

Organic Farming: Is a Metamorphosis of Modern Agricultural Imperialism or a Postmodern Agricultural Model?

Agricultura Orgânica: uma Metamorfose do Imperialismo Agrícola Moderno ou um Modelo Agrícola Pós-Moderno?

Hamyana Yana¹ , Kliwon Hidayat² , Keppi Sukesih² , Yayuk Yulianti² 

¹Agricultural Development Polytechnic of Malang, East Java, Indonesia

²Brawijaya University, Malang, East Java, Indonesia

Corresponding author: hams.lodaya@gmail.com

Abstract

The implementation of organic farming programs in Indonesia involves various actors and various interests in it. The relationship between actors and their interests has positioned organic agriculture at the intersection between modern agricultural camouflage and the antithesis of modern agriculture (postmodern agriculture). How did this happen? so this research is very important to provide a complete picture in describing the involvement of actors and power relations as one of the key factors that will determine the formulation of policies for developing organic agriculture in the future. This research used a qualitative method with a case study approach. Data collection techniques were carried out by in-depth interviews, observations, and document studies. The research data were analyzed concerning the Miles and Huberman (2002) framework, which consisted of stages of data reduction, analysis formulation, and concluding. The results showed that there were four typologies of actors, namely, type A actors oriented to spiritual values; actor type B oriented to moral values; type C actor is oriented to rational values and type D actor is oriented to political/power values. The struggle between actors is dominated by driving actors (advanced farmers or champions, state apparatus, capitalists) who have stronger knowledge power. The rhetoric and images narrated by the driving actors then become tools for domination to seize the rights of other actors with the interests and powers attached to each actor. The implementation of organic agriculture which is full of power interests puts organic farming programs in Indonesia trapped in a market trap and a poor meaning reduction of moral values, human values, spiritual values, and ecological values.

Keywords: Actor; Moral; Power

Resumo

A implementação de programas de agricultura orgânica na Indonésia envolve vários atores e vários interesses. A relação entre atores e seus interesses posicionou a agricultura orgânica na interseção entre a camuflagem agrícola moderna e a antítese da agricultura moderna (agricultura pós-moderna). Como isso aconteceu? por isso esta pesquisa é muito importante para fornecer um quadro completo ao descrever o envolvimento dos atores e as relações de poder como um dos principais fatores que determinarão a formulação de políticas para o desenvolvimento da agricultura orgânica no futuro. Esta pesquisa utilizou um método qualitativo com abordagem de estudo de caso. As técnicas de coleta de dados foram realizadas por meio de entrevistas em profundidade, observações e estudos documentais. Os dados da pesquisa foram analisados segundo o referencial de Miles e Huberman (2002), que consistiu nas etapas de redução dos dados, formulação da análise e conclusão. Os resultados mostraram que existiam quatro tipologias de atores, a saber, atores do tipo A orientados para valores espirituais; ator tipo B orientado a valores morais; o ator tipo C é orientado para valores racionais e o ator tipo D é orientado para valores políticos/de poder. A luta entre atores é dominada por atores impulsionadores (agricultores ou campeões avançados, aparato estatal, capitalistas) que têm um poder de conhecimento mais forte. A retórica e as imagens narradas pelos atores propulsores tornam-se então ferramentas de dominação para apropriar-se dos direitos de outros atores com os interesses e poderes vinculados a cada ator. A implementação da agricultura orgânica, cheia de interesses de poder, coloca os programas de agricultura orgânica na Indonésia presos em uma armadilha de mercado e uma redução de significado pobre de valores morais, valores humanos, valores espirituais e valores ecológicos.

Palavras-chave: Ator; Moral; Poder

1 Introduction

The discourse of organic farming as an anti-thesis of modern agriculture and as a model of modern agriculture camouflage is still an interesting debate to be researched. We should question whether it is true that the implementation of organic agriculture as a way to fight the determination of modern agriculture or organic agriculture as a new form of modernism in agriculture. To describe this problem, this research must be carried out as a radical reflection on the implementation of organic agriculture policies in Indonesia. The assumptions built in this study refer to the results of the study (Aji, Wangsit & Ningrum 2020) that the organic farming policy in Indonesia for more than ten years, still uses a method that is not much different from the regulation in conventional farming systems, through centralized and market-oriented control. In line with the research results Aji, Wangsit & Ningrum (2020), the result (Freyer & Bingen 2015) which states that industry and markets have directed organic farming policies and movements in various parts of the world away from the principles of the organic farming movement established by IFOAM. One of the causes that are suspected to have caused the implementation of agricultural development to deviate from the principles of the organic farming movement is the power relation of the actors involved in the formulation of planning, implementation, and evaluation of organic farming activities which play an important role in determining the direction of the implementation of organic agriculture in Indonesia.

The development of organic agriculture whose concept is adopted from sustainable development is substantively mainstreaming social, economic, and ecological sustainability (Hunt et al. 2015) we need to ask how such practices contribute to our food system (Campbell 1997. A creation of capitalism that at first glance offers friendliness and sustainability, even though the trueism is still developing. The characteristics of developments are very visible, which is reflected in its implementation which is dominated by the use of external inputs produced by outside industries, processes, practices, and results become more expensive so that they are not affordable by the weak / marginal farmers (Setiawan et al. 2018). Internal inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, and pesticides that should be fulfilled independently from the implementation of integrated agriculture, in practice, are still dominantly imported from outside. The high cost of internal input is not supported by local culture, for example the culture of raising livestock, growing crops as raw materials for vegetable pesticides, and local technology. So that the tendency is

partial implementation, ecological sustainability bias and neglect of economic, social and political sustainability.

