

# Turnitin Originality Report

Processed on: 04-Oct-2020 20:20 WIB

ID: 1404660436

Word Count: 8162

Submitted: 1

Similarity Index

3%

## Similarity by Source

Internet Sources:	2%
Publications:	3%
Student Papers:	1%

Revitalization of Gampong Institution in Aceh: Measuring the program of "Back to Gampong" in the middle of the changing society: A case in Aceh Besar regency By Mahmuddin Mahmuddin

[Geoforum, 2008](#)

1% match (publications)

[Jean-Christophe Gaillard, Elsa Clavé, Ilan Kelman. "Wave of peace? Tsunami disaster diplomacy in Aceh, Indonesia",](#)

1% match (Internet from 15-Nov-2018)

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.671.9575&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

< 1% match (publications)

[Chesfeeda Akhtar. "Eve teasing as a form of violence against women: A case study of District Srinagar, Kashmir", International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology, 2013](#)

< 1% match (Internet from 29-Jul-2020)

<http://sinta3.ristekdikti.go.id/authors/detail?id=6720368&view=documentsgs>

< 1% match (Internet from 17-Jun-2017)

<https://publikationen.bibliothek.kit.edu/1000019643/1436703>

< 1% match (Internet from 02-Sep-2009)

[http://unifem-eseasia.org/aceh/enews07\\_2/E-News1\\_FINAL\\_eng.pdf](http://unifem-eseasia.org/aceh/enews07_2/E-News1_FINAL_eng.pdf)

< 1% match (publications)

[Irine Hiraswari Gayatri. "Dynamics of Village Institution: the Gampong under Aceh's Special", Journal of Indonesian Social Sciences and Humanities, 2018](#)

< 1% match (Internet from 23-Oct-2019)

<https://bmcomeduc.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6920-14-231>

< 1% match (Internet from 17-Mar-2019)

<https://epdf.tips/democratization-in-post-suharto-indonesia.html>

< 1% match (publications)

["The Palgrave Handbook of Ethnicity", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2019](#)

< 1% match (publications)

[CHANINTIRA NA THALANG. "The fluidity of nationalistic and ethnic aspirations in Aceh", Nations and Nationalism, 04/2009](#)

[Vol.6\(9\), pp. 265-275, September 2014 DOI: 10.5897/IJSA2013.0492 Article Number: 23D351447515 ISSN 2006- 988x Copyright © 2014 Author\(s\) retain the copyright of this article](#)  
<http://www.academicjournals.org/IJSA> International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology Full Length Research Paper Revitalization of Gampong Institution in Aceh: Measuring the program of "Back to Gampong" in the middle of the changing society: A case in Aceh Besar regency. Mahmuddin Mahmuddin<sup>1</sup>, Lala M. Kolopaking<sup>2</sup>, Rilus A. Kinseng<sup>2</sup>, Saharuddin<sup>2</sup> and Sadu Wasistiono<sup>3</sup> 1Post-Graduated IPB Bogor, Indonesia. 2Study Program of Rural Sociology IPB Bogor, Indonesia. 3IPDN Bandung, Indonesia. [Received 28 February 2014; Accepted 09 September 2014](#) The passage of UU No. 18, 2001 on regional autonomy and followed up with the issuance of Qanun No. 4, 2003 on mukim, and Qanun No. 5, 2003 on gampong and reinforced by UUPA No. 11, 2006 on Acehnese government is a history of social identity of Acehnese society, which has been neglected during the conflict. The regional government has made some breakthroughs and one of the breakthroughs was gampong revitalization through a program called "back to gampong". The study aims to answer the dynamic of revitalization of gampong institution in the middle of special autonomy implementation and the implementation of Qanun gampong in the administration of gampong institution. The research uses qualitative approach. Data collection is conducted using in-depth interview, observation and documentation study. Data reduction process, data presentation and conclusion are used to analyze data. The study shows that the implementation of program "back to gampong" encourages the strengthening process of gampong institution as well as weakens the institution itself. The development of gampong that focuses on physical aspect has created coordination gap among apparatus of the institution in planning system and financial management of the institution. The tug in the mechanism of financial development and management at gampong has created a space for the involvement and influence from gampong elite in gampong governance. Non-uniform honorary allocation for gampong governmental apparatus is one of the indicators of weak role and function of gampong cultural institution because the previous inherent communal values have been calculated economically. Key words: Revitalization, Gampong institution, Back to Gampong. INTRODUCTION During the economic recession in late 1997, the implementation of social, economic, cultural and political lives has undergone perspective changing. One of the changes was when the existence of cultural institution [\\*Corresponding author. E-mail: Mahmuddin\\_spd@yahoo.co.id. Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](#) received attention. Through the umbrella of law of UU No. 2, 1999 on regional government that replaced the previous act, UU No. 5, 1974, the implementation of government in local level based on customary values within the society has started to emerge. In addition, with the pass of UU No. 32, 2004 on regional government few years later has brought re-orientation (of value) that changed the process of developmental democracy in Indonesia, which

