Claiming indigenous rights through participatory mapping and the making of citizenship

Authors:
Ståle Angen Rye*
Department of Geography
NTNU: Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Trondheim 7491
Norway
Phone: +62 735 91 818
Mail: stale.angen.rye@svt.ntnu.no

Nanang Indra Kurniawan
Department of Politics and Governments
Universitas Gadja Madah
Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta 55281
Indonesia
Phone: +62 274 563362
Mail: nanang.indra@ugm.ac.id

*Corresponding author

Abstract
This paper considers how participatory mapping, through the notion of indigeneity, is involved in the making of participants' political agency and the possible implications for local struggles over customary land and resources. Empirically, the paper draws on a field study of participatory mapping as a cartographic-legal strategy for the recognition of the customary rights to land and resources of the Dayak, an indigenous ethnic group in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. In this paper, we use citizenship as a basis for our analysis. On this basis, we discuss how the notion of indigeneity has assembled actors across different scales and how this has enabled indigeneity to develop as a site for claiming customary rights to land and resources through participatory mapping. One of our main arguments is the need to understand indigenous citizenship as a process that develops over time and through networks of actors that transcend the borders of the state and expand the formerly exclusive relationship between the state and its citizens in the making of citizenship. We challenge Isin's clear distinction between active and activist approaches to making claims of citizenship, suggesting instead that these approaches are mutually constitutive.

Keywords: citizenship, indigenous people, indigeneity, participatory mapping, political agency, Indonesia

1. Introduction: The rise of indigenous citizenship and participatory mapping

Indigenous people in Indonesia have long been on the margins of the national project of the state as the state has long ignored claims of customary, or adat,[i] rights to land and resources (Li, 2000; Persoon, 1998; Warren, 2005a, 2005b; Warren & McCarthy, 2002). Rather than accepting the differences represented by indigenous people, the post-colonial state has sought to integrate the Dayak[ii] and other indigenous people into the nation-building project by 'allowing' them to participate in the nation as Indonesian citizens, purportedly on equal footing with other citizens (Li, 2000). 'Indigenous' became a postcolonial category referring to the nation's colonial past when all Indonesians were subordinated to the European colonizers (Rosaldo, 2003). Thus, in Indonesia, as in many other countries in the global south, ignorance of indigenous rights and claims became integral to the ideology of nationalism that aimed to create a nation that could be controlled and developed and to create prosperity for its citizens (Savino, 2016).

Nevertheless, this approach to indigenous people and the possibility of making citizenship appears to have changed in recent decades in several countries in the global south, particularly in Latin America, as indigenous people worldwide are increasingly seen as political subjects with particular rights that diverge from those of the majority (Larson, 2004; Pacheco, 2004). A major force in the recognition of indigeneity as a political factor can be seen through the political principles of decentralization, which includes the devolution of power to lower administrative units (Wilson, 2008). As much as it is about governmental reform, however, decentralization is also about acknowledging that new expressions of diversity within the nation play a role in national development (Peluso, Afiff, & Rachman, 2008). This has opened the door to the development of new political identities based on ethnicity and territorial attachment on scales other than that of the nation state as well as new forms of local integration into neoliberal global capitalism and transnational social movements (Li, 2007b). What it means to be indigenous is changing as indigeneity is produced and reproduced through new constellations of power, dominance and possibilities across various scales (Radcliffe, 2015, 2017).

Indonesia, which is the empirical context of this article, followed a policy of decentralization and new forms of recognition of minorities after the end of Suharto's authoritarian 'New Order' rule in 1998 (Li, 2000; Resosudarmo, 2004; Warren, 2005b). Democratic development emerged simultaneously with the devolution of the right to manage lands to both local governments and customary institutions (Warren, 2005b). In the Province of Central Kalimantan, the location of the empirical study discussed in this paper, the Dayak indigenous people have used this approach since the 1990s as a tool of resistance against land expropriation by both companies and the state (Peluso, 1995; Radjawali, Pye, & Flitner, 2017; Warren, 2005b; Warren & McCarthy, 2002). Initially, the use of maps and mapping by indigenous peoples was conceived of as a strategy to bolster the legitimacy of customary rights to land and resources by producing alternative representations of the land on which they live (Peluso, 1995). Recently, as will be discussed in greater detail below, participatory mapping programmes in Kalimantan, as well as other places, have been accommodated by the state and conducted alongside recognition of Dayak customary land rights. However, the state's interest in participatory mapping is not limited to Dayak claims on land. It is also, as

we argue elsewhere, a strategy to simplify, classify, administer, and measure the nature and people of Central Kalimantan (NN). In the words of Scott (1998), participatory mapping has been a way to make indigenous citizens more legible and, thus, more easily brought into the market in the attempt to develop the national economy (Warren, 2005b; Warren & McCarthy, 2002). This situation raises the question of what type of political agency is created through the practice of participatory mapping and resonates with the ongoing debate within geography on the position of participation in post-colonial development (Cornwall, 2008; Kesby, 2007; Korf, 2010)

