Stiglitz, 1994; Chang, 2002). Post Keynesian and Institutionalist argue that state intervention to create or change institutions is often necessary to promote goals of full employment, economy growth, equity, social justice, and sustainable development. To overcome the governance failure, introducing maximum transparency and sharing of information in a process that includes all stakeholders and lead to joint decision making wherever feasible (Schneider, 1999). Against the conceptual individualism of the orthodoxy, Amin (1998) emphasized the process of institutional reform has to go beyond the localization and democratization of decision-making within a region's existing 'official' public-service organizations. Zittel (2006) argues that the different approaches share an institutionalist approach to political participation as well as the basic tenets of participatory theory, namely that the quantity of political participation can be positively affected by political institutions and that mass participation does not rule out a high quality of participation, that it can ensure good government.

Earth system governance can be understood as a political project that engages more and more actors who seek to strengthen the current architecture of institutions and networks at local and global levels, the policy-making in any area is not merely a question of 'rationally' choosing the 'right' decisions in a technocratic, value-free manner, but is more fundamentally shaped by contests between competing interests. Hadiz (2003) point out that decentralization is a key theme in the neo-institutionalist development literature, a hefty proportion of which is attributable to the intellectual production lines of such development organization as the World Bank, or the American aid agency, USAID. Along with civil society, social capital, and good governance, decentralization has become an integral part the contemporary neo-institutionalism lexicon, particularly the aspect of which are supposed to underline greater attention to social development. On the other part, there are important disagreements about economic and social policy that some of these disagreements are about values – how concerned should we be about our environment (how much environment degradation should we tolerate, if it allow us to have higher GDP), how concerned should we be about the poor (how much sacrifice in our total income should we be willing to make, it if allow some of

---

[2] The conception of institutions as found in the new institutional economic displays a sharp contrast with its old version as proposed by the early institutional and historical economists. For further discussion, see Zafirovski (2003).

the poor to move out of poverty, or to be slightly better off), or how concerned should we be about democracy (are we willing to compromise on basic rights, such as the right to association, if we believe that as a result, the economy will grow faster). The typical central bank governor begins his day worrying about inflation statistics, not poverty statistics; the trade minister worries about export number, not pollution indices (Stiglitz, 2002). Moreover, it seems to be both scientific and political topic, and science and politics don't mix well. Science deals with tentative conclusion and politics in absolutes. Science is invariably an enterprise built on uncertainty, and people who make policy decision see uncertainty as a reason to do nothing at all or to demand more studies (Achenbach, 2006). Coglianeses (2002) raised caution about using participant satisfaction, or other measures based on participants' attitudes and opinions, in evaluating dispute resolution and public participation in regulatory policymaking.

III.   PARTICIPATION PATTERNS IN EARTH SYSTEM GOVERNANCE

Indonesia is the biggest archipelago country comprising approximately 17,508 islands, and only 6,000 of which are inhabited. The main islands include Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Irian, and Java. The total land area is estimated about 1.92 millions square kilometers stretching for 5,150 kilometers between the Australia and Asian Continental mainland and dividing the Pacific and Indian Oceans at the Equator. Administratively, Indonesia is now divided into 33 provinces[3], and each province is divided into districts and municipalities. Each district is divided into sub districts (decimating), and village is the lowest administrative unit under a sub district. With approximately 205 millions of population, the country constitutes one of the most populated countries in the world, and 70 percent of which reside in Java Island. The geological and geographical conditions have made Indonesia a country vulnerable to natural disasters, such as floods (flash & slow onset), drought, forest fire (haze, etc.), typhoons, landslides, earthquakes, volcanoes, locusts, and tsunami.