previously was integrated into UU No. 22, 1999 (Nugroho, 2008; Satria, 2011). The movement in governmental format from local self-government to self-governing community is the actualization of radical change in regional developmental politic. This change has long been sought by all regions in Indonesia, including Aceh, which has been in conflict either during or after the independency era; for example, clergy's conflict and uleebalang that occurred in the beginning of Independence Day until the "Free Aceh Movement (GAM)" in 1976. The conflicts strengthened during the New Order era and toward the collapse of the era in 1998. Those conflicts are the social resistance from the main stream of state relation and local society (Liddle, 1973; Pye and Karl, 1978). At the beginning of reformation era, the long period of conflict between GAM and RI reached common ground with a peaceful agreement through MoU Helsinki in 2005. The MoU is described in UUPA (Aceh Governmental Legislation) as the manifestation of recognition for Aceh as "special" territory (Djojosoekarto, 2009). In this case, Aceh has a right to conduct its own government based on its specialization. It is the result from the long conflict between RI and GAM. One concrete implementation of UUPA is the effort to bring back the lowest form of customary institution, gampong, which has undergone stagnancy and disintegration of local values during the New Order era. Aceh is not the only place that undergoes local institution collapse within the society, other local institutions such as Nagari in Padang should be integrated into state power through UU No. 5, 1979 on village government. The legislation was systematically delegitimized gampong structural by unifying them as the smallest government, which is a village. Local institution was removed and the only institution left was village as the extension of New Era government to comprehensively implement economic, social and political development in village society (Bebbington, 2006, 2001; Kolopaking, 2011). Special autonomy policy and Acehese Governmental Legislation (UUPA) No. 11, 2006 gave space for social formation discourse of gampong society. The formation covers formality aspect of institutional existence and essential aspect of the life of gampong society. Gampong institution is very essential as the identity image of Acehese who upholds religion and culture because it is the cultural identity of Acehese that consists of society unit based on territorial law. Therefore, it is reasonable that there is difference in the understanding of village conceptualized by the state and the essence of gampong interpreted by Acehese. Dharmawan (2006) describes the basic different between gampong and village in sociological way. The differences are on the aspects of: (1) history of socio-societal development, village growths based on "village" legitimation persuaded by technocrat authority (more) for the interest of development organizing; whereas, gampong is developed by cultural society and religion originated from the association of socio-religious for socio-societal organizing; (2) democratic life developed in the society, which planted from the "above of the village" and often does not fit to the spirit of most societies; whereas, the democratic developed by gampong is democracy-paternalistic with respect to indigenous elders and the existence is known within tuha lapan and tuha peut; and (3) integration or internalization of village concept throughout the village society, which is a pseudo-internalization because it does not fit into the local culture; gampong is part of indigenous institution developed a long time ago. In line with the above opinion, Tripa (2003) reminds that gampong is different from village. There are substantial differences between gampong and village governments as well as the apparatus and institutions. Gampong should be viewed as the unity of legal society and culture in the lowest power structure and having its own power and wealth or income source. Gampong was led by keuchik and teungku meunasah. Keuchik serves in administration of government and the implementation of law (custom). Teungku meunasah has responsibility for the implementation of societal religious life, law (sharia), education (religion and moral), and for other sectors related to social life and community. Based on sociological context, bottom-up democratic system is applicable in gampong

government system. Therefore, societal voice is accommodated, which is different from decentralized village government. The extensive open of democratic space and regional autonomy marks the new era of political development in Aceh. The pass of UU [No. 18, 2001 on Special Autonomy for Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam \(NAD\)](#) Province and followed by the issuance of Qanun No. 4, 2003 on mukim and Qanun No. 5, 2003 on gampong has revitalized gampong and mukim. The revitalization is also strengthened by Aceh Governmental Legislation (UUPA) No. 11, 2006. It opens the opportunity to bring back customary values and religion that has united within the society. As a follow up for the new era of political development, some breakthroughs continue to be done. The break-through covers political aspect as well as economical development of society, which is the main priority to improve societal welfare that has collapsed for decades. One of the concrete forms developed by regional government is the development of "back to gampong" program. The program is an effort to strengthen gampong institution in various aspects of society. It is reasonable since the long period of conflict in the [society has affected the social structure of society](#), especially gampong. [The](#) program also describes in form of grant called peumakmue gampong financial aid (bantuan keuangan peumakmue gampong/BKPG) allocated from province. Each regencies or municipalities also give additional aid in form of gampong fund allocation (alokasi dana gampong/ADG) based on the financial ability of each regency or municipality. The aim of the program is not only for the improvement of societal economy but also gampong institution as a whole. It means that improvement in the capacity and role of gampong institution apparatus as the motor for the re-emergence of gampong is important. The program is considered important due to the stagnancy of gampong institution during New Order and post-New Order eras related to the developmental model of local institution introduced by the state. Therefore, the program received positive response from various societal elements that hope to bring back the identity of gampong being neglected. Nevertheless, it is not easy to bring back the existence of mukim and gampong to its former condition before the New Order era. The regulation has not given detail technical guidance on the implementation of government in gampong level. Another problem is the existence is limited to merely formality. It means that, some authorities are sometimes strongly influenced by sub-district authority. Thus, some studies show that the existence of gampong institution as a whole, especially for gampong government aspect, indicates the complexity among roles, authority distribution and power relation between mukim and gampong and sub-district, regency or province (Eko, 2007). Empirical fact shows problems for gampong institution autonomy indicated by decrease in respect to custom, the fade of gampong customary institution, corruption of gampong fund and weak human resources in gampong. If the existing gampong and mukim institutions are unable to function effectively, the whole apparatus who administer the society life will also be alienated. The diminishing role and function of keuchik or the role and function of teungku meunasah, keujreun blang, paglima laot, panglima uteun, pawang gle, peutua seunobok, haria peukan, tuha peut dan juga tuha lapan that faded are the basic problems found in the institution. The existence of the umbrella of law Qanun No. 5, 2003 on gampong, No. 4, 2003 on mukim, Regional Government Legislation No. 32, 2004, the open space of special autonomy and salary incentives for gampong apparatus every month do not immediately re-elevate gampong institutional form and the optimum function of the customary apparatus within the institution for the societal social order. Therefore, it is reasonable that keuchik's duties are (Sujito, 2007) limited as sub-district "administrator". Furthermore, keuchik leadership reflects single leadership instead of dual leadership. It means that duties and functions shift of gampong government is no longer optimum as its own role and function. It is logical to state that gampong institution faces serious government effectiveness problem. Based on the realities, questions emerge; is there any relationship between legislation and Qanun and the ability of gampong to bridge gampong institution reinforcement or

