

The Impact of Resettlement on Livelihood of the Bajo Tribe Community (A Case in Tomini Bay, Indonesia)

Muhammad Obie

Department of Sociology, State Islamic University of Sultan Amai Gorontalo, Indonesia

Correspondence Author: Muhammad Obie, Department of Sociology, State Islamic University of Sultan Amai Gorontalo, Gelatik Street No. 1, Kota Gorontalo-Indonesia.

E-mail: obiclimber@gmail.com

Received date: 23 March 2018, **Accepted date:** 25 April 2018, **Online date:** 25 May 2018

Copyright: © 2018 Muhammad Obie. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

The resettlement to remote communities became the new order governmental instrument to control the economic and political stability. It was designed in such a way as to exclude locally long-lasting communities fostering social, cultural, and economic integration with their natural environment, had created instability and loss of economic assets for the local communities. This research was to analyze the impact of resettlement on livelihood of the Bajo tribe community in Tomini bay. This research used the critical theory paradigm, qualitative approach, and ethnographic method. The data collection was done through indepth interview, an observation, and library research. The result of research stated that the Bajo tribe community was originally united to live on the sea surface, faced the reality of split life, along with the weakening of social capital. Similarly, indigenous institution is shaken because some of the custom figures follow the resettlement program. The Bajo tribe who followed the resettlement program lost the natural capital, sea-based livelihood after their difficult accessed to coastal and marine resources. The removal of the Bajo tribe in the resettlement program forced them to abandon their hereditary roots that were built up from generation to generation along with the coastal and marine environments. As a result, access of the Bajo tribe on coastal and marine resources eventually disrupted and even abandoned altogether. The Bajo tribe should lose its hereditary livelihood bases on coastal and marine outcomes. Meanwhile, in the depressed life on land, the Bajo tribe was forced to undergo a livelihood bases that was not its cultural roots. They are even forced to farm in unlikely smallholdings since the government-provided land for every family head is not sufficient even to produce family food. As the result they had to accept the reality of life in the shackles of poverty. They are difficult in fulfilling their daily needs since the government forces them to pursue lives that are historically not theirs. Finally, this research concluded that the resettlement program as implemented under pressure and coercion has a negative impact on the Bajo tribe community. The Bajo tribe who hereditary livelihood hangs on coastal and marine resources, the coercion of resettlement program has deprived the cultural roots of Bajo tribe attached to the coast and sea.

Key words: Resettlement, Livelihood, Bajo Tribe, Community, Tomini bay

INTRODUCTION

The new order government, after overthrowing the old order, built a project to control economic and political stability. In the course of time, the new order project was quite successful, although in fact the resistance, especially the civilian community, never stopped (Maunati, 2004). One such control model was the resettlement program. The resettlement program had accompanied the new order's developmental mission since the launch of the five-year developmental plan. This policy began to be implemented in 1972/73 with a view to improve the living and well-being of rural and backward village communities due to natural conditions, difficult communications and livelihoods still moving around.

The resettlement approach designed in such a way as to exclude locally long-lasting communities fostering social, cultural, and economic integration with their natural environment, had created instability and loss of economic assets for the local communities (Hoffman, 1985). Resettlement is the process of resettling residents from resettlement sites that are not appropriately assigned to new locations prepared in accordance with the development plan (Ridlo, 2001). In line with the definition, Yudohusodo and Salam (1991) stated that resettlement done to the location of settlements that designated not for housing or hazard-prone residential location. While according to the guidelines for the implementation of slum rejuvenation on state land, presidential instruction number 5 of 1990, it was mentioned that resettlement is the transfer of a residential area to another location by dismantling some or all settlements located on state land or individual land to be rebuilt with their infrastructure and environmental facilities.

Resettlement in its implementation can not be separated from a number of problems. The experience of resettlement reveals that many of the problems are scattered and exploded when the location has been realized. The main idea of settlement by sending as many people as possible and at the lowest possible cost has placed a heavy burden on the backs of transmigrants during the first year, followed by the use of forcible forms of mobilization by the government (Mangoenpoerojo, 1985; Heeran, 1985). Heeran (1985) reported some tension happen on Javanese settlement from Suriname in West Sumatra, besides caused by the religious differences, in other aspects Suriname groups differed from Minangkabau. The Suriname group had further accepted western cultural aspects such as dancing, drinking alcohol, and gambling, forbidden by hard-hitting Minangkabau Muslims. These two groups formed stereotypes against each other, with more sophisticated Javanese of Suriname and knew various languages to look down on the Minangkabau people whom they regarded as backward and conservative.

