



The Impact of Green Revolution Movement towards Socio-Economic Life in the Countryside



I Wayan Tagel Eddy ^a

Article history:

Received: 10 July 2016

Revised: 15 August 2017

Approved: 21 August 2017

Published: 30 September 2017

Keywords:

Slash System;

Local Wisdom;

Green Revolution;

Traditional Farming;

Abstract

The green revolution became an icon in agricultural development in Indonesia in the early seventies to eighty. It was regarded as a savior for the agricultural sector, especially in developing countries characterized by low productivity, long plant duration, low growth, and minimal farmer's welfare. Without the green revolution, it was hard to imagine how agricultural production would have been able to feed the growing population. A prominent feature of the green revolution was the use of superior varieties included PB 5, PB 8, IR 36, IR 48, IR 54, substituted the local seeds i.e. Bengawan, Rajalele, Cianjur, Mentik that have transformed their traditional cultivation systems into the modern farming systems which marginalize a local wisdom. In terms of this has led to socio-economic changes in the rural level, especially to the functions of traditional farming tools unlike ani-ani, granaries, pestle, plow, replaced by slash, tractor and huller systems.

2455-8028 ©Copyright 2017. The Author.

This is an open-access article under the CC BY-SA license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

All rights reserved.

Author correspondence:

I Wayan Tagel Eddy,

History Studies Program Faculty of Arts, Udayana University, Denpasar, Bali-Indonesia

Email address: tageledy58@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The failure of rice production and the final food shortages on the New Order stimulated discontent in the urban area. In terms of this made the New Order government in 1972-1973 applied for the green revolution program more seriously supporting it through fertilizer subsidies, low credit, price stability of rice sale and irrigation. Rice production achieves self-sufficiency for the rice. However, the success of rice self-sufficiency is not followed by an equal distribution of profits. Without intending to ignore the success achieved by the New Order regime.

The viewpoint of cultural studies, the multidimensional crisis that plagued the nation and state life in Indonesia recently can be seen as a complex reality. This reality is related to each other further a phenomenon reflection of the national culture crisis, unlike a whole. For social scientists, the development is basically a planned effort process aimed at improving people lives in the justice. An each development program should begin with a plan to mobilize the broadest possible community participation in the development process.

^a Faculty of Arts, Udayana University Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia

The resources limitation that is followed by the population growth, will be able to give creating a social craze, the human beings strive to compete for the resources, in the competition has a capital advantage, the technology and organization will come out as the winner. The mastery towards the capital and technology by entrepreneurs encourages them mastering their resources and process on a large scale, regardless of the local communities and environmental wisdom, therefore the cultural clashes cannot be avoided.

This fact is visible in the farmer's life in Subak Susuan Karangasem Bali that the wetland ecosystem toughness has been sacrificed for increasing production. The more fundamental sacrifices are the human rights deprivation and the peasant's dignity, as well as the widespread cultural crisis with the peasants increasing ignorance over the various phenomena in their environment. The rice farming activities are under government control. The Subak Susuan farmers always made a comparison between their experience in the present and the period before the introduction of the rice superior type is better known as Superior Varieties of Resistant Aphis (SVRA). A major change experienced by the peasants in terms of farming freedom as expressed who experienced both the period before and after its introduction of the mass guidance. One of the most important indicators of the peasant freedom which is often used as an example of the liberty deprivation during the green revolution is the rice type selection to be breed and grown by the farmers in Subak Susuan Karangasem.

The phenomenon of the farmer's freedom at determining the choices according to what they want, their interest, and their consequences on the farmer culture development still needs to be deeply studied. [Hobart \(1993: 1-20\)](#) has observed the development issue due to the local knowledge ignorance. This is in accordance with the scientific knowledge increasing use as the basis for the life regulation in this world by the policymakers and bureaucrats. The local knowledge degradation, Subak Susuan farmers in developing a resource management strategy for their survival.