vice versa? This is the main focus of this paper. **RESEARCH METHOD** The study focuses on qualitative approach to deeply analyze the dynamic of revitalization of gampong institution in the middle of special autonomy implementation and the implementation of Qanun gampong in gampong institution governance. The research was centered in Gampong Lamteuba, Seulimeum Sub-district (agrarian areas) and Gampong Mon Ikeun (coastal areas), Lhoknga Sub- district, Aceh Besar Regency. In addition, site selection is also done to facilitate the collection of data, where the existence of such institutions keujreun blang can be found in the Gampong Lamteuba (agrarian areas). Panglima laot institutions can be found in the Gampong Mon Ikeun (coastal areas). That is, institutional keujreun blang can be found in agricultural areas, as well as the panglima laot can only be found in coastal areas. Site selection is also based on the existence of gampong institutions and structures of society as a result of the excesses of conflict. So site selection will be important to describe social reality in the frame of gampong revitalization institutional autonomy. The target of the research was actors who involved in gampong governmental structure as societal figures, MAA at sub-district, sub- district authority, regional government, and local societies. In-depth interview, observation and documentation study were used for data collection. Analysis was conducted through data reduction process, data presentation and conclusion (Miles and Hubermas, 1992). Data validity examination was conducted in triangulation by clarifying or comparing data and information from different sources and data collection.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION** Gampong : A historical note Gampong has two different meanings based on societal understanding. First, gampong during Acehese Sultanate era is perceived as territory to control the natural resources and people who live in it. The interpretation of gampong is based on the original place. It is indicated from the various gampong names based on the people who settled there. The various interpretations on gampong are mostly based on the territory and original homeland (original tribe) and original arrivals (original areas). In another perspective, it is always faced with the context of power (territory) and citizenship (civilian) (Gayatri, 2008). Gampong in Acehese is a self-administer societal system and is a unit that organizes the society who domiciles in the village's administration environment or legal environment (Eko, 2007). Gampong is also social organization equipped with leadership structure and functional equipment appropriate to certain social, economic and political contexts. Gampong reflects the identity of its inhabitant, in this case Acehese; and it is autonomy and tends to cosmopolite due to its historical interaction with international capital power through Malacca strait in 15-16 centuries (Reid, 2005). The word gampong itself might have been taken from Malayan language meaning kampong (village) and kampoeng in Jawi language. Thus, in reading some historical written during the era of Sultan Fathahillah, in his letters with foreign delegations who visited Batavia, the word kampoeng is in capital. The spelling of "K" in Arabic-Jawi language as the official language of the sultanate will change into "G" in Acehese language after a period is given above the "K" letter (Syarif, 2001). Reading the history of Pasai kings in Bustanuslatin book by Syech Nuruddin Ar-Raniry, there are many stories on the governmental structure of Acehese Sultanate around 13 to 17 M century that mentioned the word gampong as a government led by petua, who is a societal figure trusted by Uleebalang and nominated by the Sultan. Gampong during Acehese Sultanate era is important to support Sultan's or uleebalang authorities. At that time gampong was a base for agricultural commodities. During Sultan Iskandar Muda era (1607-1636), a dramatic change happened, in which gampong gover- nance was more dynamic and democratic. The concept was maintained where gampong was known as the smallest governmental territory after mukim known as sagoe cut (little sagi), similar to sub-district. Gampong during the era of Sultan Iskandar Muda and the next sultan was interpreted as the representation of society that fully involved in the management process of gampong government. A keuchik, for example, as the head of gampong, will be assisted with tuha peuet and imum meunasah related