Settlement conflicts can also be seen in the settlement of ex-combatants in Lampung. Heeran (1985) in his study showed that the relationship between veterans and indigenous people is a constant source of conflict. The main cause is land rights. The difference with in Minangkabau is that in Lampung the

influence of old customs and institutions is not so strong. This is due to government policy, in addition to the influx of Javanese immigrants who have exceeded the number of indigenous people. The veteran organizations, who boasted their services more in the revolution, mostly acted as if the customary institutions were absent and occupied their territory without any compensation. Another source of tension is the marriage custom in the area. According to old tradition, young people are allowed to visit girls in their homes at night, but immigrants are excluded from this privilege. As a result, mixed marriages between immigrants and indigenous people are few.

The implications of resettlement to the community have also been studied in depth by the World Bank. The World Bank (1990) evaluations on several resettlement programs in developing countries, such as India, Thailand, and the Philippines, showed more negative impact. The negative impact is not only about the material losses in the old location but also the difficulties encountered in the new location. Furthermore, the World Bank (2001) saw potential impacts for people or residents affected by resettlement as follows. First, many livelihoods and lost assets, health care tends to decline, the link between producers and consumers is often disconnected and the local labor market becomes fragmented; secondly, informal social networks that are part of the daily life-keeping system (in the form of a helping-aid habit and a source of socio-economic support) are degraded; thirdly, local organizations as well as formal and informal societies vanished because their dissolution of members, communities and traditional authorities could lose their leaders; and fourth, the cumulative effect is the destruction of local social and economic systems that fundamentally have a negative impact on large numbers of people. The World Bank is also concerned about the impact that may occur on resettlement sites, especially with regard to the possible deterioration of the welfare of the population due to adjustments to livelihood resources in new places.

Long before the World Bank's findings, the Asian Development Bank (1995) in one of its studies posed a negative impact that might be caused by an unplanned resettlement program in urban development, namely that housing, community structures and systems, social relations and services can be disrupted. Productive sources, income, and livelihoods can be lost. Cultural values and mutual cooperation that exist in the community can decline. Loss of life and income sources can lead to the exploitation of ecosystems, life difficulties, social tensions, and poverty. Households affected by resettlement are particularly at risk of impoverishment in various aspects (Berg, 1999; Cernea and Soltau, 2006; Soltau and Brockington, 2007). The process of impoverishment is as follows: facing the risk of loss of land, loss a job (loss of productive employment, income and subsistence), loss of shelter, marginalization, food insecurity, increased morbidity and mortality, loss of access to common property, and the risk of social disarticulation.

The Bajo tribe as a remote community became one of the targets of the resettlement program proclaimed by the new order government. Geographically, for centuries, the Bajo tribe community settles on the sea surface in Tomini bay. They build a sea-based livelihood system. All the activities of the Bajo tribe community are conducted at the sea. The Bajo tribe views that coastal and marine resources are part of their lives. Therefore, their cultural roots are closely linked to coastal and marine resources. When the early period of the new order government forced them to follow the resettlement program ashore, it caused deep injury to Bajo tribe community. This is because they have to abandon their sea-based culture that is passed down from generation to generation. This research analyzed the resettlement of the Bajo tribe community by answering the question of how the resettlement program impacts on livelihood of the Bajo tribe community in Tomini bay.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research examined the impact of resettlement program on livelihood of the Bajo tribe community. Livelihood is defined as the way people do to fulfill their needs or survival (Chambers and Conway, 1992). Livelihood includes income, cash or worth, in addition to social institutions, gender relations, and ownership rights needed to support survival (Ellis, 1998). The Department for International Development (DFID) (1999) defined livelihood as the capability, assets, and activities necessary for survival. In line with that, Ellis (2000) interpreted livelihood as an asset, activity, and access that together determine the life of individuals or households. The livelihood concept recognizes five major asset categories that include: 1) natural capital consists of land, water, wildlife, biodiversity, environmental resources, etc.; 2) social capital consists of network, group membership, trust relationship, community institutional access; 3) human capital consists of skill, knowledge, ability to work, and good health; 4) physical capital consists of infrastructure, such as transportation, water, energy, and communication; and 5) financial capital consists of financial resources owned by everyone, such as savings, credit availability, regular shipment, or pension funds (Allison and Ellis, 2001; Lund *et al.*, 2008).