The development of organic agriculture gives birth to actors who are involved with inherent interests (Putra & Suyatna 2018). Between one actor and another, they compete for dynamics and power relations to influence the discursive practices of individuals/groups of farming communities. The level of loyalty and influence differs from one individual to another depending on the inherent knowledge and how strong the dialectic of discourse power affects the public sphere and the construction of thinking and behavior of the individual. Borrowing Foucault's framework on the Genealogy of Power or Power/Knowledge (Foucault 2002), power/power should place the interests of the weakest actors to build productive spaces and their networks to improve welfare. Genealogy/discourse power must form productive discourse, dynamics of relations, and power relations between actors to place the delegation of power and the use of knowledge because power without knowledge will not create fundamental prosperity.

The struggle of actors in fighting for the interests of individuals or groups has implications for the direction and orientation of the implementation of organic agriculture in most parts of Indonesia. On the one hand, the direction and orientation of the implementation of organic agriculture aim to criticize and even get out of developments such as industrialization, modernization, and capitalization. But on the other hand, the implementation of organic agriculture is only limited to rhetoric, jargon, and camouflage for the rulers or owners of power in defending their interests. Based on these conditions, this study seeks to describe the implementation of organic farming policies that are at the intersection between modern agriculture and modern agriculture criticism, viewed from the point of view of actor actions and actor power relations which are framed in the perspective of Structural theory. Kinseng (2017) and the theory of Genealogy of Power or Knowledge by Foucault (2002). This research is very important especially for the government because it will provide a complete picture in describing the involvement of actors and power relations as one of the key factors that will determine the formulation of policies for developing organic agriculture in the future.

2 Method

This research uses a qualitative method with a case study approach. The research location was in Batu City, East Java. The consideration of determining the location is because the case of implementing organic agriculture in Batu City is considered to represent the

general characteristics of organic agriculture development in Indonesia. Data collection techniques using observation, in-depth interviews, and document studies. Observation activities include finding facts in the field in the area of organic agriculture development in Batu City in the form of 1. What is the typology of the actors involved and what are their interests in the development of organic agriculture? and 2. How is the power struggle that occurs between actors in the development of organic agriculture? In-depth interviews were carried out simultaneously with observation activities. In-depth interviews were conducted to check the findings of field observations. The informants who were interviewed were as follows: the driving actors, namely Agricultural Extension Officers in Bumiaji District, Junrejo District, and Batu District, with a total of 6 people; 3 officers of the Department of Agriculture and Forestry of Batu City; 10 organic farmers; community leaders which include village officials, religious leaders, and village elders as many as 5 people. The interview process was carried out in-depth and focused on research questions. The documentation stage is used to find hidden facts from the actors involved in the development of organic agriculture. The documentation obtained in this research is in the form of Outline of the Road Map for Organic Agriculture Development; Master Plan for the Development of Organic Agriculture; Regional Regulation on Organic Agriculture Development; Print and online mass media news related to the development of organic agriculture; relevant research results covering topics: policy dynamics, genealogy of power and interest, actor relations, organic agriculture; and other documents relevant to the development of organic agriculture. The research data were analyzed regarding the Miles and Huberman (2002) framework, which consisted of stages of data reduction, analysis formulation, and concluding.

3 Result and Discussion

3.1 Typology of Actors and Their Importance in the Implementation of Organic Agriculture Development in Indonesia

Based on the results of observations and interviews, it was found that the actors involved in the development of organic agriculture at the Research Site consisted of the Government (regional and central), agricultural corporations or entrepreneurs, environmental activists, Organic Certification Institutes (LSOs), academics and practitioners of organic agriculture, Farmers and village

community leaders. Each actor has different interests in the development of organic agriculture, both socially, economically and ecologically; as well as the power it has. Differences in interests and power between actors are actualized in the various behaviors and actions of actors in carrying out organic farming. Therefore, to describe the typology of actors and their importance in the development of organic agriculture, it will be described using genealogical analysis of actor actions.

Actors' actions in developing organic agriculture are determined by the interaction of two elements or elements, namely the agency element and the structural element. Giddens (2010), states that an actor's actions are determined by two elements, namely agency, and structure. However, the actions of actors in the context of this research do not place the elements of agency and structure as an inseparable unit (duality) as stated by Giddens, but rather agency and structure are placed as something that must be separated (dualism). This thinking is in line with the view of Kinseng (2017) which states that "I do not agree with Giddens that the agency element and the structural element cannot be separated (dual). In my opinion, although these two elements are always present in every actor's actions, and influence each other, they can and must be separated analytically (dualism in nature)". Besides Kinseng (2017); (Layder, Ashton & Sung 1991) states that action (which means agency) and structure are two separate aspects and each has a degree of autonomy. They say "Thus we conclude that empirically structure and action are independent (and thus, deeply implicated in each other), but partly autonomous and separable domains".

The implementation of the development of organic agriculture at the research locus presents a variety of actors' actions which are based on the various interests behind them. From the results of observations and interviews with key informants, it can be seen that the typology of interests and the typology of actors is as presented in Table 1 below:

Based on the 4 (four) typologies of actors as presented in Table 1, the actions and interests of actors have different value orientations and variations of interests. First, the value orientation and interest of type A actor in doing organic farming are to worship Allah SWT. Type A actors carry out organic farming based on the values and religious norms they adhere to. Islam is the majority religion adopted by the informants in this study. Followers of the Islamic religion are obliged to maintain and protect the universe from actions that cause damage and destruction. The following are excerpts from several verses in Surah Al A'raf verse 7 and Surah Al-Qasas verse 77 (translation in English) as follows:

Table 1 Typology of actors and their importance in implementing the organic farming system.

Actor Typology	Value Orientation	Actor’s interests	Actor Action
Type A Actor	Oriented to Spiritual values	Worship in carrying out human nature as Caliph (leader)	Running organic agriculture as worship to carry out human nature as a leader, guardian of the sustainability of life
Type B Actor	Oriented to Moral and Cultural Values	Maintaining the sustainability and sustainability of social and natural resources	Running organic farming as a strategy to improve soil fertility, biological balance, and sustainability of local wisdom
Type C Actor	Oriented to Rational and Market Value	Meet market standardization, profit maximization	Running an organic farm to meet market needs and increase income
Type D Actor	Value Oriented Power	Maintaining power or consensus	Running organic farming as a media campaign and image

“And remember when Allah made you successors (in power) after the people of ‘Aad and gave you a place on earth. You build palaces in its flatlands and you cut the mountains for houses; So remember the favors of Allah and do not run rampant on the earth to cause mischief. (Surat al-’A`raf [7]: 74)”.