to customary and religious matters. Whereas, keujreun blang will assist keuchik for agricultural sector, peuteu uteun for forestry sector, panglima laot for marine sector and peutua seuneubok for plantation sector. All gampong apparatus is still maintained up until now as a form of the integration of religious and customary values in the governance of gampong government (Alfian, 1988; Umar, 2006:1-8). As an institution, gampong is a unit of individuals or groups settlements based on territory. In legal perspective, gampong is a unit of customary law society territorial in nature. It means that gampong is a society unit bound with mutually-agreed customary law. From physical aspect, gampong is a settlement pattern that consists of houses (rumoh), rice fields (blang), plantation (lampoh or seunobok), open field (padang) and forest (gle) (Nyak Pha, 2000; Gayatri, 2008). Gampong is also social organization equipped with leadership structure and functional equipment appropriate to social, economic and political contexts. As an institution, gampong is called territorial unit that describes the settlement pattern as well as a social organization consisting of individual or groups with social grouping based on its existing and developed roles and functions in accordance with space and time. In historical context, gampong institution has undergone social collapse not only in the era of independency and revolution but also [in the era of New Order](#) (Table 1). In [the era of](#) independency and revolution, social and institutional structure of gampong has changed. Gampong institution was weakened in terms of its roles and functions, especially during social revolution in 1960s which caused low political participation among the societies to occupy political positions in gampong government. Gampong in the era of Old Order cannot be separated from the political power system built by central government. Referring to Maliki (1999), a state approaching its people is not limited to negaranisasi (turning the local society level like a state level) but also the power of political ideology based on bureaucratization indicates the collapse of cultural identity of religious and customary values-based society. DI/TII incident in Aceh in 1953 was driven by clergies who joined PUSA due to logical form of their disappointment when Aceh Province was integrated into North Sumatera Province and the removal of autonomy status for Aceh to implement shariah. During the New Order era (1965-1998), the lowest social structure of a society, such as gampong or mukim was made as a customary symbol because the substantive institution administered the government, social life and economic was in the hand of villages and sub-districts government. Military bureaucracy was adhered to in the village government, in form of Muspika or Babinsa that directly occupied the important positions in societal development (Crouch, 1978). If the social systems were based on societal social system, keuchik or imum meunasah would have important role in government administration and religious life aspect. Strong penetration of New Order authority, however, has made customary institutions merely a formality and become tools to facilitate control access of the New Order government in development (Harley, 2008). Social institutions were paralyzed, keuchik only administered gampong government and could not further involve in protecting the society based on customary and religious values. Entering the reformation era echoing democratization and decentralization, state through the umbrella of law of legislation No. 22, 1999 on regional government, accommodated traditional institutions side by side with village government as part of political development and realized democracy through the lowest level. Normatively, UU No. 22, 1999 put the village not as the lowest governmental form under the sub-district but as a unit of legal society having right to administer and manage local societal interests in accordance with the village origin rights (Eko, 2005). Nevertheless, many parties considered the legislations were not effective if the state power was strong at the village level. Table 1. Position and role of Gampong institution. Period Sultanate Era Dutch Colonization Japanese colonization Policy on Gampong Cooptized in monarchy structure The transplantation of gampong institution into colonial authority Became a basis for Japanese power with its romusha practice Position and Role of Gampong Under

the authority of uleebalang in monarchy structure Utilizing uleebalang authority to control gampong. Dutch politic has triggered conflict between uleebalang and gampong societies Balace politic between uleebalang and clergies in controlling gampong Post- Gampong's role and Some government polices has weaken Independence function is weaken gampong position New Order The lowest unit under the sub-district Structural de-legitimation uniforms the governmental unit as a village and the position is under sub-district Post New Order Revitalization of gampong institutions Gampong position is under the settlement. Description Gampong is part of the lowest territory level in Aceh Sultanate. It functions as institution that assists uleebalang Dutch policies with modern infrastructure development model and cultivation created social change at gampong level Utilizing clergies to mobilize gampong societies in infrastructure development Gampong functions and roles are faded. The introduction of modern bureaucracy system Local institution is paralyzed by village government model; Gampong's roles and functions are replaced by village government system Returning existing local institutions previously paralyzed during the New Order era. The involvement of sub- district is still dominant. Gampong revitalization is not working as expected by society The issuance of UU No. 44, 1999 on the privilege of Aceh Province, in which one of the statements is returning the privilege of gampong and – although the implementation of the privileges was not maximum – followed with the issuance of several Qanun 5, 2003 on gampong government is the starting point of local democratic movement, which was under the absolute authority of state. Acehnese privilege continues to change along with the sign of peaceful agreement between RI and GAM through MoU in Helsinki on August 15, 2005. This privilege is re-improved by including not only customary and cultural aspects but also political aspect by giving an opportunity to form local political parties. This improvement directly affects at gampong level in the capacity of gampong institution and social structure of gampong society as a whole. The present separatist movement led by the Gerakan Aceh Merdeka (GAM) or Free Aceh Movement is the contemporary extension of older struggles against the Javabased colonial government even before Indonesia formally gained its independence in 1949. During this history, of which only a brief overview is provided because the references provide further details, the sepa- ratist became religious, social and economic in nature as well as territorial (Mardhatillah, 2004; Robinson, 1998; Aspinall and Berger, 2001; Reid, 2004, 2005, 2006). UUPA No. 11, 2006 states that gampong or another name is a unit of legal society under mukim and led by keuchik or another name having right to perform its own household. Gampong autonomy is extended in the implementation of development with the existence of UUPA manifested in legislation number 11, 2006. Quoting Eko (Gayatri, 2008), normatively, it describes the autonomy as well as ambiguity. First, gampong is situa- ted in autonomy position but is obligated to implement principle of single assistantship. Second, authorization system from regency to gampong is subsidiary. Third, gampong institution is a blend of self-governing community in customary institutional system and local- state government through assistantship duties. Governmental institution of gampong consists of keuchik, imam meunasah and tuha peut, with activities centered in meunasah. Gampong government has collective leadership. It means that all affairs related to gampong interest will be brought to meunasah to be determined in convention and consensus. Authority Tuha Peut Keuchik Justice of gampong ----- Imam Meunasah Tuha lapan, keujreun blang, keutua seunobok, panglima laot, haria peukan Sekretary gampong Assisted gampong Head of dusun/jurong Head of dusun/jurong Figure 1. Structure of institution gampong. Head of dusun/jurong concept in Acehnese does not separate custom and All relationship within the structure is often likened as religion. The concept is further described in governmental Aceh's aphorism "hukom ngon adat lagee zat ngon sifeut, structure of gampong that consists of keuchik, imum adat angon hukom hana tom cre ", which means that law meunasah and ureng tuha. The authority structure built in and custom is like a substance