Although quite a lot has been written about participatory mapping as a political strategy, particularly in the Latin American context, this paper aims to advance this literature by approaching the relationship between political agency and participatory mapping as it has been articulated in Indonesia from a citizenship perspective. We do so by addressing how, through notions of indigeneity, participatory mapping involves the construction of participants' political agency and the possible implications for local struggles over customary land and resources. Empirically, the paper draws on a field study of Dayak peasants' use of participatory mapping as a cartographic-legal strategy to secure recognition of customary rights to land and resources (see Bryan, 2011). 'Acts of citizenship' is used as a concept to analytically ground our analysis (Isin, 2008, 2009). The aims of this paper are, first, to highlight aspects of the transformative power of participatory mapping and, second, to explore the potential to use citizenship as an analytical tool for analysing indigenous people's claims to rights through participatory mapping.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The next section begins by outlining some basic perspectives on citizenship and how these are related to indigeneity and participatory mapping. The discussion continues by examining how Dayak peasants in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia, have applied participatory mapping in their struggle to protect their rights to customary land and resources. We end the paper by providing some concluding remarks.

2. Claiming rights as indigenous citizens through participatory mapping

Nation-state-based forms of citizenship have become the globally dominant way of defining formal aspects of citizenship and the main pathway through which people make claims as citizens to the political community of which they are a part (Isin, 2009, 2012). Nevertheless, most scholars of citizenship have observed that nation-state-based citizenship models seem to have reached their peak in terms of their importance for understanding how an individual's subjectivity develops in relation to a political community (see, for example, Delanty, 2000, 2007; Isin & Turner, 2007; Sassen, 2005; Staeheli, Attoh, & Mitchell, 2013). This recent change in the understanding of citizenship is widely related to increased global connectivity among people and places due to the recent development of the neoliberal global economy, new patterns of migration and the rapid development of new means of communication, all of which render our connections to territorial categories, such as the state, more fluid. With regard to the issue of indigenous rights in Indonesia, this development is evident in the close relation between the struggle of indigenous peoples for land and resources and the expansion of land-based

investment for industries such as palm oil plantation and mining into customarily Dayak land (Gellert, 2010; Li, 2007b; Tsing, 2004). The response of peasant farmers and indigenous peoples is seen through the formation of counter-powers that include attachment to global environmental and agrarian justice movements as well as the mobilization of grassroots efforts to counter global agrarian and extractive industries (Gellert, 2010; Peluso et al., 2008; Pye, 2010).

From the perspective of these recent reconfigurations of political subjectivities, which include new scales and sites for making claims to rights, indigenous practices of citizenship are particularly interesting as they appear to represent a kind of localism that, at first glance, appears to be contradictory to globalization and globalism. Claims to rights by indigenous peoples are typically based on territorial attachments and strong and long-lasting communal ties to lands that have existed for longer than the ties of other people to the same environment. This situation allows for special and, to some extent, exclusive rights to the land on which these peoples have lived for generations (Canessa, 2012; Castree, 2004; Greene et al., 2004) and sometimes for a type of sedentarism that violates the rights of other citizens with strong attachments to the same territory (Li, 2002). Although indigenous claims made through this version of localism appear to represent a contradiction to the current reconfiguration of citizenship in the context of migration, mobility and global connection, similarities are evident. Recent claims from local villagers, peasants and indigenous peoples – who are not typically regarded as forces or players in the recent waves of globalization – might be considered deeply rooted in contemporary processes of increased global connectivity despite their long-lasting ties to land and territories (Arora-Jonsson, Westholm, Temu, & Petitt, 2015; Asher & Ojeda, 2009). Local expressions of indigeneity are folded into a space where connections to the external world are expressed as an aspect of the local orientation of indigeneity (Allen, 2016).