And seek in what Allah has bestowed upon you (happiness) in the hereafter, and do not forget your share of worldly (pleasures) and do good (to others) as Allah has done good to you, and do not do mischief in (face) Earth. Verily, Allah does not like those who do mischief. QS. Al-Qasas [28]: 77

The results of interviews with key informants number 1 and 7 obtained data that have a similar level of meaning in interpreting the actions and orientation of their interests in the context of implementing organic agriculture. Key informant number 1 said in the interview session that organic farming is a form of worship. The use of herbal ingredients such as neem leaves, mini leaves, soursop leaves, and other herbal ingredients used for vegetable pesticides is interpreted as a form of gratitude for God’s grace. Key informant number 1 believes that Allah SWT. has created the universe and its contents with their respective functions and benefits. This means that for human needs, nature has provided adequate and balanced. It’s just that human greed causes nature to lose its balance which destroys the ecosystem.

Key informant number 7 believes that organic farming is interpreted as a form of obligation that must be fulfilled as a servant of Allah SWT. Human nature as a caliph or leader on earth is supposed to protect, care for and preserve nature. Therefore, farming activities should not damage or reduce the rights of future generations. The obligation of humans, including farmers, is to protect, care for and preserve the universe. While the key informant number 6 said that organic farming is a responsibility to

Allah SWT as the creator of the universe. In the perspective of key informants number 1, 6, and 7 that every act will be held accountable, including in farming. When Allah SWT has given the trust to humans to protect, maintain and preserve the universe, then the concrete action for this responsibility is to maintain fertility, balance, and soil capacity through the principles of organic agriculture. The use of biological agents, the use of organic fertilizers produced from agricultural and livestock waste, as well as the use of low-carbon materials are some concrete examples of key informants in carrying out their roles as forms of worship, expressions of gratitude, obligations, and responsibilities to Allah SWT. God is the creator of the universe.

The results of this study complement the results of the study Grim (2001); de Vries & Snep (2019); and Irvine et al. (2019) that there is a relationship between spiritual values and biodiversity which is implemented in organic farming. Grim (2001) cited the example of the Ifugao Igorots as one of the indigenous tribes in the Philippines performing rituals led by an indigenous priest to control rice pests, thereby preserving the plant species that the Igorots rely on for food. In addition, the Ifugao believe that “nature spirits” inhabit trees and rocks in forests and watersheds, which are “centers of biodiversity,” including more than 200 plant varieties. Other research results that support the findings in this study Wilson (2003) which states that activities such as hunting and harvesting not only provide nutritional benefits, which support physical health but also enable individuals to connect spiritually with Mother Earth, the Creator, and spirits while on land. This is important because it allows the individual to pursue a simultaneous physical and spiritual connection to the ground that is essential to emotional and mental health. Second, type B actors are oriented towards moral and cultural values in carrying out an organic farming system. This type of actor is dominated by farmers who relatively act as traditional

leaders in the research location. So that organic farming is more aimed at efforts to maintain customs, habits, and local wisdom inherited by their ancestors. Organic farming activities in maintaining local wisdom are expressed in the use of natural pesticide ingredients (soursop leaves, tobacco leaves, turmeric, and paitan leaves) mixed with other natural ingredients in controlling pests and diseases on plants. Knowledge about the efficacy of the ingredients used for botanical pesticides comes from their ancestral heritage which was later developed. Based on information from key informant number 2 that in controlling pests and diseases on the land he manages, he prioritizes the use of herbal ingredients that are around. Nature has provided a system that we must maintain a balance. Humans must not eliminate the natural balance system by eliminating one link from the existing natural cycle, including controlling pests and plant diseases on the land. The use of synthetic chemicals will only eliminate the diversity of organisms in the land which results in the loss of links in the food chain cycle in the universe. Another implementation that is practiced by organic farmers from the point of view of local knowledge and wisdom is a sense of love and compassion for water and soil.

Based on the results of in-depth interviews with key informants number 2 that land is the same as other living things, which need love, care and need to be treated in a civilized manner. How to treat them (land and water) humanely. Water and soil have their way of communicating with other creatures, including humans. For us as humans, we can recognize and communicate with land and water from their natural properties. Based on these natural properties, we can understand what land needs, what land does not need, and what land does not like from us as humans who use it. For example, the physical properties of good soil are loose, rich in organic matter, erase, and ideal drainage. When these physical properties are not met, it means that the soil is sick and needs treatment. Things like this cannot be understood if we as humans ignore and don't care about the condition of the land we manage.

The results of this study confirm the research Alhamidi et al. (2003) which states that the ability of farmers to integrate ethical values into their agricultural decisions and actions, has implications for the management of natural resources in an analytical way and not only for economic purposes. Moreover, it makes agriculture meaningful and sustainable. Loving agriculture is seen as a good job and as a way of life, not just food production. This love is deeply rooted in the minds and hearts of the small-scale farmers who operate as system maintainers. This makes agriculture a productive activity rather than an extractive activity (Allen and Dusen 1988 in Alhamidi et al. 2003).

That is why the love of agriculture as a way of life is a constant theme in the alternative agricultural literature (Freudenberger 1986 in Alhamidi et al. 2003). The cultural and spiritual dimensions of the farmer's experience and knowledge underpin the relationship between the farmer and the farm. So is research Yazdanpanah et al. (2021), states that morality and fear of disease are the dominant factors influencing the willingness of farmers to cultivate organic products in Iran.