with its nature, custom gampong institution is bound to each other and each has and law is never separated. In practice, nevertheless, not own duties and functions. A gampong can be viewed as all customary institutions exist in Acehnese with the part of state governmental structure, which involves introduction of official institutions that provide modern bureaucracy of government and keuchik as the services to the society (Figure 1). representative of government in its gampong. As the representative of government, a keuchik performs its functions and obligations authorized by the state in Back to Gampong program: Expectations and accordance with the prevailing legislation (Abdullah, realities 1988; Gayatri, 2008). In addition to keuchik, there is also imum meunasah Sociologically, social change developed from called ma gampong (mother). Its role is performing all development mechanism process, which is the national religious activities. Tuha peuat or ureung tuha (the elder) ideology as an effort to improve societal welfare, has is the central figure in decision making and as an adviser created huge friction on local values that existed and for keuchik in running gampong government. In developed within the society. This dilemma is obvious performing its duties, keuchik and imeum meunasah when a state tries to maintain local cultural identity within (executive elements) work with ureung tuha (legislative the society; however, on the other side, modernization element). Both elements are equal and their works are aspects of economy, politics and culture in form of clearly differentiated. It is different from the village system various products in the name of development and where the executive head, ex-officio, is also legislative prosperity are another indicator for the diminishing of head (Nyak Pha, 2000; Dharmawan, 2006; Eko, 2007). local wisdom previously existing in the society. It is logical Gampong secretary helps keuchik in performing its duties to state that state still dominates in some policies even in related to gampong administration. In gampong institu- the product of decentralization policies. Regional tional structure there are also tuha lapan (societal figure autonomy implementation goes as far as to the authority element), keujreun blang (administer and responsible for delegation and does not reach society involvement in the the management of rice fields areas), panglima laot development (Aspinall and Fealy, 2003; Antlo, 2003). (responsible in the management of marine resources), The expected decentralization and autonomy on harian peukan (responsible in the management of gampong is not maximal and tends to weak due to the traditional market, which is conducted weekly), peutua gampong apparatus that performs their administrative seuneubok (responsible in the management of plantation duties based on monthly salary from the sub-district sector), and syahbandar (administer and responsible in government. This consequence directly maintains the the in and out of ships at the port or sea transportation long existing bureaucratization system and makes problem). All of them are important in the societal social gampong position under the mukim and subdistrict. It life order. means that gampong's development program will be attached to authority power above it; therefore, the expected autonomy manifested through legal formal of Qonun and UUPA needs to be re-constructed. Compared to the previous legislation (UU), the issuance of Qanun is a big jump. Gampong's identity is recognized as part of Acehnese societal culture and its position is under the mukim and has clear authority and customary institution roles. The customary institutions are further strengthened with the issuance of Qanun No. 10, 2008 on customary institutions. The Qanun mostly contains the functions and roles of apparatus of customary institutions within Acehnese. The legislation covers the duty of keuchik before the role of Aceh Customary Committee (Majelis Adat Aceh/MAA) that helps Wali Nanggroe in developing and coordinating the existing customary institutions. In practice, however, it has not able to encourage functions and roles of gampong institutions and mukim to create their identity as mentioned in both Qanun. Authority relationship among customary apparatus in gampong institution is the important point for observing the dynamic of gampong institutions universally under the umbrella of Qanun gampong. It means that, it is reasonable that



some literatures critically see another side of Qanun gampong either in the context of gampong institution reinforcement or in the distribution of authority with the availability of resources through back to gampong program. This consequence gives understanding that back to gampong program as expected in Qanun No. 5, 2005 does not immediately bring its position to the essentiality of previous gampong model as expected by the society. It sets aside various problems related to authorities, rights, and obligation aspects or relationship among actors in gampong governmental structure. Reinforcement of gampong government through Qanun is an effort of the revitalization process of gampong as developmental base. The reinforcement covers institutional aspect as well as economical, political and cultural fields. Qanun gampong consisting of 72 articles describing the authority, position, relationship order among institutions, the functions and roles of apparatus, and financial management is called the locomotion to the improvement of a gampong. It means that if gampong institution and society is able to interpret the Qanun optimally it is likely that gampong autonomy will be achieved. In addition, Qanun is expected to be able to increase the electability of customary institutions that previously set aside state polices on local societal government. However, if Qanun is made as a mean for authority shift to control gampong resources, it is likely to create conflict within the society. Since the implementation of back to gampong program by regional government in early 2009, various development programs have been directed to the effort on improving the prosperity and empowerment of gampong society. Various programs conducted not only cover economic aspect but also strengthen gampong institutions in various societal aspects. Through governmental and other institutions' efforts, it is expected to bring back gampong from its collapse. The working programs from regional government and all societal elements include not only the re-arrangement of gampong governmental system but also encourage the reinforcement of economy, politics and culture within the society. Through those programs, gampong is technically directed to prepare and formulate program plan for gampong development to maximize the aid for the intended targets. There are at least four actors with direct competence in gampong development process: Acehnes government, regencies or municipalities government, gampong government and society (including NGO). Provincial government and regency or municipality government is the first sector. They are the center of authority, policies and financial resources that provide strategic direction for gampong development. Gampong government is the second sector as the actor in gampong management along with societal elements. Society is the third sector that serves as the source of knowledge and resources for the driver of gampong development. These three elements have important role and mutually integrated in the format of gampong development. Likewise, when these elements are disintegrated, gampong autonomy will be a dream. Working programs planning and formulation for gampong development as a whole should be implemented in maximum and for the intended targets due to the huge amount of aid given by the government every year. This requires all parties to be ready including apparatus of gampong institutional in the process of financial governance and program planning in accordance with the need of gampong society itself. Some local or foreign institutions involve by giving training to and helping gampong apparatus in working program formulation and planning. This is its own history in the governance process of gampong institution after conflict and peace in Aceh (Robinson, 1998; Jemadu, 2004). It is understandable because gampong societies are not familiar with the development concept involving huge financial aid. Therefore, to avoid misappropriation and misuse of the funds, government and non-governmental organizations should provide integrated assistance to achieve gampong autonomy. As mentioned on printed media, in 2010, Acehnes government gave pemakmue gampong financial aid of Rp. 318.950 billion to 6.379 gampong. Each gampong received Rp. 50 million. In addition, PNPM Mandiri grant also distributed for 244 sub-districts in 18 regencies of Rp. 318.6 billion and