The global aspects of indigenous localism are apparent for several reasons. First, recent indigenous movements may be understood as part of a global movement as much as local articulations of rights to land and resources (Canessa, 2012; Castree, 2004; Niezen, 2003; Pye, 2010; Tsing, 2004). Although different indigenous peoples have experienced diverse political, cultural and social contexts, they share a particular sense of justice or, rather, the historical injustice of being denied customary rights to the land on which they have lived for generations. This situation creates the conditions for indigenous people to become part of a global justice network in which non-governmental organizations (NGOs) support various indigenous peoples' claims to rights (Cumbers, Routledge, & Nativel, 2008). Second, indigenous peoples' conflicts with external actors, particularly in relation to land and resources, have been actualized with the new configuration of global capitalism and neoliberalism (Li, 2007b; Peluso, Kelly, & Kevin, 2013). The global expansion of production networks has increased pressure for land that can be codified and then incorporated by markets, which the literature conceptualizes as 'land grabbing' (Cotula, 2012). Notably, however, the growing need for land has also been related to global causes, such as biodiversity and efforts to combat climate change, which the literature labels 'green grabbing' (Fairhead, Leach, & Scoones, 2012). Finally, indigenous local knowledge and customary rights to land have recently emerged on the global political scene through consideration of how these are important to the global community. This aspect is particularly important in the

discourse on rainforests and their relevance for global climate change (Arora-Jonsson et al., 2015) and bioprospecting (Greene et al., 2004). Notions of connectedness to nature are used in these cases as part of a discourse on securing the living conditions of everyone on the planet. In this discourse, people with predominantly local interests are drawn into a new identification as global citizens (Arora-Jonsson et al., 2015; Peluso et al, 2008; Tsing, 2004).

As discussed above, indigenous claims of rights to land are increasingly assembled through a variety of global connections that interfere with indigenous peoples' long-lasting ties to particular territories. Nevertheless, the indigenous aspects of citizenship continue to centre on being accepted into and included in the nation state (Gellert, 2010; Peluso et al, 2008). This inclusion is not only about the ability to access the same rights as the majority in the nation but also about the struggle for acceptance as distinct from the majority (Staeheli, 2008). From the state perspective, citizenship can be understood as a way of controlling and ordering subjects under the state to be 'good citizens' and thus maintaining basic power relations (Ong, 2006; Pykett, Saward, & Schaefer, 2010). The acceptance of claims or of the ability to make claims is only awarded to minorities at the cost of losing something on the journey to full membership in a political community, typically a nation state (Castree, 2004). Including indigenous people in the nation-state project thus has advantages and costs. Citizenship is not, as is often thought, merely a matter of the desire for subjects and objects to become members of a certain community; it is also a tool that those at the centre of citizenship institutions use to govern people and to produce the outcomes the community or its elites desire (Ong, 2006; Pykett et al., 2010). Therefore, societies, majorities, and elites typically want indigenous peoples and other minorities to become citizens of the greater community, but only if they can produce what the community, in the form of the state, wants.

Scholars such as Hale (2004) have conceptualized this development in relation to indigenous people through the concept of neoliberal multiculturalism. Through this concept, he raises critical questions about the implications of the state's embrace of indigeneity for indigenous people. Rather than regarding this development as an expression of the inclusion of indigenous citizens into the state, Hale (2004), who bases most of his work in Guatemala, argues that it is an expression of how the state abrogates its duties to its indigenous people by granting them and accepting only very particular areas of influence (Hale, 2002). Other scholars conducting research in different contexts have argued that liberal reforms have created real political opportunities for indigenous people through inclusion in the state project (Postero, 2007).

This possible dual process of inclusion/exclusion highlights the need for a processual approach to the study of indigenous people, whereby indigeneity – what it means to be indigenous – is produced and reproduced as a result of particular spatial and temporal constellations of subordination (Bryan, 2009; Radcliffe, 2015). Indigeneity should thus not be essentially or solely identified through the particular characteristics of indigenous groups (such as particular and long-lasting ties to the land on which they live) but also through the changing relations that constitute indigenous peoples as distinct groups within particular communities. This perspective considers how indigeneity, as a site for claiming rights, is constantly configured and reconfigured within particular geographies at particular times. In the case of the Dayak of Kalimantan, it is about the making of citizenship through various

systems of embeddedness in national politics, global trade and transnational political exchange and about how these systems define Dayak indigeneity. Similarly, Radcliffe (2015) suggests that forms of citizenship that interpellate indigenous peoples must be considered within the wider legal and governance order within which they are placed, which is a process that stems from geographically and temporally fixing processes. In line with this argument, Isin (2009) suggests that studies of citizenship should not be a matter of finding the answer to the question of what contemporary citizenship is – in this case, indigenous citizenship – but rather of how it is produced at particular times and places through claims of rights at a time when attachment to territories is shifting and new actors at various scales are entering the political stage. There are, of course, numerous ways in which indigenous people can make claims of rights (Sletto, 2015). In this paper, our focus is on participatory mapping as an approach to staging indigenous claims against the state through what Wainwright and Bryan (2009) label a cartographic-legal strategy.