The Authoritarian Regime, 1970-1990s

Following the fall of the socialist regime of Soekarno in 1960s, the major premise of environment resource exploitation was to support shot-term economic targets to handle the fragile macroeconomic stability with 650% inflation. In the name of economic growth, the New Order allowed exploitation of almost 70% of Indonesian forest area (143 million ha) by invited various business interests, both domestic and international. During the 1980s and early 1990s, the regime benefited newly industrializing as the kick-starter of economies and that after the initial phase of growth. During the time, the environmental regulations and land concessions were determined by national government in Jakarta, often being out-of-step with the needs and risks in the outlying localities. The centralized environment management created systemic deforestation and entrenched national government as well as concession in forestry deviant actions that made the dispute on land and natural resource was emerging, such as the lands of forest area between local communities and business conglomerate, the crony of government. During the regime, many conflicts were repressed and hidden by the military or settled by force.

---

[3] Under the decentralization policy, such new provinces keep on rising to meet the local need.

Under the repression approach, the government initiated the community approach. In the early 1980s, the Indonesian Ministry of Forestry (MoF) introduced a social forestry program in a state-owned forest plantation (Perum Perhutani) in Java known as the Tumpangsari. In 1990s, the government initiated to facilitate community approach, such as community development program with the Ministry of Forestry Decree No. 691 of 1991 and No. 69 of 1995. Under this program, concessionaires were obligated to support activities which contributed to the socio-economic development of communities living in and surrounding their concessions. In 1995, the government announced a new policy by issuing MoF Decree No. 622/Kpts-II/1995 and made the concept of community forestry was no longer limited to increasing the technical and production aspects of forest management, but also supported the development of a community's capacity and rights in the management of forest resources as a long term objective. Additionally, through this decree the local people were given access to use Non Timber Forest Products (NTFP).

Along with the steady economic growth, earth system governance well established structure on disaster response specifically natural disaster, few social conflicts (fast detection and response), regular training, The next MoF Decree No. 677/Kpts-II/1997 was issued in 1997 improving Decree No. 622. With this decree, community groups were be given the right to use the forest in what is known as a License to Manage the Forest. Local people were granted a permit to use timber and non timber forest products. However, since there was a need to make some improvements prior to implementation, the new MoF Decree was delayed and then eventually signed in 2001, as Decree No. 31/Kpts-II/2001. The decree contained regulations to allow a more active role for local people by placing them as the main actors in forest management. However, the decree was not implemented since 2002 because of new regulations on forestry planning which did not accommodate the right to manage the forest and only allow for licensing the use of forest resources (Hindra, 2005).

The Decentralization Era, 1999-current
Following the fall of Soeharto and the financial crisis of 1997, Indonesia entered a new era of decentralization[4]. As an important component of the reform and reconstruction process, Indonesia embarked on what is arguably the most expansive and rapid decentralization process that the world has ever witnessed. Through stipulations of Law No 22/1999 on regional government, the Indonesia's ongoing decentralization process new powers to grant resource concessions and design environmental regulations has offering an opportunity to earth system governance based on local decision. Unfortunately, in two years of preparation period 1999-2001, during the changes of presidents from Habibie, Abdulrahman Wahid, to Megawati, there were several political conflicts in central government on how to manage decentralization and regional autonomy. The chaotic central government and unprepared local administrations, devolution had turned into a nightmare in along of turmoil. In affect, Indonesia faced many constraints in its efforts to improve environmental regulations and policy and their application. These include a fragmented institutional structure, limited coordination

---

[4] There has been such a complicated situation on democratic trend in Indonesia show with the size and noncontiguous nature of country; by the military's deep permutations of state institutions and territorial deployment; by widespread sectarian violence, sponsored by disenchanted elites, and by secessionist tendencies (see Ganesan, 2001).

among ministries and agencies at national and local levels, and limited financial and technical resources.

The lack of concern of government on managing the communities was raising opportunity for the explosive revitalization movements among Indonesia's communities attempting to redress the disempowerment they suffered under the former regime. Although it was clear that the root of the problem grew from the New Order, reform and decentralization had significant effect on the escalation of conflict, shown by the increased incidence of demonstrations, visits to government offices and debates. Conflicts have been especially intense in areas of remaining valuable forest, such as Sumatera, Kalimantan, Papua, Sulawesi, and Java. Indeed, the Indonesia's financial crisis of 1997 was exacerbated by a corresponding surge in forest fires that devastated rural resources and disrupted air transportation. The environment faced particularly serious challenges as stripped resources and severe pollution threaten to halt development gains. If that so, the government enacted Government Regulation No. 27/1999 on environmental impact assessment to replace regulation No. 51/1993. The establishment of new businesses was strictly required to be subject to environmental impact assessment. Chapter 10 of Forestry Act No 41 year of 1999 provided for the rights and responsibilities of the community as well as the supporting role of the government in promoting community participation.