In accordance with [Gardner and Lewis \(1996: 122\)](#) stated that in order to the social scientists can play a more active role in studying discourse, development paradigms, in the terms of knowledge and power, and the local people inclusion in the overall development process. Through ethnographic and analytical studies, both from within and outside the development institutions context, cultural studies is able to do therefore based on the assumption that development discourse is flexible and changeable.

The green revolution that is regarded as one of the developmentalism model implementation is closely related to the small farmers. It is in this regard that the green revolution can be studied as an interesting case of how the economic process, technological, cultural, knowledge, gender, and political dependency is systematically dialectically associated with the structural impact of the deprivation of the small people lands. It is not simply a mere agricultural engineering program, however a local cultural strategy change and exclusion ([Fakih, 1995: 9](#)). For 40 centuries people's knowledge in farming for the first time facing evictions. For the first time in human history, an agricultural model pioneered by the multinational entrepreneurs, homogenizing the diversity of human agricultural knowledge, is reduced to an agricultural forms pattern, the green revolution. The programs supported by 13 high research institutes managed by the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) are able to change the world's agricultural culture. As the result, the farmers who have for centuries produced, selected, stored, and planted their seeds have been displaced. The seed is not only commodity commercial goods but also as a control tool.

The green revolution is a hegemony shortly time succeeded in changing the lifestyle, the attitude and principle of the peasants become more accepting for the capitalist model. As a result, the thing that was not known unlike the competition, efficiency became a part of the farmer life. The interests of chemical fertilizers, pesticides, and multinational seeds and the supply continuity of the agricultural commodity consumption and market creation for agro-industrial multinationals.

The green revolution is also a positivism knowledge invasion of the farmer's wisdom. The knowledge becomes a tool of the state, multinational corporations, universities, and developed countries capitalists to the peasant control. The discourse on the agriculture modernization of the green revolution to be the only form the valid knowledge and legal culture. The discourse of the green revolution displaces all forms of the knowledge and traditional agricultural wisdom. The indigenous peasant's wisdom and their seeds are removed, along with the evictions of the rural non-capitalistic social system such as working tradition of *gotong-royong* or political culture of *sangkepan desa* (villagers meeting).

In addition, the green revolution ensures dominance over the rural women. Regarding the agricultural mechanisms that are gender biased, women are displaced in the agricultural sector. The gender assumption also discriminates towards the women, that the rural women play a role in the production process were excluded due to the new technology and seed options introduced systemically to replace the women role. The anti-green nature

for the green revolution creates problems for the environment and rural communities that destroy rural ecosystems. Since the new seed created by the green revolution is very vulnerable to pests, the seeds require large pesticides in order to "*pest control*" and "*plant protection*." The pesticides are not able to control pests, instead spoiling pests, creating immunity a new pest, is not a war for the pests, due to the people have for years been doing an effective way to control pests by balancing pests and predators, however the seeds and chemicals that are the main inputs destroy a balance. As a result, the farmers are forced to depend on the chemical fertilizers and pesticides, and these inputs besides destroying rural environmental ecosystems also create farmers' dependence on the seed and agricultural equipment entrepreneurs.

In order to understand how the Subak Susuan Karangasem can survive in the capitalist process of the green revolution model, it will be explained by using Gramsci's hegemonic theory. According to Gramsci, the hegemony process occurred if the ideology, tastes and viewing the dominant class have been taken over dominated. The hegemony process is done either through *coercion* or/by a *consent*. The process is able to create a new reality concept that affects the tastes, morality, habits, principles of life and politics and the social relations pattern of Subak Susuan Karangasem farmers.

2. Research Methods

The present study is conducted as a qualitative research. The data is obtained by observation as well as an interview to the farmers. The data collection then paraphrase descriptively in accordance with the reality the occurred currently the study is done.