A basic assumption of this paper is that maps and participatory mapping are political in nature and cannot be understood as mere technical procedures that involve certain people. Mapping is never neutral or value free. It can be used to consolidate and preserve political power (Harley, 1988, 1989), but it can also serve as a means of protest and resistance (Allen, Lambert, Apsan Frediani, & Ome, 2015; Peluso, 1995; Sletto, 2002). Mapping might thus restrain or enable political action as well as individual and collective agency, but the direction of the effect is not a given. The same is true of participation, which cannot be reduced to a matter of involving people in a certain action; it is also a matter of activating, handling and manipulating power relations (Allen et al., 2015; Cooke & Kothari, 2001; Refstie & Brun, 2016). Participation is, at least as a postcolonial tool for development and despite efforts to dislocate development from the political field, deeply political (Kesby, 2007; Korf, 2010). The political embeddedness of participatory mapping has given maps and mapping, as a means of participation, significant roles in the struggles of indigenous peoples over land and resources (Bryan, 2011; Reyes-García et al., 2012; Sletto, 2009; Wainwright & Bryan, 2009).

In the early stages of the participatory mapping movement, labelled counter-mapping, efforts were made to produce alternative representations of spatial knowledge to contest the legal basis of the state's spatial politics (Peluso, 1995). In Indonesia, including Kalimantan, this movement emerged from concerns about the ecological degradation resulting from the New Order's destructive economic development model (Peluso, 1995). State-initiated development projects led to state expansion into Dayak territory. These intrusions were then legitimized by regulations and supported by official maps (Arnold, 2008). The state used these maps as part of a larger resource management strategy with a strong territorial component (Peluso, 1995). These official maps, together with a legal framework that undermined customary rights to land, subjected numerous forest-dependent communities in Indonesia to land expropriation. The response from indigenous communities and their allies was to produce representations that challenged the official maps and the legal tenets that the maps supported.

This paper does not focus on these alternative representations as such. Rather, we apply a post-representational approach to mapping and do not focus on the maps as artefacts representing alternative or counter-information about land and resources (Kitchin, 2014). In

line with Sletto (2015), we aim to go beyond maps as representations and instead to consider both maps and the mapping process as embedded in various forms of action. By considering maps through acts, we aim to answer the question of whether participatory mapping creates new forms of membership and access to particular rights. We thus seek to examine what participatory mapping indicates about the Dayak's ability to act as citizens, or, in the words of Arendt (1968), the rights to claim rights. By doing so, we extend the debate on whether participatory mapping, through new legal regulations, can endow indigenous peoples with full citizenship. We examine how participatory mapping contributes to a transformation of citizenship as an institution and, thereby, of the Dayak people's fundamental relationship with the state. We thus consider the Dayak claim from the perspective of what Isin (2009) calls 'acts as action' that are expressed in ways that disrupt the existing order and create what he calls 'real' political change. These acts, which Isin (2009) calls 'acts of citizenship', work to enable struggles by challenging existing scripts, practices and routines through the creation of new scenes in which rights are claimed. Isin claims that these diverge from contemporary conceptions of 'active citizens', which are typically seen as activating and practicing citizenship through routines, conduct and existing scripts for citizen behaviour (Isin, 2009). If we consider participatory mapping from this perspective, counter-mapping and the early stages of participatory mapping appear as acts that challenge the existing order and the script inherent in the state. The way that states and governments also become part of the participatory movement remains an open question that will be discussed in the remainder of this paper.