Third, type C actors are oriented to the rational aspect of running an organic farming system. The rational aspect in question is more about the consideration of financial gain and loss. Refers to rational choice theory (Coleman & Farraro 1992), There is a basic idea that people act intentionally toward a goal and that goal is shaped by values or choices. The actors will take actions to maximize benefits, profits, and satisfaction of their needs. The rational theory assumes that every human being is rational by always considering the principles of efficiency and effectiveness in carrying out every action. While acknowledging the existence of determinant factors in the form of strong peasant community solidarity, economic subsistence (material), and production relations of pre-capitalist society, the influence of rationality always occurs in the context of the operation of the rational interest mechanism of individual community members. Humans tend to maximize their rationality and always tend to calculate the value of something (utility) to be exchanged, namely economic and moral utility. This theoretical fact is following field facts where most farmers prioritize aspects of financial benefits in choosing or not choosing an organic farming system. Key informant number 10 stated that the decision to farm organically was because there was a promising market potential. The price of organic products is relatively more expensive than conventional products, although certain standards must be met. Almost the same as key informant number 10, key informant number 8 said that the consideration of doing organic farming was based on the interest in the facilities provided by the government at that time in the form of production facilities assistance (organic fertilizers, vegetable pesticides, and training by the agricultural service) provided in the policy program of "Batu Go Organic".

Type C actors are dominated by cabbage, carrot and potato farmers. The mindset of middle farmers who are categorized as type C actors are the most vulnerable to return to conventional (non-organic) farming systems. The results of observations and interviews show that all actors belonging to type C have been confirmed that currently they are no longer running organic farming. The reasons are given varied. One of the informants said that the obstacle faced by organic farming is the product standard which is

too high so that farmers find it difficult to fulfill it. Apart from this, other reasons are that although the price of organic products is high, the market segment is small, demand is unstable, and the cost of producing organic vegetables is more expensive than conventional products. These results are following the results of the study Pham & Shively (2019) which states that the adoption of organic production is significantly influenced by farm size, age of the head of the household, differences in yields, differences in prices and differences in input costs. Thus, in the context of type C actors, running organic farming is a rational choice if it can provide economic benefits financially.

The implementation of the Batu Go Organic policy as an intervention or stimulus for farmers to switch from conventional agriculture to organic farming, has not been fully successful in reality. This is corroborated by the statement of key informant number 6 that "The Batu Go Organic Program is almost the same as government programs in general. Very thick with a project approach where sometimes local community involvement is very small. I, as a PPL, was in the wrong, too, to stand on both sides. On the one hand, I am an officer, but I also have to be able to reach out to farmers to be able to accept this program properly. In the end, I did what I could do." As a project that is centralized in nature, the implication is the lack of awareness of the farming community to be involved in a sustainable manner in the planned program. An event that is always repeated in almost all programs is the level of participation of the program targets which is decreasing day by day. In the end, farmers in the field are increasingly not considered their existence. This is a bad sign for the existence of the government as a partner of farmers.

Fourth, type D actors are farmers or community leaders who tend to be the holders of power, so that the implementation of organic agriculture development is oriented towards efforts to perpetuate the power they have. The principles and standards referred to in organic farming are not considered important, in fact the main concern is how much image is obtained from every action they take, including the implementation of organic farming. This fact is revealed in excerpts from an in-depth interview with key informant number 3 who stated that organic farming is an image, as a way of life to be seen as someone who cares about the environment, cares about small farmers, and cares about the sustainability of generations. The issue of the environment and small farmers, politically, has its own charm to be presented in the current power discourse. In the midst of the issue of climate change, the greenhouse effect, the addition of carbon, and pesticide residues as well as the degradation of soil fertility, it seems to be an interesting presentation to be included in the public sphere,

especially the paradigm of future agricultural development. However, this is only a matter of discussion, a matter of debate which is not implemented in the real world. The rhetoric created by type D actors on the one hand has given color to the development of organic agriculture. But on the other hand, environmental and sustainability issues that are juxtaposed in organic farming patterns are only mere rhetoric and jargon.

Key informant number 4 explained that some elite figures only pretend to care about the degradation of soil fertility and always talk about the use of organic fertilizers. But at the same time the elite take advantage of the opportunities that lie behind it. For example, when one of the elites met at a regular farmer's meeting, the elite said many things related to the threat to the agricultural system driven by capitalists. But at the same time the elite is also promoting an organic liquid fertilizer product for farmers to buy. The price is more expensive than chemical fertilizers that are common in the market. In the understanding of key informant number 4 that this phenomenon is not much different from a campaign to take certain advantages from a situation. There are things that make farmers antipathy to elites like this, causing the impression of a half-hearted presence in the midst of farmers who are in need of support and guidance.

The actions of elite individuals and apparatuses who only use rhetoric and discourse, have an impact on the declining prestige of the elite and apparatus at the peasant level. This was confirmed by key informants numbered 1, 2, 6, and 7. The impression of the presence of the government and elites who are half-hearted in helping farmers is not without reason. In a very simple perspective, when chili prices soared, the government swiftly took control measures. Almost all officers were dispatched to the production center to immediately identify the problem of chili scarcity in the market, which in the end opened the tap for imports. Meanwhile, when the price of chili fell and even touched the price of 500 rupiah per kg, the government seemed to be swallowed up by the earth. The eyes and ears of the government were suddenly blind and deaf. Observing this case from the farmer's point of view, it is clear whose side the government is actually on.

Referring to Table 1, the actions and interest orientations of actors type A, B, C, and D have very contrasting differences. This can simply be understood by analyzing the reciprocal relationship between actors as agents and the structures in their environment. Agents and structures are seen as a single unit that is dualistic in nature and the determination of this agent or structure will determine the actions it takes (Kinseng 2017). For example, that the Qur'anic verse and customary norms, in terms of

structure theory, are seen as structures that force individuals to act according to these norms. Type A and type B actors carry out organic farming systems because they are subject to religious norms and cultural norms that they adhere to. Religious norms and customary norms are very strong, stable and given structures in a society that will continue to be maintained and maintained along with the existence of individuals who maintain or practice them (Kinseng 2017). Likewise, the act of organic farming as an act of worship or a moral movement to preserve the universe will continue to survive and be implemented as long as there are actors who reproduce it. For this reason, it is necessary to internalize and crystallize the values that exist in religious norms and customary norms in every organic farming activity. Although initially seen as something that is forced, over time the act of organic farming is interpreted as an activity of worship or a moral movement that is embedded in the actions of actors as a social practice.