3. Results and Analysis

3.1 Green Revolution: Beginning of Farmer's Liberation

"Fooling period" is the term used by Subak Susuan farmers in naming the times when the rice cultivation changes from the way that irrigation water flow regularly. When the change is remembered by the farmers with the emergence of diverse recommendations and emphasis and threat from the government. Gede Pula is a farmer and also as a former of Kelian/Head of Subak Susuan Karangasem stated:

"If you do not join the agricultural development program as it has been introduced by the government through the green revolution package, then the farmers will not be given a water to irrigate the fields and often get intimidation from the authorities and entrepreneurs."

This expression is a reflection of the restraint experienced Subak Susuan farmers in adopting government programs, including a rice selection, fertilizer use, pesticides, credit, and others. The coercion conducted by government apparatus is strongly remembered the farmers, among others in the effort of adopting urea fertilizer. A wide variety of chemical fertilizers are then introduced to the farmers, as well as pesticides. The official clearly requires a great sacrifice for the farmers, due to the loss of freedom, especially in the crops selection. "In the past, the farmers in Subak Susuan Karangasem were free to choose any type of rice to get a rice kind in accordance with the farmer's wishes." Stated by I Gede Pula still remembered the various types of rice stains, both hairless and non-hairy and a variety of sticky rice. The farmers will continue to try different rice types, until the discovery of the rice type with the grain yields and tastes that match their desires and expectations. The glutinous rice is a rice type that is not left behind, due to the sticky rice is one of the main ingredients to make a cake (snacks), especially for the ceremony purposes.

The Subak Susuan Karangasem farmers are arranged by the government, what must be planted, when start planting and how to plant it. The farmer is able to be only resigned to implement the officer's recommendations. "If I do not obey, then farming credit is not liquid," the story of Wayan Merti who feel depressed by the officer's threat.

In this context, it shows that the farmers freedoms who slaughtered as well as indicate a delay of the pilot study process to the extent of their efforts to adopt a government recommendation package. The clues of a cultural crisis that one of its embodiments is in the pest explosion. The pest explosion is an explosion of cultural crisis as stated by I Gede Suastika:

"it is true that the Subak Susuan Karangasem farmers are currently able to earn a higher income than the former, however, the situation now makes me more worried more and more fertilizers for the rice crops in the fields", that is the farmer's complaint who started farming our rice since a local rice.

The quote above is merely a snippet of a farmer complaints pile facing the situation on farming. Honestly, the Subak Susuan Karangasem farmers currently recognize their current level of living increases with income increase several times from their local rice cultivation. However, the plant diseases are not as much nowadays, when chemical is available abundantly. The scientists generally explain that these pest explosions from an ecological point of view as an uncontrolled growth of insect populations. The loss of rice resistance towards pest attacks increased the pest resistance and natural enemy destruction due to excessive use of pesticides, can be considered as explanatory factors of the increasingly rampant pests and diseases. They attribute the term to an error in the policy and pest control technologies that are based on pesticide use. However, one of the main factors cannot be ignored is what farmers are experiencing, as pesticide users. It is also stated that the farmers do not understand and not know what causes the widespread pest, even though they have increased the pesticide use. They only know about the pesticides benefits unlike the pest killers and protect plants from pests or diseases. Indeed, it is what farm officers are socializing to farmers accompanied by the introduction of the word 'chemical' a pesticide analogy to cure the disease people. It is term knowledge that underlies the actions of farmers doing spraying of pesticides. However, this activity implementation is also based on the farmer's ignorance for the various negative impacts of the pesticide used in an excess and unwise. It is interesting to note that the farmer is actually a careful and thorough observer. They always evaluate the strategies they develop. From evaluation to evaluation that the farmers learn and enrich their knowledge as one of the strategies to hold counter hegemon to the ruler and entrepreneur.

In the early 1990s almost 30 years introduced the green revolution in Indonesia generally and Karangasem particularly, the government attempted to correct it in introducing the Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program. The program further attempts to change the farmer's paradigm in pest control. However, before that, the peasants have been immersed increasingly complex ignorance. The existence and function of natural enemies unlike pest predators remain not understood. The negative impacts of pesticide use on wetland and farmers' own health are not well known. In fact, the pesticides as a killer of pests and crops as well as increasingly become a mainstay. When there is a pest explosion, what they are questioning is there any more potent chemical? If the farmer is asked again, why the pest of aphid plant explodes again, then the farmer cannot answer it.