Before we proceed to examine how such notions of citizenship can highlight Dayak claims to rights to customary land through participatory mapping, we outline the vocabulary Isin suggests to grasp shifts in the notion of citizenship. First, Isin (2009) suggests that it is no longer adequate to regard states as 'containers' of citizens, and it is equally inadequate to view citizenship as a contract between a state and its citizens that is defined through a sort of membership with the possibility of exclusion. At present (as before), new actors within and outside the state articulate claims for justice through new sites that involve multiple and overlapping scales of rights and obligations that transcend the borders of the state (Staeheli, 2011). The manifold acts through which new actors as claimants emerge at new sites and scales have become, as Isin (2009) suggests, essential to understanding new figures of citizenship. These sites have become the new objects of investigation. Hence, we need to understand how sites, scales and acts produce new actors who enact political subjectivities and transform themselves and others into citizens by articulating ever-changing and expanding rights (Schattle, 2008). Thus, actors, sites and scales should, as Isin argues, constitute the basic vocabulary of studies of citizenship, and the staging of acts through claims to rights should be the focal point of empirical analysis. In the remainder of this paper, we use fundamental terms in Isin's vocabulary to consider the case of participatory mapping, which was introduced at the beginning of this paper. In subsequent analyses of the empirical material, we raise the following questions regarding participatory mapping as a tool for indigenous people to claim rights to customary land and resources. (i) Who are the actors? (ii) What scales and sites are created? (iii) What types of acts (of citizenship) are produced? First, we will provide a brief overview of the methodological issues related to the present case of Central Kalimantan.

3. A field study of participatory mapping in Central Kalimantan

The empirical field addressed in the remainder of this paper relates to participatory mapping in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia, the homeland of a large group of Dayak indigenous people. According to the 2010 Census, of a total population of 2.2 million inhabitants in Central Kalimantan, 54.28 percent are Dayak and live primarily in rural areas (Earth Innovation Institute, 2015). With its rich natural resources, Central Kalimantan has long been targeted for various land-based investments, and the recognition of Dayak customary rights to the land remains weak. Growing investment has increased land conflicts in the province.

The empirical data were collected during several field research sessions from February 2011 to April 2016. The data collection was organized in conjunction with networks and NGOs working on issues related to participatory mapping among indigenous people in Central Kalimantan, and the data consist of multiple sources. A total of 94 interviews were conducted with local people, NGO activists, local government officials, and international donors. Participatory observation of a local NGO in Central Kalimantan, POKKER SHK, was conducted between May 2011 and December 2012. During this time, mapping activities were observed in three villages in Central Kalimantan: Bawan, Galinggang, and Jahanjang. During this period, two focus group discussions were organized in two villages, Bawan and Galinggang. These discussions involved local people who were engaged in the participatory mapping programme. New discussions and a short field trip with this NGO were arranged in April 2016. Three focus group discussions were conducted with local communities and participatory mapping activists in Palangkaraya. Archival research was also important and included official regulations and official reports on forest and land use in Central Kalimantan. In addition, data came from traditional and new media sources to capture the public discourse on participatory mapping, land use and related issues. Most of the data collection occurred in Central Kalimantan Province, but links to organizations and situations outside this province were also followed (for example, NGOs located in Bogor were interviewed).

In the following discussions, we emphasize that the aim is not to analyse each source in depth but rather to use them, together with the relevant literature, to tell the story of how participatory mapping in Central Kalimantan has developed over recent decades. This is not the full story. It is a story that focuses on the importance of indigeneity for defining the political power of participatory mapping and on how the Dayak, as political subjects, use participatory mapping as part of a legal-cartographic strategy to claim their rights to customary land and resources.

4. The making of citizenship through participatory mapping in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia

We will now approach the case of participatory mapping in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia, through a discussion framed by the three central questions concerning citizenship that were posed in the theoretical discussion above. First, we aim to identify the major players by asking who the main actors are in the claim making of indigenous rights through the use of

participatory mapping in Central Kalimantan. We continue by discussing what types of scales and sites are created by these actors through their engagement in participatory mapping among indigenous people. Finally, we explore the types of acts (of citizenship) that are produced by the identified actors through the staging of particular sites at various scales.

Who are the actors?
A simplistic approach to studying claim making by the Dayak through participatory mapping in Central Kalimantan (and elsewhere) would be to regard this practice as a relation between the state and its citizens—in this case, the Dayak making legal claims of rights to land against the Indonesian state. However, as evidenced by the field study and the literature review, this view is problematic. First, neither the state nor the Dayak act as unitary actors. Second, important actors outside of the state–Dayak relationship are relevant for understanding the claims of rights that have been attached to participatory mapping practices. Therefore, to avoid oversimplification, which is often reflected in the literature on indigenous peoples (Coombes, Johnson, & Howitt, 2012), we follow Isin (2009) and understand actors of citizenship as not limited to those who are citizens by status and already constituted to territories or their legal subjects. Actors, Isin claims, can be any individual, state, or NGO making a claim, and they cannot be defined before analysing such claims. Who are the main actors of citizenship in the participatory mapping process taking place in Central Kalimantan, and what are their main characteristics?