Determination of the structure that occurs in the typology of actors A and B, is inversely proportional to what occurs in the typology of actors' C and D. The actions taken by type C and type D actors are based on initiatives that arise from within themselves. The initiative to run an organic farming system as a strategy to increase income is purely the decision of actors who are free from structural pressures that compel it. In this context, the actor or agency is autonomous, meaning that the actor's actions are not "dictated" by the structure, but are determined by the actor himself, who has the ability to think, assess, weigh, and choose what actions are considered the most appropriate at the time and place. certain. According to Kinseng (2017) that the actions taken by an actor or agent to maintain the existing condition (status quo) may be dominated by the agency dimension. The agency is not only the ability to make changes, but also the ability to maintain the existing conditions. Indeed, intrinsically each individual human being is unique, no one is exactly the same from one another (Emirbayer and Mische 1998). Therefore, it is not surprising that agencies also vary from person to person; Moreover, the agency is also influenced by various other external factors.

3.2 Actor Power Relations in the Implementation of Organic Agriculture Development in Indonesia

The power relations of actors in the implementation of organic agriculture development are framed in Michel Foucault's perspective, namely the theory of the concept of power. Power is governed by the power of discourse

that strongly influences individuals or groups in language, thought, knowledge and action or in Foucault's language discursive practice. (Foucault 2002). In his view, actors have the freedom and interest to influence or comply with the discourse constructions that arise. In short, in the application of the power of discourse, there should be no actor who dominates the rhythm of the game at the level of social life, but the fact is that it is inversely proportional to the fact that there will be losses and there will be gains. (Putra & Suyatna 2018). In the context of the development of organic agriculture in Indonesia, actors compete with each other for dynamics and power relations to influence the discursive practices of individuals/groups of farming communities. The level of loyalty and influence differs from one individual to another depending on the inherent knowledge and how strong the dialectic of discourse power affects the public sphere and the construction of thinking and behavior of the individual. The sustainability of people's lives, both economically and culturally, is generally under threat. This is due to the declining status of the stability of the agrarian resources they have, as well as the economic structure and power that are not conducive to building strong village institutions (Syahyuti 2002).

Actors with each other have a variety of power genealogy tools. Rulers and driving actors use words and conceptual knowledge to influence other actors. Type D actors who are more dominated by state apparatus or local political elites, use the influence of power relations to arrange political agreements on behalf of the people. This also occurs in the context of product certification which is used as a tool of power by parties with a higher position of power. The critical point of contention for many farmers is that standards are imposed on them, their knowledge is not respected, and/or their interests are not taken care of (Hatanaka 2010). Dominative action also occurs in the type C Actor typology which is dominated by advanced farmer figures. The influence of power relations is used to build markets and subordinate small farmers in a circle of unequal market access. Likewise, type A and type B actors use the influence of power relations to crystallize spiritual values and local wisdom values inherited from their ancestors. The struggle of the actors in fighting for dominance becomes very complicated and complicated because all of them have a sweet setting agenda and biased interests. The implementation of the development of organic agriculture as a form of community welfare development should provide productive space in creating a real improvement in the welfare of the community, not as a tool for domination and a vehicle for dominant actors to seize the rights of other actors with the interests and powers attached to each. actor.

The power relations of the actors can be analyzed from various points of view. This research chooses the power of discourse perspective/power genealogy as a perspective in unraveling and describing how the actors compete for each other's power. Genealogy of power/discourse power is interpreted more broadly to make knowledge of discourse that is empowered to treat people/individuals and even community groups as subjects, from which these subjects can develop their productive capabilities so that non-material and material welfare can be achieved. (Foucault 2002). In the context of the development of organic agriculture, type D actors who are dominated by government apparatus as the executive party formulate an instrument for planning the development of organic agriculture in various programs. The results of observations and interviews at the research location found the fact that in the regional executive axis, the development of organic agriculture is controlled by the Mayor, Bappeda and the Department of Agriculture and Forestry. On the legislative axis, it is given to the commission in charge of development in the DPRD and the highest decision is the Plenary Meeting of the DPRD. The network is built across the axis, the direction remains the same, namely forming political deals between classes or other groups by conducting certain lobbies. Political deals that occur in planning, where the conflict of interest that occurs between the axes in approving the development of organic agriculture, is very closed and requires certain interests. Consensus will be very easy to achieve in the name of farmers' welfare and ecological sustainability (Putra & Suyatna 2018). In other words, that the power of discourse that gives rise to the impression of the government's presence on the protection of agricultural sustainability makes Type D actors free to subordinate other actors around them. In Foucault's language, the term "biopolitics" is known which is used to explain the existence of a dominant relationship overpower that massively affects individuals with one another, its application can be carried out in various forms or symbols which are often termed symbolic violence. The symbol influences the way of thinking, acting, and thinking about the protection and creation of welfare that is sought (Foucault 2002).

Quoted from research results Putra & Suyatna (2018) which states that the development of organic agriculture from the initial launch to its implementation has utilized indirect symbolic violence through launching t-shirts, development billboards and claims of unilateral success with program achievement indicators and the creation of farmer groups / champion farmers who are loyal to the driving actors. The launching of the T-shirt is the initial series of branding for the development of organic agriculture. Farmers and the community who are present in

their mindset have embedded that the well-being process has so far received more attention from the government, so that the development program that is being discussed is awaited by the community to truly create a better welfare improvement. Pro-populist/popular prejudice is getting more and more popular with the installation of billboards for the development of organic agriculture. This raises the perception of the community, mainly type C actors, that the government protects agricultural sustainability, but the reality is that many farmers feel cheated by this program, especially vegetable farmers, they follow organic planting in mid 2014 - 2015 but in fact the driving actors are not ready for markets and marketing. This results in farmers' distrust of this program because the selling price is the same as inorganic.