This is a social phenomenon that shows how the peasants interpretation as part of their knowledge. However, it is evident that the farmers' action strategy on the knowledge basis is not effective in dealing with pest explosions. The learning process that occurs from these pest explosions is constrained by ignorance of what is objectively taking place in its habitat. The objective knowledge is inaccessible to the peasants due to the learning mechanism is based only on empirical observation and subject interpretation. There are no tools that can help farmers to understand symptoms that are beyond the observation reach, and no new concepts and schemes can correct the misunderstanding. The introduction of the Integrated Pest Management program by the government is an intelligence period for farmers because through it seeds of freedom began to grow.

A new interpretation scheme begins to develop in the peasant mind. How to control pests without eliminating natural enemies, thus, will save unnecessary expenses that have previously been spent. In addition, there is a great curiosity in understanding the pest behavior, their life cycle, and appropriate controls in accordance with the stages development in the pest life cycle.

The clue of the freedom and development signs of the peasant culture show to take place in a number of farming communities including the farmers in Subak Susuan Karangasem. An inability to change the scheme of interpretation and thinking that has been rooted for a long time is only one factor is able to explain why the program's activities are not fully able to overcome the crisis. The farmer ignorance about the pesticides chemical substances and the way they work and other things related to the pest's life cycle is also found among IPM farmers and non-IPM farmers. The genuine guidance among national program guide developers in developing the peasant community's capacity working together and developing common agreements and rules to tackling problems in their environment is not implemented.

Another cause of the internalization constraints in term a new paradigm lies in the number of interrelated factors. First, the pesticides production is still running with the main target consumers are the farmers themselves. Thier marketing style remained unchanged. The cooperation with the local bureaucrats, local

executives, and agricultural extension agents continue to run with the goal of maximizing profits. The conflicting policy is not often accepted by the farmers. The peasant liberty deprivation also continues. One of the areas of the deprivation of farmers' freedoms is the imposition of complete package receipt from the Credit Farming, including the pesticide component. In the meantime, the field facilitator's accompaniment style to the farmer has not undergone a fundamental change, since these field extensionists continue to function unlike a government splice is be able to promote the established agricultural development program.

However, an exciting phenomenon is beginning to show up. In the coercion context of farming credit packages, there are many places including in Subak Susuan Karangasem began to dare to speak up, voicing their disagreement over the ill-treatment, they had received through the package coercion. The farmers critically criticize policies that are contrary to what the farmers receive, as well as through the government programs. Furthermore, Gede Suastika stated:

For what we are schooled, if indeed we have to buy pesticides? For what have pesticides first before knowing which pest will explode in this season? He said that IPM should not prepare pesticides first before the observation, why should we accept pesticides as supplies?

This is one example of the farmers' outpouring of resentment over the accepted policies contradiction, moreover, which still retains their freedom for choosing. This complaint is also a sign of the paradigm thinking and interpretation scheme of pesticides that harm the farmer if it should be owned without knowing its use appropriately. The pesticides use wisely or even in many places do not have to use poison at all or the pest-free rice planting, a new slogan in daily conversation in Subak Susuan Karangasem. Thus, it can be stated that this is a sign of the re-creation of peasant freedom, the growth seeds ability to self-regulate in the activities of rice farming in the rice fields.

3.2 The Economic Interests behind the Green Revolution Program

The multidimensional series crises experienced by Indonesian people since mid-1997, expressed by many of the policies implications of the New Order regime development. Over the years 'development' became a compulsory idiom for the government in governing the people lives and countries. In fact, the word seemed to function as an ideology, the whole life is being ordered. The people who are critical development policies and an execution, or the people who try to block the pace of 'development stakeholders' will be wiped out as government enemies as well as the state. The development concept in terms of the context gives birth to fantasy, disappointment, failure, and evil. Therefore, it is only natural that some intellectuals have declared the failure of the development concept (Lubis, 1999: 53).