operational fund of Rp. 90.432 billion (Harian Serambi Indonesia, July 12, 2011). Even with the huge amount of fund allocated in the process of program acceleration, there are many obstacles in the practice. The readiness of resources in Table 2. Critical issues institutional strengthening program of "Back to Gampong". Regional aspects of District development Lamteuba Mon Ikuen Socialization Qanun Facilities and Infrastructure Giving Welfare Implementation Customs and traditions Coordination between institutions Qanun participates in NGO's involvement on the side, but the involvement of local governments still lacks Dissemination of Qanun is not optimum The low understanding of Qanun gampong and preparation of draft Qanun gampong Still focused on physical development and non-development is still lacking physically administration is feasible, but the public service is There is no government office still less than the maximum Improvement honorarium Honor is often too late and not on time, and are often given two / three months later Honorarium is Conflict social Implementation of customs of low understanding of indigenous Keujreunblang Implementation of custom-based farming systems start to fade not uniform Panglima Laot involvement in resolution conflict of low Lack of coordination between institutions in the operation of indigenous customary fishing The lack of involvement of the district / city in the administration of customs Some disputes / cases have settled procedural law rather than common law (though still able to customary law) Institutional Coordination between traditional institutions in governance is not optimum Opened the space for the emergence of gampong elite, which has big influence on financial governance of gampong fund management and planning, delays on grant distribution from regency or municipality government and potential conflict among gampong society due to different interest toward the grants are among the obstacles. The huge amount of fund received - if there is no delay on the distribution of grants - by every gampong every year is something new for gampong government in terms of financial governance and planning as the mechanism of grants disbursement. Related to the management system, human resources factor and integration of all elements within gampong institution are requirements for the success of peumakmue gampong program as a whole (Table 2). Based on Governor Regulation No. 25, 2009 on the guidance in managing peumakmu gampong financial aid or ADG grant, the grant is used for government's operation and gampong development. Priority scale on poor household economy and continuous acceleration of gampong's facilities and infrastructures are programs triggered by gampong and regency or municipality governments as the follow up for the high number of poverty, unemployment, job opportunity and effort to re- arrange gampong institution as buffer for the success of gampong autonomy after conflict and peace in Aceh. In order to realize those programs, central and regional governments run various assistance programs directed to the empowerment and development of gampong society. Among the programs are PNPM Mandiri for urban and rural areas and BKPG or ADG, which are direct assistance model received by society to improve poor household economy, health care, education, religion and socio-cultural. In addition, the programs also directed to the development of gampong infrastructure will be able to bridge the integration of gampong development as a whole. In practice, problems remain the target attainment of gampong development through the allocation of the grants. The problems can be related to the planning and management systems of the grants that have not been on target, accountability, transparency and the ability of human resources in financial governance. These factors are mostly criticized by NGO or society regarding the weak monitoring system on the development policy of peumakmu gampong program. The reality shows that to date, grant for gampong development such as PNPM Mandiri for rural areas and BKPG or ADG tends to be used for the development of physical facilities and infrastructures instead of non-physical infrastructure. Some projects on physical facilities have been abandoned and cannot be fully utilized by gampong society. Weak participation from gampong society on information access of peumakmue gampong

program, direct assistance mechanism such as "distributing money" create dependency based on the effort to accelerate improvement on poor family economy, and focus on the development of infrastructure projects which are basic problems found in the field in the implementation of peumakmue gampong program. What has developed in the society is inversely proportional to societal expectation on the development program of gampong. What mostly occur are the misappropriation case on gampong budget or ineffective funds absorption. Huge amount of grants disbursed every year has not able to realize autonomy and reduce poverty in gampong and household economy of gampong society is in poor condition (Mei, 2012; Serambi Indonesia, 2012). In reality, reinforcing gampong institutional structure as a whole in the middle of changing society is not as easy as estimated. Empirical facts show despite the identity of gampong institution is returned to its philosophic root of Qanun and UUPA the weak gampong governmental institutions, structural or cultural still can be found in the implementation of gampong development. Those basic problems can be related to two factors, internal and external factors. The internal actor includes the weakness of human resources; whereas the external factor is related to inadequate supporting facilities and infrastructure. Therefore, sometimes the structure of gampong institution is only in the memories of a keuchik or the institution has no clear structure despite the apparatus (actors) receives incentive or salary every month. The linkage between functions and responsibility attached to gampong governmental apparatus as mentioned in Qanun No. 5, 2003 and reinforced with Qanun No. 10, 2008 on customary institutions is a form of social order that has long been rooted and closely related to the fulfillment of gampong societal subsistence that related to cultural, economic and political aspects. Efforts taken by regency or municipality government to revive and re-function the customary institution of gampong government developed through back to gampong program at present is not simple as imagined. Top down system of the relationship between state and local community is a pillar for gampong development (Painter and Goodwin, 1995; Grootaert, 1999). Therefore, it will need a long period to change the development paradigm into bottom-up system originated from lower society voice. In addition, the accumulation of prolonged conflict has caused gampong government loses trust and disintegration of the existing values as essential part of a gampong. Modernity on gampong development conducted through the existing program has placed gampong as regional development agent in one side, and in the other side reducing gampong development model vis a vis top down and bottom up. It means that, gampong's authority and rights are not accommodated thoroughly in Qanun gampong. What exist is a historical romantic without holistic interpretation on the meaning of authority, clear power relations or authority of governance system of gampong government itself. Basically, the existence of customary institutions in every social system is very significant to preserve the custom itself. This institution is important as an effort to save hereditary customs. The sustainability of a custom can be predicted through the existence of the institutions. In other words, the existing traditional values become important instruments to observe the sustainability and influence societal attitude and behavior. Previous study shows 90.47 percent of society wanted to re-function the customary institutions in gampong. The disappearance of many customs in the society is closely related to the uncertainty of the existence and role of customary institutions within the society. Real data show that almost 93.58 percent of customary institutions have been realized in every areas; the empowerment, however, is less. The mechanism of back to gampong program mostly rests on physical development aspect, which indirectly gives more space to the occurrence of coordination gap developed in planning system and development of gampong. The tug on gampong planning process involving apparatus gampong government has opened the space for the emergence of gampong elite, which has big influence on financial governance of gampong. Inconsistency in grants allocation to improve the well-being of gampong apparatus is one of the factors for