Without the establishment of a comprehensive framework for the earth system governance in a broader sense, the implementation of the new regulation was raising protest. In east part of Indonesia, some environmentalist NGOs sued the biggest foreign investor, Freeport, which violated the 1997 environment law, and government regulations on water pollution, rivers and management of toxic materials and other harmful waste. In surrounded Jakarta, protest against Indorayon made the government to permanently shut down its rayon-making unit for environmental reasons. In Sumatera, the environmentalist community declared Riau City as the dirties among the province's towns during the ceremony of the World Environment Day in 2000. While a cooperation network for environmentalist was established to fight the increasing danger of bio piracy and exploitation of the country's rich biodiversity by irresponsible businesses, when the government not yet took action to protect biodiversity. On the other hand, the local administrations still was struggling to prepare administration for the new system of decentralization.

To catch up the very dynamic movement of community, the central government enacted several regulations. Government regulation No 34/2002 was mandating for every level of government to emphasize the community institution capacity upon forest utilization (article 51). The government's policy to scrap the Environmental Impact Control Agency (BAPEDAL) and to fuse its functions into the Office of the State Ministry for Environment met strong opposition from environmentalists. A coalition of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) wrote to the President Megawati Soekarnoputri requesting her to annul presidential decrees No. 2/2002 and No. 4/2002. The NGOs doubt the policy failed to empower the ministry as the government hopes. On the other hand, through the decree VI/MPR/2002, the national legislative came to a statement that the poor environment management was the source of environment degradation. The volume of illegally harvested logs far exceeds that of legally harvested logs in Indonesia.

During the latter part of 2003, the Ministry of Environment launched a further phase of reform to improve the system on environmental impact analysis, called AMDAL Revitalization. It aims to address specific challenges that have arisen since the introduction of the Government of Indonesia's laws on regional autonomy in 1999, such a review and approval procedures at sub-national level; strengthening the enforcement of the environment analysis; developing alternative environmental management tools; and improving the effectiveness of public participation. According to a study of the World Bank (2005), as compared to other middle income countries, the Indonesia experience was weakest in relation to environmental screening and environment impact assessment study content but is relatively strong in relation to coordination issues, AMDAL review, and public participation. In 2003, the new Minister declared the creation of the Social Forestry program. To implement this program, the Regulation of the Minister of Forestry, No.1 /Menhut-II/2004 was established in 2004. This regulation concerns empowerment of the people living within and surrounding the forest in the implementation of social forestry. In this regulation, social forestry is described as a forest resources management system for state forest areas and or private forests, which will provide the local people an opportunity to become the main actors and or partners in a simultaneous effort to increase local welfare and preserve the forest. By the end of 2004, the Ministry of Forestry declared five priority policies, which one is to enacting the community forest project.

The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), a Canada-based environmental organization, awarded the Cities for Climate Protection Campaign Milestone Award to the Yogyakarta municipal government for its achievement in in decreasing gas emissions by five percent from 2001 to 2003 and electricity consumption by 40 percent over the same period. As many as 56 companies received awards from the city administration for success in managing their liquid waste by the City Environment Management Body (BPLHD). The companies were selected from 800 that took part in a clean liquid waste contest adjudicated by the organizing committee. On the other hand, Minister of Forestry of Indonesia met Commissioners Louis Michel and Stavros Dimas, responsible for Development and Environment respectively, in Brussels on 8th January 2007. They agreed to initiate formal negotiations towards conclusion of a voluntary partnership agreement (VPA) on Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT), which will provide assurance that Indonesian forest products imported to the EU are verified to be legal. In regional context, ASEAN has designated the year 2006 as ASEAN Environment Year (AEY) with the theme "Biodiversity: Our Life, Our Future". The official launch of AEY 2006 was held at the Bogor Botanical Gardens, Bogor, Indonesia, on 18 May 2006 in conjuction with the 189th Anniversary of the Bogor Botanical Gardens. The launch or AEY 2006 aims to raise people awareness of the region's rich biodiversity, and strengthen regional cooperation an implementation of actions on environment conservation. It supported ASEAN's commitment to achieve the goals of sustainable development envisaged in ASEAN Vision 2020 on the establishment of a "clean and green ASEAN".