The development model is facing the regime power. If the ruling government actor is authoritarian, paternalistic, and hegemonic, the attributes attached number to the New Order regime then the *top-down* choice and centralized development models is inevitable. An observer has long demonstrated the failure of the *trickle down effect* due to what actually happens is the exploitation of the top growth-centered development approach currently becomes a policy basis. The development model which has resulted in various crises based on economic capital lease (regarding the success measure in the economic growth figures form), meanwhile, a social capital is ruled out.

The implications of the character and behavior of the New Order regime towards the socio-cultural order in Indonesian has been extensively reviewed by scientists. For example, the euphemism tendency languages, the habits ask for guidance to superiors, just making Boss happy, loss of innovation passion and initiative among the people, warning of the mutual confidence between the social differences and cultural background (SARA), the ruler who regard the people stupid, is part of a small sample of the socio-cultural phenomena that thrived in the New Order era.

The policies at implementing a uniform agricultural development rather than a diverse one, which is more government regulated than the farmers regulated themselves, as well as increased productivity above sustainability and sustainability, seems to remain the agricultural policy cornerstone, unlike the latest program launched by the government. The food crisis that occurred in 1997-1998 has prompted the government to seek a breakthrough to overcome the food production problem. The special effort of Crisis Production for Food Crisis Management was introduced, one of the programs known as GEMA PALAGUNG 2001 which is an abbreviation of the Self Improvement Movement of Rice Production, Plants and Maize 2001.

Based on the various obstacles, efforts were made to overcome problems while increasing production with indicators: increasing the food diversity index, plant area, harvested area, and production/ha until 2003. The growth rate calculation was also determined. In order to achieve this goal, starting from the details of the problem, the way the government pursues is to go back through the *Bimas System* with extension activities and the technology application; distribution of production facilities appropriately; and pest control, harvesting, and post-harvest to reduce yield loss. Even, an explicitly stated also the need for re-controlling the pest disease is supported by the pesticide use.

Fundamentally, what is promoted through GEMA PALAGUNG 2001 based on a development paradigm that is proclaimed from top down with the farmers as production target. In order to achieve this production target, then re-introduction models of technology, extension activities and guidance model exercise and visit, training, and visit, the effort to make the farmers implement the recommended technology recommendations, procurement of credit packages, organizing farmer groups is a strategy that is run. The farmer group organization has created a program without seriously and fundamentally re-evaluating the approach strategy that has been implemented.

Although the farmer who has internalized the IPM principle has voiced disagreement over the need to accept the pesticide component package, the farmer still has no authority to change the policy from the top. For a decade the farmer's struggle escapes the necessity of purchasing pesticides through a credit package is still an endless struggle to be sought (Winarto, 1996: 65). Now, in the food intensification context, the struggle is increasingly difficult. The farmer's problem perceives in terms of receiving this pesticide component is one of the cases that indicate ongoing conflict within the farmer who has to make a choice, between following the conscience and the freedom to make decisions, or following the government's recommendations.

The inner conflicts within each farmer are actually a reflection of the discourse conflicts at the elite level of agricultural development policymakers. On the one hand, there are parties who seriously strive to implement this principle consistently with the objective of changing the pest control paradigm, the bearer of farmers and the management of a healthy and resilient environment. On the other hand, the IPM principles are acknowledged as existence and usefulness, even as one of the strategies of food intensification program, but still in the context of production improvement discourse. In terms of this kind of discourse the use of pesticides should not be abandoned, due to it is still considered as an effective strategy in situations of the pest attacks that are not addressed by other alternatives. An explicitly stated in the background of GEMA PALAGUNG 2001 problem (Agriculture Department of Bimas Controlling Secretariat, 1993: 3) that:

“... the IPM implementation is often still needed to be supported by the use of the pesticide, but due to the pesticides price is still perceived as expensive, the use is not as expected”. That's why the farmers are still often blamed in the event of a serious pest explosion, fit planting. When the peasants return to the lowest position of the power relations constellation, and the climate that sustains capacity building and farming culture become irrelevant, where will the culture of the peasants be brought? This is a challenge that needs to be looked at and studied in depth by scientists, therefore, unrelated especially from the perspective of cultural studies, that marginalized groups get the space in the real position in order to be for the food security that is more characterized by heterogeneity and not a monoculture. The green revolution program introduced by the government is more concerned with increasing production to meet government targets than realizing the general farmers welfare. Thus, the green revolution seems to be more favorable to capital owners, rulers, and landowners.”

3.3 Resistance of Subak Susuan Farmer as Hegemony Contra Struggle

The natural agriculture is not really a matter anti-chemicals, but the hegemony behind these chemicals is more important and fundamental to criticism and resistance. The hegemony has castrated and enslaved the Subak Susuan Karangasem peasantry, therefore, the ideology it embraces a resistance ideology in order to achieve the peasant's liberation from the dependence trap and helplessness due to the systematized global structural hegemony. The organic farming is a *poleksosbud* movement. That is, the organic farming can be used unlike capital for political, social, cultural, and economic change movement (Widyanta, 2008: 23). They aspire to realize the autonomy, independence, and peasant's sovereignty. They assume that natural agriculture allows the peasants to be more independent in choosing various options or opportunities toward independence, therefore, the sovereignty peasants are also more likely to be achieved. Through the natural agriculture, based on spirit and hard work as well evidence that Subak Susuan farmers have a big part in the resistance movement against the

green revolution regime and the restoration of agricultural cultivation and the wisdom values of the peasants who have been neglected and marginalized even uprooting the best local rice seeds to be removed from the original land.

An organic farming is like going towards the current, the consequences are considered unorthodox, even the judged as the state enemies. The productivity is only the reason for food sufficiency. The food self-sufficiency can be achieved, but only a year. After that, the soil was damaged, its production declined steadily. Moreover, how much the cost is wasted to fulfill the government's ambitions, unlike fertilizer and seed subsidies, however, those who feel are factories, not the farmers. In fact, the farmers buy fertilizer is as well as difficult, the price is still expensive.

Related to the negative impact of the current seed assistance program, it has caused damage to the farming communities mentality. Firstly, in order to educate the farmers is to be spoiled and lazy; secondly, in order to educate the farmers is to be independent and dependent; thirdly, it was a waste of money, and fourthly, risking people's lives. An assistance seeds in addition to being unnatural will also make the farmer is more spoiled, lazy, and unwilling to work hard. Because of being lazy, the farmers did not want to bother to make their own seeds and wait for helping seeds. This means the peasants have no independence and dependence on seed. The implication is that the state must waste the budget to finance dependency costs. It is just to pursue increased production, the government did not think about the danger.

An organic farming is more appreciative to the environment, due to it is an environment that will determine human life and history. In principle, the organic farming should not kill. That is why the organic mindset forbids the use of chemical fertilizers and GM seeds that kills the fellow creature slowly but sure.

The chemical intake impact has led to floods and global warming. The chemicals are not all parsed, and there is always the toxin remains. If the soil is constantly filled with toxic substances in the ground, there is an invisible life, microorganisms, soil biota, then over time will surely die. As a result, the soil becomes solid, dense, and has no pores. When it rains, the water is not easily absorbed into the ground, then there was a flood. Meanwhile, during the summer, temperatures are not absorbed by the dense soil is not porous, and the result in the occurrence of global warming.