First, those who are formally making claims of indigenous rights to land and resources through participatory mapping in the investigated case are Dayak individuals and their communities in Central Kalimantan, where they have lived for centuries and where most of them are, or were, swidden cultivators residing in the island's interior (Dove, 2006). Swidden culture and accompanying conceptions of land and resources explain why most Dayak communities traditionally have no sense of territorial jurisdiction (see Tsing, 2004) and, accordingly, why the massive delocalization of Dayak land in support of national and international capital was made possible through Basic Forestry Law (BFL) No. 5/196. (Lindayati, 2003). Through this law, approximately 74 percent of the nation's land area, including most customary land, was considered 'wasteland' and became subject to direct state control. The law followed a discourse that centred on Dayaks' shifting cultivation as a 'destructive' and 'irrational' practice (Fried, 2003, p. 149) that justified stopping swidden agriculture and other local activities on lands that were intended for projects such as agriculture estates, transmigration, plantations, and mining. This dispossession of Dayak land was followed by a state spatial strategy to control resources and populations through the creation of official maps that coded much of Dayak customary land as state land. Combined with ignorance of Dayak customary laws and practices, these maps provided the grounds for a kind of 'legal landlessness' that resulted in significant reductions in the areas traditionally used by Dayak peasants for economic production under customary laws (Colchester et al., 2006). Specifically, in Central Kalimantan, the state used these official maps to issue various licenses for timber concessions, infrastructure, transmigration, biodiversity, conservation, mining, and plantations, among others.

The tradition of weak juridical ownership over land and resources together with intervention by the 'modern' state through the modern language of official maps illuminate why a large

majority of Dayaks still live as peasants with weak control over the land they use for agriculture. Dayaks are, however, not exclusively peasants. There exists a significant indigenous Dayak elite, particularly in Central Kalimantan, which for decades has made alliances with the state to consolidate their power (McCarthy, 2004, McCarthy, Vel and Afiff 2012; van Klinken, 2002, 2006). The state's discriminatory discourse on Dayak peasants has thus been reproduced with the direct involvement of Dayak elites. This has been visible since the emergence of Central Kalimantan Province in 1957, which integrated the state structure into Dayak society, but it became more intensive in the new era of decentralization, when Dayak elites dominated the local government. Gradually, the Dayak elites have enhanced their bargaining positions to extend control their land and resources by gaining political legitimacy as the 'guardians' of Dayak culture (McCarthy, 2004). This conflict within the Dayak community, which is evident in the field, can be exemplified through a discussion with a villager from Mantangai Hulu (May 6, 2012) about the growing issuance of palm oil licenses by local government officials: *"Dayak people are now fooled by Dayak people".* In this light, Dayak peasant claims against the state raised through participatory mapping are not simple issues of ethnic minorities making claims against a majority but also involve peasants making claims against a controlling elite.

Although the fieldwork revealed how some Dayak elite used participatory mapping programmes as political tools to gain support from potential voters, it was primarily the community that already had links to NGOs working on local community rights that became involved in participatory mapping. Thus, the use of maps by the Dayak and their communities cannot be separated from the way participatory mapping became a vital force in the early 1990s with the expansion and globalization of the human rights discourse, environmental activism, and agrarian reform (Safitri, 2009). In Central Kalimantan, several NGOs have been active in integrating participatory mapping into the agrarian movement since 2000. This process became more intensive when Simpul Layanan Pemetaan Partisipatif Kalimantan Tengah (SLP2KT), also known as Simpul or the Center for Participatory Mapping Services of Central Kalimantan, was established with support from local governments and international donors. Those involved in SLP2KT are activists of NGOs such as POKKER SHK, Perkumpulan TEROPONG, WALHI Central Kalimantan, and Yayasan Petak Danum as well as Dayak peasants who have already been trained in participatory mapping.

This participatory mapping movement has challenged state land use practices by promoting indigenous rights in its campaigns (Pramono, Natalia, & Janting, 2006). Facilitated by national and international NGOs, Dayak communities have used maps and mapping as a strategy to challenge the state territorialization discussed above and to bolster the legitimacy of customary claims to land and resources (Peluso, 1995). Through counter-mapping and new maps, NGOs have helped local communities transform the mental maps that exist in oral tradition into cartographic maps and to document historical land uses and claims (Pramono et al., 2006). SLP2KT has recently coordinated this work with the aim of providing closer, cheaper, and quicker participatory mapping services for local communities. Furthermore, new types of digital technologies have become essential in the Indonesian environmental movement (Kurniawan & Rye, 2014). GPS, mapping software and, more recently, unarmed drones have been critical to the development of the participatory mapping movement (Crampton, 2009; McCall & Dunn, 2012; Radjawali et al., 2017). The Dayak have used NGOs,

maps, and new technologies to strengthen their ability to act as citizens and to form the present-day participatory mapping movement.