the weak role of customary institutions. Therefore, it is understandable if well-being problem is indicator of gampong development process. On the other hand, less coordination between regional government of regency or municipality and gampong government apparatus regarding the amount of honorarium received by each apparatus is the actual problem developed in the society. This means that the existing position has been calculated economically. With bureaucratization system that opens up to gampong level, gampong apparatus should be able to solve any problems related to administrative, planning and financial management, and policies formulation for future gampong development. It will be the basic problems in gampong governmental structure when development projection is not properly managed with the weakness of human resources and the existing local potential. The weakening of local customary institutional values is something inevitable in the present format of gampong development. Despite various programs directed to bring back the customary identity of gampong society with Qanun and other supporting regulations, this basic problems continue to emerge in various opinion provided by society or traditional figures in gampong. It is especially when Qanun gampong is not entirely able to bring back the customary identity of Acehnese and minimum development programs conducted by regional government to reinforce customary institutions (Schulze, 2005). Looking back at the efforts of Aceh Government to re-function the customary institutions through Qanun No. 5, 2003 and Qanun No. 10, 2008 that explain the identity of customary institutions in Aceh, it seem meaningless when the authority form and power of customary institutions are linear in nature and have not integrated as rules that clearly describe the existing institutions. Therefore, cultural symbolism is obvious in the existing Qanun without good manifestation in the concept of customary institutions empowerment. Routine activities have not shown the identity of customary institutions as in the glory era of Aceh. For example, teungku meunasah only serves as imam in meunasah or mosque with no further involvement in decision making of gampong development. Moreover, tuha lapan has not able to serve optimally in formulating or making decision on a case when gampong elite involvement is dominant in the formulation of policies. It happens when all functions and roles are limited to historical narrative and abstract. It has not touched the real form of the institution itself. In ancient times, keuchik position, for example, in gampong government had board roles and functions on its authority. Keuchik was highly respected and the decision made was also respected. Hurgronje (1985) describes, 'The keuchhi, the headman or father of the gampong borrows his authority from the uleebalang of the province to which his village belongs'. As the father of gampong and representative of the government, keuchik determined the operation of gampong government. This reality is still the basic obstacle in gampong governmental structure when the attached roles and functions are unable to be interpreted in the context of social reality. It means that their position in a gampong describes cultural symbol retained instead of involving them as subject of gampong development. Even though various programs have been directed to bring back the customary identity of gampong society with the existence of Qanun and other supporting regulations, this basic problems continue to emerge in various opinion provided by society or traditional figures in gampong. It is especially when Qanun gampong is not entirely able to bring back the customary identity of Acehnese and minimum development programs conducted by regional government to reinforce customary institutions. Looking back at the form of gampong societal life, homogenous bound of societal life was formed in a territory, with its sovereignty and control on natural resources together; if it has its own government with all the legal order, which is based on customary institutions and all its apparatus and legal material; gampong will be the important part of the social system of Acehnese. Conclusion Gampong is a unit of legal society and custom in the lowest authority structure having its own authority and wealth or income sources. Gampong governmental structure consists of three elements: government, religion and representative.

Those three elements are known as keuchik, teungku meunasah and tuha peut. Keuchik that serve in the administrative sector of the government and in the implementation of customary law. Teungku meunasah is responsible for the implementation of religious life of the society. Whereas, tuha peut is an advisory body and assists keuchik in decision-making. In addition to those three elements, the governance of gampong government also involves customary institutions element directly in touch with livelihood system of the residents. Implementation of the program peumakmu gampong (back to the gampong) turns out in practice to still have many problems. The low custom awards, overlapping authority structures of power and authority in the gampong government are mechanized as a result of the shift in the meaning of the role and function of the overall gampong governance. Sociologically, strengthening program for the gampong in addition to functioning institutional system as a whole village has a positive function (latent function) for the elite gampong as they relate to the power struggle and economy of space. Back to gampong program launched by regional government in early 2009 has impacted the reinforcement process of gampong institution. On the other side, it opens the space for the weakening of the reinforcement of gampong institution itself. Less appreciation of custom and overlapping power and authority in the structure of gampong government are the mechanization resulting from the shift of role and function in the governance of gampong government. Less socialization on Qanun gampong in the mechanism of gampong government as mentioned in Qanun no. 5, 2003 has impacted the governance process that is still trapped in administrative routine, which in turn will undermine the identity of customary values to realize back to gampong program.

REFERENCES

Alfian (1988) *Kelompok Elit dan Hubungan Sosial di Pedesaan*. Jakarta: Grafiti Kita.