IV.   PARTICIPATION PROCESS

As a home to the world's greatest breadth of biodiversity, Indonesia faces great challenge on the earth system governance to engage more actors' participation, such as government, business and civil society actors. Under the decentralization policy, the earth

system governance continue to face an expanded array of problems: facilitating community participation, seeking sustainable financing system, working with producer groups, providing more complex information for diverse systems and responding to changing human needs. In short, the earth system governance seems to intensify the necessity for change without suggesting how it may be brought about, and organization sociology seems to reinforce the difficulty experienced in bringing about change, which itself is considered unpredictable and non-linear by nature.

Development Planning

Government action to open up the public policy to participation will still largely depend on the extent and effectiveness of external pressure placed on governments, i.e. Act no 25/2004 and local regulations. Initiatives toward collective action in preparedness and contingency planning process which accrues largely locally could be conducted at several level of administrative government, such as village, sub-district, municipal, province level; while those that benefit the citizens of an entire country should be undertaken at the national level. Through Act No 25/2004 and Act No 32/2004, it is a mandate for every level of government in Indonesia to evolve community participation in each level of development planning through public consultation mechanism called Musrenbang. The current guidelines for the Musrenbang are outlined in Circular Letter of the Minister of Home Affairs No414.2/966.D/PMD on Manual for the Management of Participatory Development in Villages and Sub-districts, July 2004 and Letter of the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister for National Development Planning No.050/166/SJ - 0259/M.PPN/I/2005 on Technical Guideline for Implementing the Participatory Planning Consultation.

The topic on the community consultation comprised into general issue (general community consultation) and sectoral community consultation. At the village and sub-district level of governments, the community consultation based on territory planning rather than focus on sectoral issues. At this level, to promote development with environment friendly has been done along with the common issue on the strong normative assumption that the needs of the poor should be the top priority in the making of public budgets. At the higher level governances, each department in municipal and province government facilitated participations which come from the previous community consultation in which environment issue is one of a series issues. At the next level of participation, all departments come up with proposed program in the making of public budget. Certainly, the policy-making in these areas is more fundamentally shaped by contests between competing interests, in which key choices are made about spending priorities by geographical area, sector, and among social groups.

The planning bureau in each level of government (BAPPEDA) is the one who has responsibility to facilitate the series of local development planning. While some local government has dozen of department and other come with a few departments, the planning bureau comprised with three divisions into infrastructure, social culture, and economic. In affect, the priority tends to focus on the three issues, which unfortunately environment is beyond their priority. On the other hand, the authority on budget allocation has on the major, who seems does not make any concern with participatory and planning activities. No wonder that some local governments are unable to conduct even relatively simple analysis of their own budget data, while some other government prefers

view participation by civil society in public decision making with deep skepticism. A head of planning bureaus mentioned, "I do not believe that civil society will be able to conduct participation in overall fiscal priority setting, such as environment and poverty alleviation program."

At national level, the participation process as mentioned above was really good on the paper but poor in implementation. The fragmented institutional structures, limited coordination among ministries and agencies at national and local levels, and limited financial and technical resources has been common problem for the new structure. Participation was a more common perspective among the local governments as political obligatory but little practice significance. The governments use participatory rhetoric but they may not meaningful engage with the process. In line with Stiglitz (2002), the contests on competing interests particularly has been a long story, particularly between the Forestry Department and the Energy and Mineral Department about how government should tolerate the deforestation regarding their contribution for the government revenue. In 2006, the Forestry Department contributed around $ 244 million for the national government revenue, while the Energy and Mineral Department contributed around $2.7 billion. However, subsequent Government Regulations need to be issued in support of this Act.