The emergence and development of the Dayak use of participatory mapping in Kalimantan in the 1990s, as suggested above, were made possible by the active role of national and international grant-making organizations (Pramono et al., 2006). At that time, there was a trend among international development institutions and grant-making organizations to promote market-led agrarian reforms by replacing confrontational land reforms with more collaborative approaches, especially in countries that had inherited dualistic (i.e., individual and communal) landownership patterns (Deininger & Binswanger, 1999). It was believed that a participatory and collaborative strategy would ensure secure tenure and facilitate land transfer, which would, in turn, promote and protect corporate investments through the Community-Based Natural Resource Management Programme (Borras & Ross, 2007; Safitri, 2009). Extensions of these practices can be seen in the Ford Foundation's support of two large environmental organizations, WALHI and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), followed by assistance from USAID, which gave financial support to various NGOs in Kalimantan to develop participatory mapping through its Biodiversity Support Program (Pramono et al., 2006). As revealed through the fieldwork, the most active donor institutions are currently the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (PGRI), also known as Kemitraan, which is a grant-making organisation founded in 2000 based on the initiative of the World Bank and the United Nations Development Program. This institution has been active in the funding of SLP2KT and has canalized much of its work through the aforementioned local NGOs. A main funding institution is the Norwegian Government (NORAD, 2010), which, as will be discussed in greater detail, has used this institution as a tool in their engagement in Indonesian national forest management.

With strong support from donors such as Kemitraan, Indonesian governments have, in recent years, accommodated the Dayak cause by providing a legal framework for claims and actions in support of their customary rights. During the New Order era, the state controlled customary rights using coercive means supported by law, but recent legal regulations underline the need to recognize customary rights (Arnold, 2008). Government intervention in the participatory mapping movement in Central Kalimantan formally began in 2008 with the legal reform of customary rights to land and resources through Local Government Regulation No. 16/2008 on Dayak customary institutions in Central Kalimantan and Governor Decree No. 13/2009 on customary land and customary rights to land in Central Kalimantan. A main target of this intervention was communities and villages with high levels of land conflicts with national and international companies. Local NGOs and transnational networks played an important role in implementing the government-initiated participatory mapping activities at the local level.

Together, these actors and networks in central Kalimantan reflect the complex assemblage of actors and objectives involved in the Dayak's claims (Li, 2007a). The primary actors have been Dayak people and their communities, local, national and international NGOs, donor agencies, local/regional governments and local elites. However, land, resources, technology, and legal regulations have contributed significantly to the configuration of these assemblages. Making claims through participatory mapping has become a means of

assembling the actors under a common cause based on the notion of indigeneity. How they formed new sites and scales in the struggle over rights to customary land in Central Kalimantan will be addressed in the following discussion.

What sites and scales of struggles are created?
Sites of citizenship are, as Isin (2009) notes, fields where there is contestation and struggle over certain interests, stakes, issues, themes and concepts. Scales represent the range over which these sites of struggle are applicable. In the following, we focus on two relevant examples from the field data. The first relates to local government involvement in Dayak communities' staging of claims through a participatory mapping programme in 2008. The second, which is connected with the first, relates to transnational networks of states, agencies and NGOs involved in indigenous legal rights through the transnational cause of protecting the rainforest. The first example illustrates how new sites for making claims are developed from scales below the nation state by (re)establishing indigenous legal institutions on a local level. The second example demonstrates how sites for making claims are created through the involvement of institutions from scales above the nation state. These actors meet by means of participatory mapping in the production of new cross-scalar sites for making indigenous claims to customary land. Both examples address the transformative power of participatory mapping when indigeneity is attached to new actors, sites and scales of claim making. We begin with governmental involvement in indigenous claim making.