The claim of one party's success is a form of hegemonic governmentality and is often contradictory (Foucault 1978, in Haryatmoko 2013). Borrowing an ideal governmentality statement is to provide an open space for choices for various productive and reproductive actions for the actors involved to use the space obediently by paying attention to the provisions of the existing rules of the game as well as the culture that has been embedded in the social body (society). The jargon of caring for farmers is becoming more grounded, coupled with the naming of an integrated building for the Batu city government named Among Tani, culturally the name symbolizes the government's strong spirit to protect the agricultural sector and farmers who are struggling in the villages. Not to mention that the jargon is shared in official government events, both birthdays and comparative studies of other regions. Through this, the claims of success of the driving actors are accepted by the general public and other actors who have not studied this matter.

The dominant image of success has not connected the opportunities for optimizing synergies between actors, which in fact are still weak and there is skepticism and ignorance in the community, both farmers, village heads and other communities in supporting or criticizing the development of organic agriculture. This must be a joint correction material if the sustainability of the organic agriculture development program is to be carried out.

Victory in the battle of dynamics and power relations over the development of organic agriculture is evident at the practical level. Strong mastery of the discourse network/normalizing judgment is a factor in this. Discourse/normalizing judgment nets take various forms (Foucault 2002). This form will affect the operational space for power through legitimacy. The legitimacy of the perpetuation of the discourse of genealogy of power in the public sphere, for example: claiming the formation of

regional regulations, concern for the welfare of farmers, concern for environmental damage and other discourses.

Reinforcing this idea, (Mudhoffir 2013) explained that the conduct of conduct that uses the apparatus that is disciplinary power and symbolic violence that gives birth to the dominant actor. This actor plays the role, influence and mindset of individuals to agree with him without having to look at the reality of the field. The driving actor has his way of building a winning path. Organic farming development areas give birth to champion/driver farmers who are trusted and loyal to these actors. During a comparative study visit to other regions, it is certain that a farmer group in which there are champion farmer actors will be appointed. There are two areas for the development of organic agriculture which, according to the driving actor, were successful, the Temas farmer village and the development of Pendem organic rice.

Loyalty and being trusted by the driving actor is the key in influencing and making a smooth winning road to be created. Meanwhile, those who oppose and criticize will be stigmatized as not wanting to move forward and hindering the development of organic agriculture that is being discussed. The dominant actor's ways of building roads lead to the opinion that the dominant actor who dominates the arena of domination and power relations will meet a point of resistance (the antithesis of power) because everyone who is in the circle of domination and power relations cannot get out of it. breaking down from below because power with the relations inherent in it is not a hierarchical structural relationship between actors which can play influence to control and be controlled depending on the knowledge and experience of action inherent in each actor (Foucault 2002).

3.3 Organic Agriculture: Between Market Trap, Meaning Reduction and Moral Movement

Since it was initiated in early 2000 which later strengthened to become the "Go Organic 2010" policy, the direction and orientation of the organic agriculture policy seems to be increasingly showing a development design towards agricultural industrialization and world trade. (Aji, Wangsit & Ningrum 2020). This condition has provided great opportunities and opportunities for organic business actors who are legal entities to take part in a larger organic farming system.

The Indonesian government's policy in implementing organic agriculture is outlined in various regulations issued. Until 2020, the regulations issued by the government related to organic agriculture include: Minister of Agriculture

Regulation (Permentan) 20/2010 concerning the Food Quality Assurance System for Agricultural Products; Ministry of Agriculture no. 70 of 2011 concerning Organic Fertilizers, Artificial Fertilizers, Soil Improvements; and Ministry of Agriculture no. 64 of 2013 concerning Organic Agriculture Systems. These three regulations have a very important role in strengthening the implementation of organic agriculture in Indonesia.

The transition of the ruling regime from the government of Susilo Bambang Yudoyono (SBY) to the government of Joko Widodo (Jokowi) in 2014 has also had an impact on policy orientation in the development of organic agriculture. The "Go Organic 2010" program was changed to the "One Thousand Organic Farming Villages" program. This program at least marks a change in the policy direction from the previous one on increasing production, quality competitiveness and competition at the global level to achieve industrialization and world trade to towards the development of organic agriculture that relies on food sovereignty at the village level. Besides being colored by a development strategy that has the nuances of "building from the periphery", this new direction of "One Thousand Organic Farming Villages" seems to also emphasize the importance of village development as mandated by the Village Law (Aji, Wangsit & Ningrum 2020).

To implement the program "One Thousand Organic Farming Villages", based on the Decree of the Minister of Agriculture No. 58 of 2015, the Minister of Agriculture established a Working Group on the Development of a Thousand Villages of Organic Agriculture. The decree stated, among other things, that this working group was tasked with coordinating, monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the program at the village level. Although this program is based on the spirit of food sovereignty, the various regulatory instruments used to implement this program are a product of the policies of the previous administration, which of course have different directions and orientations. In other words, the program which is based on the spirit of food sovereignty and the strategy of "building from the periphery" is trapped in various policy instruments that have been made in the previous administration which have a direction and orientation towards increasing production, quality competitiveness and market competition at the global level for achieve industrialization and world trade development.