In order to the extent that the society is mere as sale object, the food security of food sovereignty will vanish. The hard work values, diligence, patience, simplicity will wear off. The local wisdom and farming culture will be lost. They are unlike the food heroes no longer dignified. Indeed, they are the kings in their own land, but they slumped in the lowest layer social stratification of to be government hegemony servants. This fact is unrest base and also as one of the factors causing the resistance emergence of Subak Susuan Karangasem farmers against the green revolution movement as a form of *counter-hegemony* movement. If the government actually launched the *organic go-ahead* in 2010, its strategy must be changed. The agricultural program should really start from the bottom (*bottom up*). Since this activity is not a momentary program, the organic farmer community's endeavor should be facilitated and strengthened by the government, rather than just playing the claim. The government must also change the role of PPL, from accumulators to motivators. Abstinence to make farmers as an object of selling agricultural products as has been experienced before. If the government is still pro on the company, and not pro-peasant, then it means at plunging farmers from the "*actions speak louder than words*".

4. Conclusion

The land issues essentially related to the agrarian policy options in a certain era. The land issue for peasants is not independent, it is part of a big issue regarding an ideology and the social change paradigm, where the paradigm choice requires a legitimacy from the political, economic, cultural, legal, gender, education and knowledge aspects. The green revolution, unlike an agricultural development strategy, resulting in *betting on the strong* practice - is beneficial to a strong economy and politics. Therefore, for the future, it needs to be strived seriously to change the agricultural development strategy from *betting on the strong* to *betting on the weak* strategy.

Acknowledgements

Regarding this paper, the authors sincerely thank Prof. Dr. A.A Bagus Wirawan, S.U. as the Promotor, Prof. Dr. I Wayan Cika, M.S. as a Co-promotor I, and Prof. Dr. I Nyoman Suarka, M Hum. As Co-promotor II for their criticism, suggestions, and directives during the process until the research completion. Hopefully, this will be beneficial for generally the development of social sciences and cultural studies particularly.