Abdullah A (1988) *Struktur Sosial Pedesaan Aceh*, Pusat Pengembangan Penelitian Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial, Universitas Syiah Kuala Banda Aceh.

Antlo v H (2003). Not enough politics! Power, participation and the new democratic polity in Indonesia. In: Aspinall E, Fealy G (Eds.), *Local Power and Politics in Indonesia: Decentralisation and Democratisation*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore.

Aspinall E, Berger MT (2001). The break-up of Indonesia? Nationalisms after colonisation and the limits of the nation-state in post-cold war Southeast Asia. *Third World Quart.* 22(6):1003-1024.

Aspinall E, Fealy G (Eds.) (2003). *Local Power and Politics in Indonesia: Decentralisation and Democratisation*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore.

Bebbington A (2006). "Local Capacity, Village Governance, and the Political Economy of Rural Development in Indonesia". *World Dev.* 34:11.

Bebbington A (2001). Rural development strategies. In N. Smelser, & P. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (pp. 3578-3583). Oxford: Elsevier.

Crouch H (1978). *The Army and Politics in Indonesia*, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press.

Dharmawan AH (2006). *Pembaharuan Tata Pemerintahan Desa Berbasis Lokalitas dan Kemitraan*. Bogor: PSP3-IPB.

Djojosoekarto (2009). *Kebijakan Otonomi Khusus di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Kemitraan Partnership.

Eko S (2007). *Bergerak Menuju Mukim dan Gampong*. Yogyakarta: IRE.

Eko S (2005). *Manifesto Pembaharuan Desa*. Yogyakarta: APMD Press.

Gayatri IH (2008). *Runtuhnya Gampong di Aceh Studi Masyarakat Desa Yang Bergejolak*. Jakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Grootaert C (1999). *Social capital, household welfare and poverty in Indonesia*. Local Level Institutions Working Paper No. 6. Washington DC: World Bank, Social Development Department.

Harley (2008). *Mukim Masa ke Masa*. Banda Aceh: JKMA.

Hurgronje CS (1985). *Aceh di Mata Kolonialis*. Jakarta: Jilid I. Yayasan Soko Guru.

Kolopaking LM (2011). "Peningkatan Kapasitas dan Penguatan Struktur Kelembagaan Otonomi Desa", dalam Arif Satria, *Menuju Desa 2030, Pohon Cahaya*, Yogyakarta.

Liddle RW (1973). *Political Participation in Modern Indonesia*, Monograph Series, No. 19, New Haven Conn, Yale University Southeast Asia Studies.

Jemadu A (2004). *Democratisation and the dilemma of nation-building in Post-Suharto Indonesia: the case of Aceh*. *Asian Ethnicity.* 5(3):316-331.

Maliki Z (1999). *Penaklukan Negara Atas Rakyat Studi Resistensi Petani Berbasis*

Religio Politik Santri Terhadap Negeranisasi. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press. Mardhatillah F (2004). Ethno-methodological reflections on the case of Acehese conflict. In: Trijono, L. (Ed.), *The Making of Ethnic and Religious Conflicts in Southeast Asia: Cases and Resolutions*. CSPA Books, Yogyakarta. pp.205-229. Miles MB, Huberman AM (1992). *Analisis Data Kualitatif*. Jakarta: UI Press. Nugroho T (2008). *Pembangunan Desa dari Modernisasi ke Liberalisme*. Yogyakarta: Satunama. Nyak Pha H (2000). *Adat dan Budaya Aceh*. Banda Aceh: Balai Kajian Sejarah dan Nilai Tradisional. Pye LW, Karl DJ eds. (1978). *Political Power and Communications in Indonesia*, Berkeley, University of California Press. Painter J, Goodwin M (1995). Local governance and concrete research: investigating the uneven development of regulation. *Econ. Soc.* 24:334-356. Reid A (2005). *An Indonesian Frontier, Acehese and Other Histories of Sumatra*, Singapore: Singapore University Press. Reid A (Ed.) (2006). *Veranda of Violence: The Background of the Aceh Problem*. Singapore University Press, Singapore. Reid A (2004). War, peace and the burden of history in Aceh. *Asian Ethnicity*. 5(3):301-314. Robinson G (1998). Rawan is as Rawan does: the origins of disorder in new order Aceh. *Indonesia*. 66:127-156. Satria A (2011). *Menuju Desa 2030*. Yogyakarta: Pohon Cahaya. Schulze KE (2005). *Between Conflict and Peace: Tsunami Aid and Reconstruction in Aceh*. London School of Economics, London. Sujito A (ed.) (2007). *Membangun Aceh Dari Gampong*. Yogyakarta: IRE. Syarif SM (2001). *Menuju Kedaulatan Mukim dan Gampong: Riwang U Seuneubok*. Banda Aceh: YAPPIKA dan Yayasan Rumpun Bambu. Tripa S (2003). *Rekontruksi Gampong di Aceh*. Banda Aceh: Aceh Institute. Umar M (2006). Peradaban Aceh Kilasan Sejarah Aceh dan Adat. Banda Aceh: JKMA. 266 [Int. J. Sociol. Anthropol.](#) Mahmuddin [et al.](#) 267 268 [Int. J. Sociol. Anthropol.](#) Mahmuddin [et al.](#) 269 270 [Int. J. Sociol. Anthropol.](#) Mahmuddin [et al.](#) 271 272 [Int. J. Sociol. Anthropol.](#) Mahmuddin [et al.](#) 273 274 [Int. J. Sociol. Anthropol.](#) Mahmuddin et al. 275