This research used the critical theory paradigm with the consideration that the Bajo tribe who followed the resettlement program experienced intervention from the government that forced them out of their original settlements. By using the critical theory paradigm, the relationship between researchers and respondents was bridged by certain values. The ontological paradigm of critical theory embraced historical reality, where observed reality was a "pseudo reality" that was formed by historical processes and social, cultural, economic, and political forces (Guba and Lincoln, 2000). This research used qualitative approach with ethnographic methods. In qualitative research, the researcher himself or with the help of others was a data collection tool. Qualitative research used inductive data analysis. This means that the search for data was not intended to prove the hypothesis that had been formulated before the study was conducted. This analysis was more formation of an abstraction based on parts that had been collected, then was grouped (Moleong, 2007). The ethnographic methods in this research were used to understand the livelihood of the Bajo tribe after following the resettlement program. Ethnographic methods used to collect data were indepth interview and observation of passive participative (Spradley, 2007). Informants of this research were the Bajo tribe of resettlement program participants who selected by snowball technique. The researcher first interviewed the village chief in depth, who then was asked to name others who were deemed to know the topic of the problem under research. Thus, the number of informants grew more, like a snowball rolling into ever larger ones (Sugiyono, 2009). Besides the ethnographic methods, the data collection was also done through literature research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Community Split:

The Bajo tribes are historically inseparable from marine life. They form a community and live on the sea surface, moving around to match the potential of fish to be caught, using a traditional boat called *soppe*. Thus, within a long span of history, the cultural roots and traditions of the Bajo tribe are closely related to the sea. This characteristic then differ the Bajo tribe to the others. The Bajo tribe prefers the sea as their livelihood bases. They catch fishes and look for other marine products, then sell them to Bagai people (non Bajo) on the beach. The Bajo people identify themselves as the *Same* (Bajo people/in group) and *Bagai* to call other than Bajo (out group). With such labeling, it is very strong solidarity of the Bajo people, and at the same time distinguishes themselves from non Bajo people.

Finally after passing sea nomad phase, the Bajo tribe community chose to settle in Tomini bay. There are many dispersion of Bajo tribe in Indonesian archipelago. The Bajo tribe can also be found in Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Nusa Tenggara, Maluku, and others who all inhabit and move on the sea. Meanwhile, Tomini bay is just one of the Bajo tribe residences. It is known that the Bajo tribe began to settle in Tomini bay since the 1800s. They lived on a boat called *soppe* as well as a center to do all activities with family. Each boat was inhabited by one family head. The choice of Tomini bay for the place of residence was of course due to the enormous potential resources that could ensure their livelihood. The area was finally inaugurated by the Dutch colonial government into a residential village of Bajo Tribe in 1901 (Obie *et al.*, 2014). Currently the village is known by the name of Torosiaje village. As time passes as the number of Bajo tribe community grows, they build housing on the sea surface by utilizing mangrove for building materials.

The intimacy of the Bajo tribe community at sea did not last forever. At the beginning of the new order governmental regime, 1976/1977 the Bajo tribe as a whole who lived on the sea surface face governmental pressure to follow the resettlement program ashore. This program was strongly rejected by the Bajo tribe at that time, so that initially was not realized. This was because the Bajo messengers met directly with local and central government (advisor to the minister of environment and population in Jakarta) by explaining various reasons. According to the Bajo people, land-based dwelling programs were unreasonable in many ways: human, economic, material (Zacot, 2008). The government then did various ways to convince the Bajo people to be willing to follow the resettlement program to land. Through the village elites, the government spreaded propaganda that discredited the Bajo tribe if they kepted surviving on the sea surface. The Ministry of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia who became the leading sector of resettlement program finally formed the field social officer and social

workers. Both elements were recruited from local residents to spearhead the programs initiated by the Ministry of Social Affairs in the field. Both played a role in providing counseling and organizing the Bajo tribe to be willing to accept resettlement program.