References

- Astika, K. S. (1978). Social and economic effects of the new rice technology: the case of Abiansemal, Bali. *Prisma*, (10), 47-56.
- Astika, K. S. (2010). Budaya kemiskinan di masyarakat: Tinjauan kondisi kemiskinan dan kesadaran budaya miskin di masyarakat. *Jurnal Ilmiah Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 1, 20-26.
- Cha, M. S. (2008). The Economic History of Korea. *EH. Net Encyclopedia*, edited by Robert Whaples.
- Fakih, M. (2000). Kekerasan Dalam Perspektif Pesantren. *Jakarta: Grasindo*.
- Fakih, M. (2000). Persoalan Ketidakadilan Sosial Dan HAM Dalam Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Dan Hak Asasi Manusia.
- Fauzi, N. (1999). *Petani & penguasa*. Diterbitkan atas kerjasama INSIST, KPA, [dan] Pustaka Pelajar.
- Geertz, C. (1976). *The religion of Java*. University of Chicago Press.
- Hardjono, J. M. (1991). *Indonesia: Resources, ecology, and environment*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Hayward, R. A., McMahon, L. F., & Bernard, A. M. (1993). Evaluating the care of general medicine inpatients: how good is implicit review?. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 118(7), 550-556.
- Jawi, I. M., Suprpta, D. N., Dwi, S. U., & Wiwiek, I. (2008). Ubi jalar ungu menurunkan kadar MDA dalam darah dan hati mencit setelah aktivitas fisik maksimal. *Jurnal Veteriner Jurnal Kedokteran Hewan Indonesia*, 9(2), 65-72.
- Landsberger, H. A., Alexandrov, Y. G., & Mahasin, A. (1981). *Pergolakan petani dan perubahan sosial*. CV Rajawali, Jakarta.
- MacDonald, M. E., Ambrose, C. M., Duyao, M. P., Myers, R. H., Lin, C., Srinidhi, L., ... & MacFarlane, H. (1993). A novel gene containing a trinucleotide repeat that is expanded and unstable on Huntington's disease chromosomes. *Cell*, 72(6), 971-983.
- Maliki, Z. (1999). *Penaklukan negara atas rakyat: studi resistensi petani berbasis religio, politik santri terhadap negaranisasi*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Nasikun, J. (1980). Urbanisasi Berlebih, Involusi Perkotaan dan Radikalisme Politik di Negeri-negeri Berkembang. *Prisma*, 6, 9-22.
- Nata, E. M. H., Astina, I. B. K., & Sulistyawati, A. S. S. S. Analisis kualitas pelayanan room attendant terhadap tingkat kepuasan pelanggan di hotel golden tulip devins seminyak bali. *Jurnal Kepariwisata dan Hospitalitas*, 1(1), 47-54.
- Oey, M., & Astika, K. S. (1978). *A report from the Institute for Economic and Social Research Faculty of Economics of the University of Indonesia in collaboration with the Research and Development Board, Department of Manpower, Transmigration and Cooperatives*. Mimeo (Jakarta: Institute for Economic and Social Research, Faculty of Economics, University of Indonesia, 1978).
- O'Hanlon, R., & Washbrook, D. (1992). After orientalism: culture, criticism, and politics in the Third World. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 34(1), 141-167.
- Pontius, J. S. (1995). Franking. In *The Encyclopedia of the United States Congress* (Vol. 2, pp. 883-88).
- Popkin, S. L., & Popkin, S. L. (1979). *The rational peasant: The political economy of rural society in Vietnam*. Univ of California Press.
- Priyono, A. E. (1993). Peri-feralisasi, Oposisi, dan Integrasi Islam di Indonesia (Menyimak Pemikiran Dr. Kuntowijoyo). *kata pengantar untuk buku Kuntowijoyo, Paradigma Islam Interpretasi untuk Aksi*. Bandung: Mizan.
- Siahaan, H. S., & Hum, M. (2014). Perlindungan hukum reproduksi perempuan di indonesia.
- Sumodiningrat, G. (2001). *Menuju swasembada pangan: revolusi hijau II: introduksi manajemen dalam pertanian*. RBI.
- Suprpta, D. N. (2003). Ubi jalar ungu mengandung antioksidan tinggi.
- Suprpta, D. N. (2005). *Pertanian Bali dipuja, petaniku merana*. Arti Foundation.
- Tjondronegoro, S. M. (2004). Forest margin protection and community involvement. In *Land Use, Nature Conservation and the Stability of Rainforest Margins in Southeast Asia* (pp. 27-37). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Trijono, L. (1994). Pasca Revolusi Hijau di Pedesaan Jawa Timur (pp. 23-31). *Majalah Prisma*, (3).
- Trijono, L. (1994). Pasca Revolusi Hijau di Pedesaan Jawa Timur (pp. 23-31). *Majalah Prisma*, (3).
- Wahono, F. (2003). Revolusi Hijau: Dari Perangkap Involusi ke Perangkap Globalisasi. *dalam I. Wibowo & F. Wahono (eds.), Neo-Liberalisme, Yogyakarta: Cindelarast Pustaka Rakyat Cerdas*.
- Wahono, F. X. (2003). *Gelombang perlawanan rakyat: kasus-kasus gerakan sosial di Indonesia*. Insist Press.

White, B., & Wiradi, G. (1989). Agrarian and nonagrarian bases of inequality in nine Javanese villages. *Agrarian transformations: local processes and the state in Southeast Asia*, 266-302.

York, D. G., Adelman, J., Anderson Jr, J. E., Anderson, S. F., Annis, J., Bahcall, N. A., ... & Boroski, W. N. (2000). The sloan digital sky survey: Technical summary. *The Astronomical Journal*, 120(3), 1579.

Biography of Author

I Wayan Tagel Eddy graduated his primary school in 1970, junior high school in Singaraja 1973, high school in Denpasar 1976. He completed his study in History Department, Faculty of Arts and Culture UGM in 1984. He was appointed as a civil servant lecturer at Udayana University in 1986. Then continue his studies to Postgraduate UGM, graduated in 1992. He is interested in teaching included History Introduction, History of Modern Thought and General Historiography. He is currently completing her doctoral studies program at cultural studies in Udayana University. He has been the Secretary and Chairman of the History Department, Faculty of Arts, Udayana University and currently listed as an Expert Team of Cultural Heritage, Bali Province.