Emergency Program

Along with enactment of Law no 22/1999, disaster response and management was well structure from the national level down to the district level. The BAKORNAS (National Coordination Board for Natural Disaster and Refugee Relief) had mandate to respond and manage disaster across the country through operational structures such as Satkorlak at the provincial level, Satlak at the District/Municipalities level. Under the decentralization process, many municipalities the previously established sources were lost its potentiality due to restructure and changes of personnel. Similarly at the national level though the secretariat of BAKORNAS was expanded in-term of organizational structure and number of personnel, however some ways they had lost of authority and control over the resources at provincial and district/municipality levels. The lack of resources would lead to lack of capacity that leads to lack of capability to mitigate. Lack of mitigation skills lead to lack of preparedness that would lead to lack of capacity to reduce risks and manage disaster. The lack of capacity to reduce risks and manage the disaster will give great impact and lost that at the end will further reduce of the available sources. Moreover, because BAKORNAS had no contingency plans, it was unable to provide operational capacity and coordination for national and international responses.

The issues of coordination need to be put into the context of the complexity of the disaster, ensuing response, and the political/security environment pre-existing in the earth's environment with severe natural hazards. There are some local governments i.e.; Special Province of Yogyakarta, District of Sleman, Province of Central Jawa and Jambi that have tried hard to develop more participatory disaster mitigation and responses by involving people representatives or NGO in the policy decision making and operations (Adinugroho, 2004). Some of them with their own initiatives had allocated contingency funds that could be easily being used for preparedness training and quick responses. The current structure and available resources are not well manage and very low synergy has been achieved between and among of the local government. The new paradigm which is

expected to be more comprehensive, decentralized, more human and participatory is still far for being fully operational due to the fast changing political environments.

In the case of Aceh, the national government set up a board for rehabilitation (BRR). Surprisingly, the unprecedented outpouring of concern, action, and financial assistance made around 300 international NGOs responded to the disaster; an estimated 2,000 foreigners and thousands of Indonesians arrived to help in Aceh and made coordination exceedingly challenging. In both Banda Aceh and Jakarta, the government met regularly with the humanitarian community and among themselves from outset of the disaster. The blue print for rehabilitation and recovery has been published by government which outlines the priorities and time frames for recovery and rehabilitation (Canny, 2005). In fact, the blue print contained only few concrete references to the assistance required by local government, while most international agencies had already decided on their programs.

This is worsened with the lack of community participation in disaster risk and management. In this context, civil society group should conduct activities, acting independently of governments or in co-operation with them, to track the flow of funds through established bureaucratic channels to ensure that disbursed amount reach intended beneficiaries. Such tracking party relies on the ability of civil society organizations to conduct detailed analytical work along with communities to assess whether the funds have been spent as intended. Unfortunately, the informal assessment has no legitimate power to reform the system. It was a common gossip that the more people experience with natural hazards, the more public finance allocates for emergency program, the more prosperous the official staff working for the program. Just like adagio in financial market that "you can make money when there is blood on the street". While the emergency program seems to be a never ending "nightmare" rehabilitation and possible reconstruction of affected zones of devastated regions was tempted to sacrifice the environment.

Civil Societies

In this country with many emergency program due to earth disaster, the first response to calamity from individuals, families, and communities, by organizing themselves to care for those in need. Conversely with the idea of welfare state in which the government should take responsibility on their community with calamity days, the family is the one who take care on everything. The early civil society initiatives are foundation on which the national response has been built, and it is civil society which remains at the forefront of prevention, particularly among the most vulnerable and hard-to-reach population. However, as a country with weak civil societies or participatory tradition, the participatory earth system governance depends on the extent to which they are built on existing process and political structure. In some case, inviting the vulnerable community seems contrasted with the interest of the government.