The resettlement program of the Bajo tribe in Tomini bay was finally first implemented in 1984/1985, although not all citizens attended the program. The Bajo tribe ultimately underwent five phases of resettlement: the first phase of 1984/1985 was relocated 125 heads of families; the second phase of 1985/1986 was 50 heads of families; the third phase of 1995/1996 was 50 heads of families; the fourth phase of 1996/1997 was 50 heads of families; and the fifth phase of 1997/1998 was 84 heads of families. During the resettlement process, there were 40 heads of families secretly left their homes on land and back again to the sea. Meanwhile, the Bajo tribe who still survives on the sea surface to date is 338 heads of families (Obie *et al.*, 2015).

The Bajo tribe community with its uniqueness of culture that blends with the coastal and marine natural environment must experience the harsh reality. Their united community falls in a split valley, following the pros and cons of the resettlement program. Those who dare to declare their rejection of resettlement programs survive on the sea surface with their original culture (figure 1), while those who are depressed and fearful of government propaganda are forced to move ashore by carrying all the risk of being removed from their cultural roots (figure 2). Today the Bajo tribe community that survives on the sea surface is known as *Bajo Laut*, while those who participate in land resettlement program is known as *Bajo Darat* (Obie, 2015). In the midst of the existing split, social capital also weakened. Similarly, indigenous institution is shaken because some of the custom figures follow the resettlement program.



Fig. 1: The Bajo tribe settlements on the sea surface. There are about 250 stilt houses arranged in U formation that is occupied about 1,400 inhabitants. To connect all the houses, built corridors of wooden bridges around the entire village along 4,000 meters.



Fig. 2: The Bajo Tribe settlements on land, uprooted from their cultural roots at sea.

Loss of Sea-Based Livelihood:

The removal of the Bajo tribe in the resettlement program forced them to abandon their hereditary roots that were built up from generation to generation along with the coastal and marine environments. As a result, access of the Bajo tribe on coastal and marine resources eventually disrupted and even abandoned altogether. The Bajo tribe should lose its hereditary livelihood bases on coastal and marine outcomes. Unfortunately, it happened just when in a new place had not promised a better livelihood. The Bajo tribe lost its natural capital on coastal and marine resources that became its livelihood bases for a long time. The livelihood bases lost from the Bajo tribe due to the resettlement program were livelihood bases on fishing, off-fishing, and non-fishing. Income derived from the fishing sector includes catching fish and other marine products. Off-fishing income may be on wage labor in fisheries, labor payments that are equal (such as profit sharing), and non-wage employment contracts. While income derived from non-fishing may be non-fisherman's labor wages, wages of own activities not derived from fisheries and income from property, such as rent and so on. This is in line with the statement of Ellis (1998) that distinguished livelihood bases in the agricultural sector on farm, off-farm, and non-farm categories.

Since the Bajo tribe moved ashore through the resettlement program, their access for catching fishes and searching for other marine products was no longer maximal. At the beginning of the program they could still go back and forth to the sea, but in the end they left it because no longer effective. In addition because they could not keep the boats they moored on the coast, the issue of time and efficiency was also a major obstacle. Often when they wanted to go to sea, their boat could not be used because of the tidal water left behind on the coast. Unlike when they were still living in their home on the sea surface, the boat was tied at the stake, so there was no need to guard it. When they live on land, they have to spend extra time and expense to go to sea. Similarly for employers, both employers in the field of fisheries such as ship owners, and non fisheries, they prefer to employ Bajo people who live on the sea surface. This is solely for reasons of efficiency and effectiveness of the work to be done at sea.

The Bajo people who follow the resettlement program to land can no longer cultivate fishes in the sea with traditional equipment (such as figure 3). They can no longer catch fishes with traditional tools that when they are still in the ocean at bedtime can get fishes. They can no longer get the fish catches they do while resting relaxed on the terrace of their house, or even the children of Bajo Laut can get fishes while playing at the dusk. This happens because of the unification of

the Bajo tribe community with coastal and marine resources. The resettlement program separates the Bajo tribe community with their coastal and marine resources. As a result, they can no longer get the hereditary marine products as their livelihood bases.