Policy instruments that are biased in favor and tend to be trapped in the grip of the market have implications for reducing the meaning that is internalized within farmers. This raises the question of whether organic farming is a metamorphosis of modern agriculture that hides behind the issue of ecological sustainability? Or is organic

farming anti-modernism? Organic agriculture is more of a creation of capitalism which at first glance seems to offer friendliness and sustainability, even though its true ism is still development. Agricultural driving actors who have stronger discourse power dominate other actors in imposing ideas, images, and even beliefs that are not necessarily true in terms of cultivation methods, even marketing. Organic agriculture is used as a rhetorical agenda that is full of political interests, capitalist interests and poor meaning and moral movements. The results of this study confirm the research (Aji, Wangsit & Ningrum 2020) that there has been a reduction in the meaning of organic into a partial and pragmatic trend in the implementation of organic agriculture development policies in Indonesia. Organic agriculture development programs only give meaning to the meaning of organic limited to the acquisition of a label, logo or stamp, not to give meaning to a complete organic farming system. Though, according to (Mishra et al. 2019) soil as well as human beings. The frequent use of agrochemicals not only affects the texture or quality of food but is also an important factor in changing climatic conditions. To mitigate the challenges of agrochemicals and climate change, organic farming is a sustainable and safer choice in sustainable agriculture. Organic farming (OF, that organic farming has a role that is considered safe for the environment and the formation of high quality food ingredients. Therefore, organic farming policies must consider environmental practices, consumer willingness to pay for products, and social aspects of organic farming.

Research result (Hunt et al. 2015) we need to ask how such practices contribute to our food system (Campbell 1997, if organic practice fits the rhetoric associated with it from its inception as a social movement, then it will have a lot to offer in the present and the future in terms of its contribution to the possible pathways of adaptation and the flexibility it offers. Thus, as a form of adaptation, the development of organic agriculture must be carried out within the framework of a social movement or a moral movement. However, what Mishra et al. 2019 and Hunt et al. 2015 conveyed has not been fully implemented in the development of organic agriculture in Indonesia. The color of the construction is visible in practice. Apart from still being dominated by the use of external inputs produced by the industry, the processes, practices and results have become more expensive, making it unaffordable for the poor (peasant). Internal inputs (seeds, fertilizers, pesticides) which should be fulfilled independently from the implementation of integrated farming, in practice, are still dominantly imported from outside. The high cost of internal inputs occurs because it is not supported by local

culture, both animal husbandry, plant cultivation and even biological pesticides and local technology. The tendency is, organic farming is applied partially, it is ecologically sustainable and ignores economic, social and political sustainability. The implication is that land conversion is not controlled, regeneration does not occur, urbanization remains high and economic inequality is getting higher. Organic farming is operational, but the needs of the present generation remain unmet, imports are rising, the needs of future generations are being forgotten and jobs or rural entrepreneurs are not created. Even though it is considered environmentally friendly, because it is still thick with developmentism, organic agriculture deserves to be labeled as modern agriculture that hides in the mask of ecological sustainability.

Winnett (2011) stated that judging from the environmental awareness approach in the organic farming community in Kaliandra – East Java, it has a bigger mission than the organic farming community in Milas – Central Java. However, this has an impact on the loss of public awareness of the importance of community independence as farmers because what is implemented is only limited to shifting the issue of forest looting by the community to organic farming. This is in stark contrast to what Milas did by focusing on self-reliance and public awareness as organic farmers.

Based on some of the literature above, it further strengthens the findings of this study that organic farming is still trapped in the trap of modern agricultural camouflage. The policy of developing organic agriculture that replicates the green revolution approach has implications for the birth of actors categorized as type C and type D whose interests in the application of organic agriculture are only limited to economic interests and power. Only a few people are consistently running organic farming as a moral and spiritual movement. The relationship between actors' interests that bring together the moral dimension with the rational dimension still places the rational dimension as the main consideration for farmers in implementing organic farming. Therefore, it is imperative to reorient policies and approaches in formulating policies for the development of organic agriculture in the future.

4 Conclusions

There are 4 (four) typologies of actors involved in the implementation of organic farming programs in Indonesia, namely: Type A actors who are oriented towards spiritual values; type B actor-oriented to moral and cultural values; type C actor-oriented to rational and market values; type D actor who is oriented to the value of power and politics.

The interests of the actor are divided into two dimensions, namely the interests in the moral and spiritual dimensions; and interests in the rational and political dimensions. Interest in the moral and spiritual dimensions is dominated by a strong structure in suppressing the actions of actors, and interests in the rational and political dimensions are dominated by agency actors in generating strategies for making logical choices.

The conflicting power of discourse is dominated by champion farmers or driving actors as outlined in dominative and coercive actions to control the interests of other actors.

The implementation of organic agriculture is only limited to the rhetoric of success, the rhetoric of partisanship, and the rhetoric of sustainability. This causes organic agriculture to be trapped in a market trap, meaning reduction which further separates the nature of the purpose of organic agriculture as an anti-thesis of modern agriculture.

5 Suggestions

Based on the conclusions of this study, several suggestions are proposed as follows: reorientation of organic farming development policies directed at solving problems in favor of organic farming households; empowerment of organic farmers through strengthening organizations at the household and group levels, participatory advocacy, and strengthening access in favor of weak farmers; and revitalizing spiritual and moral-cultural values in the implementation of plant cultivation systems.