Among the poor and vulnerable community, those who lose in a conflict prefer to stay away from they came from, such as in remote area. Along with the major human rights and poverty issue, community concern in earth system governance in Indonesia should concern on involving the most vulnerable community as impact of continuing abusive behavior by security forces against civilians in Aceh and Papua (Irian Jaya); massive internal displacement of populations due to political, ethnic, and religious

conflict; judicial corruption; and the government's continued failure to prosecute commanders responsible for past atrocities, including the 1999 scorched earth destruction of East Timor and dozens of other cases dating all the way back to the army-backed massacres in 1965 that accompanied Soeharto's rise to power.

Opportunity for rent seeking, capacity gaps or bottleneck in the flow of resources mean that only fraction of fund budgeted for sustainable development purposes are actually spent to this end, just like other developing countries (Heimans, 2002). In this context, civil society groups conduct activities, acting independently of governments or in co-operates, has made significant investment in promoting a better environment by developing local planning and institutionalizing participation to deal with environment issues. Such environment advocacy partly relies on the ability of civil society organization to assess whether the policies have been issued with environment concern. WALHI (Indonesian Forum for Environment) is one of advocacy coalitions with over 100 NGOs join concern on environment issue. Regularly, the NGO coalition sends the President a warning letter with a map illustrating disaster-prone spots on the island. For instance, on January 7, 2006, WALHI send an open letter is to raise several considerations in regard to the handling and management of disasters in Indonesia after the country categorized as sensitive to disasters and call for consistent and integrated action to be taken to overcome this. A coalition of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) called on the government to cancel auctions for two selective logging concessions in Riau and Jambi, saying the move would endanger protected animals and threaten the livelihood of indigenous peoples. Eyes on the Forest, a coalition of Riau NGOs, said the auctions of PT SWS's 124,000 hectare concession in Riau and PT IFA's 130,000 hectare concession in Jambi would endanger Sumatran tigers and elephants. On the other hand, the international movement need to pressure private investment such the World Bank has banned 40 Indonesian firms and 29 individuals from participating in its projects for between 1 and 5 years due to their alleged involvement in fraud and corruption for January 2006. This is particularly relevant in light of the fact that environmentalist NGOs have greatly proliferated and become more visible, while remaining relatively unregulated in many parts of the world.

While the number of non-governmental organizations has increased sharply since the collapse of the New Order, some question whether their professionalism has kept pace. A lack of standards of NGO accountability has allowed far less credible organizations to undermine the effectiveness of credible NGOs. There is a legitimate concern over the question of NGO accountability, one underlying factor behind the confidence deficit. Though volunteerism has long been part of Indonesian culture but people still need encouragement and training to become effective volunteers. This spirit of volunteerism may have touched the hearts of many, but questions remain as to whether the volunteer work was properly implemented and supervised, for the sake of both the volunteers and those they were helping. More than 1,000 NGOs gathered in Aceh in the early days after the tsunami, but that number plunged to the dozens when the reconstruction work began in April 2005. In some cases, the conflict between civil societies and government has become endemic. Such an anecdote below perhaps explains the capacity building program for civic societies on participatory earth system governance in Indonesia.

During the Soeharto authoritarian regime in 1980s, a group of elephant made destruction in a kampong, community dwelling, in Lampung Sumatra due to the national resettlement program had made such terrible deforestation in which the elephant community lived. That hundreds of people had been forced to flee their homes had called for national attention. After a series of meeting with the President, the national top management ultimately came up with a program of school for the elephants. Some trainer for elephant school was invited from Thailand to make the elephant more cooperate with people. Therefore, some trained elephant made other elephant communities joint the school. They even trained elephant foot ball teams. Surprisingly, the elephant communities now help the resettlement program to devastate their livelihood, the forest, contrasted with their initial protest.