Fig. 3: The traditional fish cultivation of "karamba" species belonging to Bajo Laut around their settlements.

Shackles of Poverty:

The Bajo tribe who lives on land due to follow the resettlement program is shackled poverty. They are difficult in fulfilling their daily needs. The government forces them to pursue lives that are historically not theirs. They are even forced to farm in unlikely smallholdings. One hectare of government-provided land for every family head is not sufficient even to produce family food. Especially expect more harvest to be sold, very far from their hope. So it is reasonable for those who still have a house at sea because they had not been dismantled at the beginning of their move to the land, as many as forty heads of families were forced to return to the sea. In the meantime, for the majority of other Bajo tribe who has dismantled their homes following their displacement ashore, are forced to survive living on land in conditions of hardship of life that handcuffed.

The difficulty of living on land forces them to do anything just to survive. All the work they never do at sea, they do it on land. They build relationships with *Bagai* people and live together. Some work as farm laborers, construction workers, workshops, motorcycle taxis, and others. For Bajo women there are working as laundry garments in the homes of the *Bagai* family, domestic servants, masseurs, and some are trading cakes. For girls, getting married at an early age is a common thing, which ultimately experiences a more difficult life because it has to undergo a double burden. In addition to do domestic tasks as housewives, they also have to work outside the home to help the family economy. They do all that just to survive in the midst of economic difficulties on land.

When the sub-district market day arrives, where every family shopping for supplies needs until the next market day, including Bajo Laut and Bajo Darat, there was an inferiority feeling experienced by the Bajo Darat people. According to Bajo Darat, they did not dare to meet the Bajo Laut people in the market. The Bajo Darat felt shame due to the very lame economic factors among them. When the Bajo Laut went to market, they always shopped in large quantities because it was supported by an adequate economy. Meanwhile, Bajo Darat only shopped a bit often had to refrain from shopping for things that actually became their basic needs.

Such economic hardship conditions also affected the fulfillment of other basic needs, such as the cost of children education and health costs. As a result, when these basic needs had to be fulfilled, it often forces them to owe. Debt issues further exacerbate the poverty experienced by Bajo Darat. When the Bajo community is still united on the sea surface, it usually owed enough to the nearest relatives without interest, while when they live on land the debt issue becomes increasingly twisted because it often owes to the moneylender who asks for high interest. This is because when still united on the sea surface the social capital was still strong, where every problem can be solved together in their community. Meanwhile, the community split has weakened the social capital of the Bajo tribe. As a result, when experiencing an urgent need, there is a feeling of shame and insecurity to owe to other Bajo relatives. Owed to moneylenders with high interest has finally become the only option that increasingly fettered the life of the Bajo tribe on land.

Conclusion:

The resettlement program as implemented under pressure and coercion has a negative impact on the Bajo tribe community. In the midst pros and cons of the resettlement program, split among the Bajo tribe community occur. Some of the Bajo people were pro-resettlement program for fear of the governmental pressure and propaganda, while others dared to resist by declaring their rejection. The split among the Bajo tribe community had an impact on weakening the social capital. The Bajo tribe who hereditary livelihood hangs on coastal and marine resources, the coercion of resettlement program has deprived the cultural roots of Bajo tribe attached to the coast and sea. The Bajo tribe who follows the resettlement program loses the natural capital, namely sea-based livelihood, both in the sector of fishing, off-fishing, and non-fishing. In the fishing sector the Bajo tribe loses access to catch fishes and search for other marine products. Meanwhile, in the off-fishing sector, the Bajo tribe loses the opportunity to get a job in fisheries, even if only to become laborers. In the non-fishing sector, the Bajo tribe loses the opportunity to get work outside the fishery at sea. In the condition of losing access at sea the Bajo tribe on land must struggle to build the livelihood bases in sectors that historically are not their culture. As a result they are chained of life's difficulties, so that poverty becomes a reality that they must accept.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The profound thanks to all my parents, my father La Siko and my mothers Wa Suumi and Wa Nuriima, who took pains to take care of me and seek to pay for my education till able to publish this work. May this work becomes charity for all of them, get forgiveness from Allah s.w.t. and placed in His heaven with the His believers. Aamiin Ya Rabbal Al-Amiin.