6 References

- Aji, G.B., Wangsit, S. & Ningrum, V. 2020, *Reorientasi kebijakan pertanian organik sesudah "Go Organik 2010" dan "Program Seribu Desa Pertanian Organik" di Indonesia*, UB Press, Malang, INA.
- Alhamidi, S.K., Gustafsson, M., Larsson, H. & Hillbur, P. 2003, 'The cultural background of the sustainability of the traditional farming system in the Ghouta, the oasis of Damascus, Syria', *Agriculture and Human Values*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 231-40, DOI:10.1023/A:1026123929170.
- Coleman, J.S. & Farraro, T.J. 1992, *Rational choice theory: advocacy and critique*, SAGE Publications Inc, London, UK.
- de Vries, S. & Snep, R. 2019, 'Biodiversity in the context of "Biodiversity – Mental Health"', in M. Marselle, J. Stadler, H. Korn, K. Irvine & A. Bonn (eds), *Biodiversity and health in the face of climate change*, Springer, Cham, pp. 159-73, DOI:10.1007/978-3-030-02318-8_8.
- Foucault, M. 2002, *Historia de la sexualidad: el uso de los placeres*, vol. 2, Siglo XXI, España, S. A., Argentina.
- Freyer, B. & Bingen, J. (eds) 2015, *Re-thinking organic food and farming in a changing world*, Springer, Dordrecht, vol. 22, DOI:10.1007/978-94-017-9190-8.
- Giddens, A. 2010, *Teori strukturasi: dasar-dasar pembentukan struktur sosial masyarakat*, Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta.
- Grim, J.A. (ed.) 2001, *Indigenous traditions and ecology*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Haryatmoko, J. 2013, *Etika publik: untuk integritas pejabat publik dan politisi*, Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta.
- Hatanaka, M. 2010, 'Certification, partnership, and morality in an organic shrimp network: rethinking transnational alternative agrifood networks', *World Development*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 706-16, DOI:10.1016/j.worlddev.2009.11.001.
- Hunt, L., Rosin, C., Campell, H. & Fairweather, J. 2015, 'Organic farmers: contributing to the resilience of the food system?', in B. Freyer & J. Bingen (eds), *Re-thinking organic food and farming in a changing world*, Springer, Dordrecht, vol. 22, pp. 187-211, DOI:10.1007/978-94-017-9190-8_10.
- Irvine, K.N., Hoesly, D., Bell-Williams, R. & Warber, S.L. 2019, 'Biodiversity and spiritual well-being', in M. Marselle, J. Stadler, H. Korn, K. Irvine & A. Bonn (eds), *Biodiversity and health in the face of climate change*, Springer, Cham, pp. 213-47, DOI:10.1007/978-3-030-02318-8_10.
- Kinseng, R.A. 2017, 'Structurgeny: Sebuah teori tindakan', *Sodality: Jurnal Sosiologi Pedesaan*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp.127-37, DOI:10.22500/sodality.v5i2.17972.
- Layder, D., Ashton, D.N. & Sung, J. 1991, 'The empirical correlates of action and structure: the transition from school to work', *Sociology*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 447-64, DOI:10.1177/0038038591025003006.
- Mishra, P., Singh, P.P., Singh, S.K. & Verma, H. 2019, '5 - Sustainable agriculture and benefits of organic farming to special emphasis on PGPR', in A. Kumar, A.K. Singh & K.K. Choudhary (eds), *Role of plant growth promoting microorganisms in sustainable agriculture and nanotechnology*, Elsevier Inc, Sawstow, pp. 75-87, DOI:10.1016/B978-0-12-817004-5.00005-1.
- Mudhoffir, A.M. 2013, 'Teori kekuasaan Michel Foucault: tantangan bagi sosiologi politik', *MASYARAKAT: Jurnal Sosiologi*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 75-100, DOI:10.7454/mjs.v18i1.3734.
- Pham, L. & Shively, G. 2019, 'Profitability of organic vegetable production in Northwest Vietnam: evidence from Tan Lac District, Hoa Binh Province', *Organic Agriculture*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 211-23, DOI:10.1007/s13165-018-0223-0.
- Putra, R.E.N. & Suyatna, H. 2018, 'Genealogi Kuasa dalam kebijakan pengembangan pertanian organik di "Wilayah Pardikan" Jawa', *Jurnal Pemikiran Sosiologi*, vol. 5. no. 1, pp. 69-84, DOI:10.22146/jps.v5i1.35403.
- Setiawan, I., Supyandi, D., Rasiska, S., Judawinata, M.G., Prasetya, B. & Febriani, A.N. 2018, *Pertanian postmodern: jalan tengah vertikal generasi era bonus demografi membangkitkan peradaban nusantar*, Penebar Swadaya, Jakarta Timur.
- Syahyuti, F.N. 2002, 'Ikatan genealogis dan pembentukan struktur agraria: kasus pada masyarakat pinggiran Hutan di Kecamatan

- Palolo, Kabupaten Donggala, Sulawesi Tengah', *Jurnal Agro Ekonomi*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 64-84, DOI:10.21082/jae.v20n1.2002.64-84.
- Wilson, K. 2003, 'Therapeutic landscapes and first nations peoples: an exploration of culture, health and place', *Health & Place*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 83-93, DOI:10.1016/S1353-8292(02)00016-3.
- Vinnet, Winnett, y. 2011, 'Go organik! Berangkat dari wacana revolusi hijau menuju pertanian berkelanjutan: siapa diuntungkan oleh pendekatan pertanian organik diarahkan ekonomi dan pemberdayaan sosial?' Australian Consortium for In-country Indonesian Studies (ACICIS) Angkatan 32, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Jawa Timur. Viewed 20 march 2019. <<http://1073zb3xfs20yv98x228do7r-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/winnett-yasmin.pdf>>.
- Yazdanpanah, M., Moghadam, M.T., Javan, F., Deghanpour, M., Sieber, S. & Falsafi, P. 2021, 'How rationality, morality, and fear shape willingness to carry out organic crop cultivation: a case study of farmers in southwestern Iran', *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 2145-63, DOI:10.1007/s10668-021-01523-9.

Author contributions

Hamyana Yana: conceptualization; formal analysis; methodology; validation; writing-original draft; writing - review and editing; visualization.
Kliwon Hidayat: methodology; validation, writing - review, supervision, and editing. **Keppi Sukesi:** methodology, writing - review and supervision.
Yayuk Yuliati: methodology, writing - review and supervision.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no potential conflict of interest.

Data availability statement

All data included in this study are publicly available in the literature.

How to cite:

Yana, H., Hidayat, K., Sukesih, K. & Yuliati, Y, 2022, 'Organic Farming: Is a Metamorphosis of Modern Agricultural Imperialism or a Postmodern Agricultural Model?', *Anuário do Instituto de Geociências*, 45:49113. https://doi.org/10.11137/1982-3908_45_49113

Funding information

This research was funded independently by the researcher.

Editor-in-chief

Dr. Claudine Dereczynski

Associate Editor

Dr. Marcus Vinícius Alves de Carvalho