Sustainability is the main threat for the advocacy of community for environment, as most of them have weak leadership, poor planning and poor strategic management, while most of them are project-based oriented and dependent on funding agencies. Unfortunately, the capacity building programs in some cases seems to be similar to the anecdote above. It is contradiction with initial objectives of civil society respond for the earth community governance.

V. DISCUSSION

Following the impact of frequently natural disasters in Indonesia which has increased since overpopulation as a root cause of vulnerability, good governance for the earth system governance is a prerequisite to elevating disaster reduction on the earth system management which much rely on such a informal network, political patronize kinship, and even family business rather than on formal system. Along with the increasing widely held argument that when the expansion of citizen participation and increased role for civil society will change for successful implementation of the policies or decision for environmentally wisdom increase significantly, Indonesian has recently incorporated sector representation into its legislature. Such mechanism for participation may not be particular democratic. The policy-making in any area is not merely a question of 'rationally' choosing the 'right' decisions in a technocratic, value-free manner, but is more fundamentally shaped by contests between competing interests. Because of dominant patronage systems, may if not most of these representatives are hand-picked by the local leader.

Rater than initiate or lead efforts to implement participatory program, a more common perspective among Indonesian local governments sees participation process as being political obligatory, but as of little practical significance. Though act no 25/2004 mentioned that development planning system aims to optimal citizen participation, some government view participation by civil society or legislatures with deep skepticism. Along with a common patronage systems, such as family or other political and economic kinship, it seems that the increased transparency and accountability that usually accompanies participation as a threat to the relationship with particular sectors or interests. In some case, the implementation of participatory governance may also motivated by attempts to marginalize other centers of political and bureaucratic power. When participant do simply argue for more funds rather than focus on reflect priorities

with much more concern for the sustainability development, it is great challenge for earth system governance to promote commitment to participant for more ambitious model, which can entail the creation of major new civic institutions. It may initially step, and over the time, it is expected that learning by the governments about the benefit of participation creates the potential to shift governments into a more positive and proactive stance, accompanying the extent to which they are built on existing processes and international political structures.

It is also clear that relatively new concern for public participation, accountability and even democracy, is in itself partly response to criticism of the support of international development agencies for technocratic and top-down development policies along with their paradigm on neo-institutionalism. However, it is often counterproductive to try to convince neo institutionalist that they are making wrong assumption, or to chastise them for not incorporating societal, cultural, and historical perspective in their paradigm for promoting participation on developing country, such as Indonesia. The greatest challenge of the earth system governance is not just in the institutions themselves but in mind-sets. Short of a fundamental change in the earth system governance, the most important way to ensure that the international, national, and local economic institutions with widely various perspectives are more responsive to the environment, to the poor, to the broader political and social concern is to increase openness and transparency.

Often, the poor who are most directly impacted by environmental damage was the victim of previous political conflict. If that so, under the environment emergency program, the need for accountability, coordination among donor agencies, and participatory approaches; and the role of national and regional platforms become great challenge for decision making which needs to be done as soon as possible. To avoid the environment devastating under the name of emergency, the different types of participation will be appropriate for different local, national, and international context. An initiative requiring the creation of new institutions and dedicated political process will require a more favorable environment than that which would be required for effective civil society advocacy on environment. The collection of individual whose interaction is determined by the same self-interest that motivated people in the private sector have made the participant satisfaction is at best a relatively unimportant criterion, since it does not equate with the quality or effectiveness of regulatory policy. It because focusing on participant's opinion can easily lead one a problematic measure because participants' perception can easily lead one to overlook the broader public's interest or be influenced by irrelevant factors rather than concern in a way that secures the sustainable development of human society.

REFERENCES

Achenbach, Joel, 2006, When Science and Politics Clash, National Geographic, May.