REFERENCES

- Allison, E.H. and F. Ellis, 2001. The Livelihood Approach and Management of Small-scale Fisheries. *Marine Policy*, 25(5): 377-388.
- Asian Development Bank, 1995. *Involuntary Resettlement Policy*. Manila/Philippines: ADB
- Berg, T.M.V., 1999. We Are Not Compensating Rocks: Resettlement and Traditional Religious Systems. *World Development*, 27(2): 271-283.
- Cernea, M.M. and K.S. Soltau, 2006. Poverty Risks and National Parks: Policy Issues in Conservation and Resettlement. *World Development*, 34(10): 1808-1830.
- Chambers, R. and G.R. Conway, 1992. Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century, Discussion Paper 296. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.
- DFID, 1999. Sustainable Livelihood Guidance Sheet. London: UK Government.
- Ellis, F., 1998. Household Strategies and Rural Livelihood Diversification. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 35(1): 1-38.
- _____, 2000. *Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Guba, E.G. and Y.S. Lincoln, 2000. Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds). Handbook of Qualitative Research (Second Edition). California: Sage Publications, Inc, pp: 191-215.
- Heeran, H.J., 1985. Beberapa Masalah Tentang Pemukiman Kolektif Pedesaan di Indonesia. In Swasono, S. E dan M. Singarimbun (eds.). Sepuluh Windu Transmigrasi di Indonesia, 1905-1985. Jakarta: UI Press, pp: 86-95.
- Hoffman, C.F., 1985. Punan Liar di Kalimantan: Alasan Ekonomis. In Dove, M. R. (eds.). Peranan Kebudayaan Tradisional Indonesia dalam Modernisasi. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia, pp: 123-162.
- Lund, R., L.A. Dei, K.A. Boakye and E. Opoku, 2008. It is all about livelihoods: A study of women working in stone chip production in Cape Coast Municipality, Ghana. Journal of Geography, 62(3): 139-148.
- Mangoenpoerojo, R.B., 1985. Rancunya Pola Pikir Cendekiawan dan Akibatnya Terhadap Transmigran. In Swasono, S. E. dan M. Singarimbun (eds.). Sepuluh Transmigrasi di Indonesia, 1905-1985. Jakarta: UI Press, pp: 96-114.
- Maunati, Y., 2004. Identitas Dayak. Komodifikasi dan Politik Kebudayaan. Yogyakarta: LKiS
- Moleong, L.J., 2007. Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif (Edisi Revisi). Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosda Karya.
- Obie, M., 2015. Perampasan Hak Ulayat Pesisir dan Laut Komunitas Suku Bajo (Kasus Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Pesisir dan Laut di Teluk Tomini). Bogor: Disertasi Sekolah Pascasarjana IPB.
- Obie, M., E. Soetarto, T. Sumarti and Saharuddin, 2014. Konflik Etnis di Pesisir Teluk Tomini: Tinjauan Sosio-Ekologi Politik. Al-Tahrir, 14(2): 321-342.
- Obie, M., E. Soetarto, T. Sumarti and Saharuddin, 2015. Sejarah Penguasaan Sumber Daya Pesisir dan Laut di Teluk Tomini. Paramita, 25(1): 73-87.
- Ridlo, M.A., 2001. Kemiskinan di Perkotaan. Semarang: Penerbit Unissula Press.
- Soltau, K.S. and D. Brockington, 2007. Protected Areas and Resettlement: What Scope for Voluntary Relocation? World Development, 35(12): 2182-2202.
- Spradley, J.P., 2007. Metode Etnografi, Edisi II. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Sugiyono, 2009. Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta
- World Bank, 1990. Operational Policy, Involuntary Resettlement. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank
- _____. 2001. Operational Policy 4.12, Involuntary Resettlement. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank
- Yudohusodo, S., and S. Salam, 1991. Rumah untuk Seluruh Rakyat. Jakarta: Yayasan Padamu Negeri
- Zacot, F.R., 2008. *Orang Bajo Suku Pengembara Laut: Pengalaman Seorang Antropolog*. Translator Laure F.M., Pranoto I.B. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia (KPG) in Cooperation with *Ecolo Francaise d'Extreme-Orient* dan Forum Jakarta-Paris.