Adinugroho, Kusuma, 2004, Nature an Practice of Community Based Disaster Risk Management in Indonesia, Institutionalizing Community Based Disaster Risk Management in Government Policy Making, Planning, and Program Activities: Proceeding Report, 3rd Disaster Management Practitioners' Workshop for Southeast Asia, Bangkok 10-13 May 2004

Amin, Ash, 1998, An Institutionalist Perspective on Regional Economic Development, the Economic Geographic Research Group Seminar 'Institution and Government' July 3, ULC, London

Canny, Bill, 2005, A Review of NGO Coordination in Aceh: Posh Earthquake/Tsunami, the International Council of Voluntary Agencies

Chang, Ha-Joon, 2002, Breaking the Mould: an Institutionalist Political Economy Alternative to the Neo-Liberal Theory of Market and the State, Cambridge Journal of Economics, 26, 5, p 539-559.

Coglianese, Cary, 2002, Is Satisfaction Success? Evaluating Public Participation in Regulatory Policy Making, Faculty Research Working Paper No RWP02-038, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University,

Etzioni, Amitai, 2002, Toward a Socio-Economic Paradigm, in Rogers Hollingsworth, Karl Muller, and Ellen Jane Hollingsworth, Advancing Socio Economics: An Institutionalist Perspective, Rowman and Littlefield, 37-49.

Ganesan, 2001, Appraising democratic developments in post authoritarian states: Thailand and Indonesia, Asian Affairs, an America Review, 28(1), p 3-17.

Hill, Alex, 2006, Economic Rights, Environmental Management, and Conflict In Indonesia, http://www.alternatives.ca/article2508.html

Hindra, Billy, 2005, Indonesia Community Forestry, in Community Forestry Status Report.

Jakarta Post, several editions

JIFPRO, 2004, Feasibility Study on Clean Development Mechanism at Lombok Island, Republic of Indonesia, Japan International Forestry Promotion and Cooperation Center, http://gec.jp/gec/en/Activities/cdm/FS200316SE.pdf.

MERI – Minister of the Environment Republic Indonesia, Rapid Environment Impact Assessment – Banda Aceh, Sumatera

Niggle, Christ, 2006, Evolutionary Keynesianism: A Synthesis of Institutionalist and Post Keynesian Macroeconomics, Journal of Economic Issues, 40, 2, p 405-412

Reagan, Donald P., 2006, An Ecological Basis for Integrated Environmental Management, Human and Ecological Risk Assessment, 12 (5), p 819-833.

Reinert, Erick S., 2006, Institutionalism Ancient, Old, and New: Historical Perspective on Institutions and Uneven Development, United Nation University, Research Paper No. 2006/77

Sakumoto, Naoyuki, 2002, the Participation Forestry Management System in Indonesia, Policy Trend Report 2002, IDE JETRO

Savall, Henri, Veronique Zardet, and Marc Bonnet, 2002, the Contribution of the Social Economic Approach to Change Management, EURAM conference, Stockholm

Schneider, Hartmut, 1999, Participatory Governance for Poverty Reduction, Journal of International Development, 11 (4), p 521-534.

Stiglitz, Joseph E., 1994, Whither Socialism? The MIT Press, Cambridge.

Stiglitz, Joseph E., 2002, Globalization and Its Discontents, Penguin Book Ltd, England

Warren, Carol, 2005, Mapping Common Futures: Customary Communities, NGOs and the State in Indonesia's Reform Era, Development and Change Volume 36 Issue 1 Page 49 - January 2005

Wentling, Tim L., 2001, A qualitative assessment of the EET programme: an educator's perspective, in Wentling, Aadhikarya, and Teoh, Participatory Environment Education and Training for Sustainable Agriculture, FAO Corporate Document Reposition, Rome.

World Bank, 2005, What is right with AMDAL: A study on emerging EIA good practice in selected province in Indonesia, For the World Bank, in support of Ministry of Environment, Republic of Indonesia

World Bank, 2005, the Sourcebook for World Bank Task Manager, Washington DC

Zafirovski, Milan, 2003, Orthodoxy and heterodoxy in analyzing Institutions: Original nad New Institutional Economics Reexamined, International Journal of Social Economics, Volume 3, No 7, p 798-826.

Zittel, Thomas, 2006, Participation Engineering: Can Institution Reform increase the Quantity and Quality of Political Participation? Working Paper University of Mannheim.