The state's involvement in participatory mapping in Central Kalimantan was first evident through Local Government Regulation No. 16/2008, which was formulated as an effort *"[…] to promote the preservation, development, and empowerment of Dayak customs and the enforcement of [customary] law in the community"* (article 2) and *"[…] to manifest the Dayak philosophy of huma betang (communal life and togetherness)"* (article 10). Through this regulation, the provincial government provided legal status for the Dayak people in Central Kalimantan and their customary relationship to lands and resources that are generally located in areas controlled by the state (Simarmata, 2015). Dayak elites were involved in this process to a large degree; in recent decades, many have become members of local governments and of Dewan Adat Dayak, or state-sponsored customary institutions,[iii] which have direct or indirect influences on the technical processes of the legalization of customary claims on land made through participatory mapping. One Dayak customary institution covered by Regulation No. 16/2008 is the Kedamangan, a traditional Dayak institution formalized by the state in 1938 when the Dutch colonial government simplified Dayak institutions (see Hadi, 2007).

Under Regulation No. 16/2008, the Kedamangan was delegated the authority to address affairs relating to the ownership, management, use, and transfer of customary lands and land rights and was tasked with supporting the government in conflicts in Central Kalimantan, especially those related to land and other customary affairs. To support the implementation of Regulation No. 16/2008, the Governor of Central Kalimantan issued Governor Decree No. 13/2009 on customary land and customary rights to land in Central Kalimantan, which was followed by the Programme Inventarisasi Tanah Adat Dayak, or the Inventory of Dayak Customary Land Programme. The provincial government employed a participatory mapping approach to this inventory process that included the identification, mapping, and marking of

customary land and land rights. The Kedamangan played a central role in this programme as the provincial government granted the Damang Kepala Adat (the head of the Kedamangan) the authority to issue letters of proof of customary land ownership and customary legal rights to land (these letters are also known as SKTA). A government official at the Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda) in Palangkaraya City expressed the aim of these governmental interventions in participatory mapping as follows:

> "[…] rather than spending time on demonstrations, I think it's better for [indigenous] people to use the existing regulations to protect their land. Local government has facilitated this through the Governor's decree [No. 13/2009]. Just map it and make an SKTA. We need a conducive environment. If we have [a] safe environment, development will run well" (August 22, 2012).

A major motivation for the regional government to engage in participatory mapping was, as expressed by the government officer cited above, to resolve conflicts over land use originating in customary rights as they hindered 'development'. The efforts apparently advanced the interests of indigenous peasants and their communities in several respects. However, the fieldwork revealed that the emergence of these regulations also served the interests of local Dayak elites, who used the issue of indigeneity to gain political legitimacy as the guardians of Dayak culture and to expand their influence in determining the direction of land use and control over resources in Central Kalimantan. This situation is similar to those in the so-called 'indigenous states' in parts of Latin America (Canessa, 2014), which implies the state's use of key indigenous concepts, such as adat, Dayak, and huma betang (Zimmerer, 2015).

A key point here is how the state, through a combination of participatory mapping and local legal customary institution, is challenging the nation state as the exclusive frame for making claims as citizens. Dayaks became recognized as legal subjects through their exclusive status as indigenous, not only as Indonesians. To some extent, this can be seen as a downscaling of politics that followed the decentralization of national politics. As will be discussed in the following, this could not have happened without involvement from actors and institutions from scales above the nation state.

The direct and indirect involvement of external actors such as NGOs and donors can be seen in the making of Local Government Regulation No. 16/2008 and Governor Decree No. 13/2009, which officially regulate relations between Dayak communities and the state. During the fieldwork, the director of POKKER SHK explained how NGOs in Central Kalimantan, with support from various grant-making organizations, were actively involved in discussions with provincial governments and politicians before those regulations were issued (personal communication, May 3, 2012). He also confirmed that national donor agencies with international funding, such as Kemitraan, have played a central role in influencing the agenda of indigenous land rights in Central Kalimantan. POKKER SHK itself, he noted, had several collaborations with these donors to conduct participatory mapping activities as well as to enhance forest governance in Central Kalimantan on the basis of indigeneity. Local government–initiated participatory mapping was possible only in

partnership with grant-making organizations, with Kemitraan as a central actor. This dependence on external funding was explained by an officer in the provincial government:

> "Half of the budget is used for providing tools and paying for mapping experts. We only have 200 million rupiahs left for fieldwork [...]. Luckily, we are supported by Kemitraan, even though I am sceptical [that] we can cover all 600 villages. Without Kemitraan, I think it would be difficult to implement the Governor's decree [...]" (September 25, 2012).

Through the Forest Governance Program[iv] funded by the Norwegian Government, Kemitraan has worked in an institutional partnership with the provincial government to enhance governance in Central Kalimantan since 2009. Through this partnership, Kemitraan aimed to develop a model of tenure rights and conflict prevention in Central Kalimantan (NORAD, 2010). Under this institutional partnership, the provincial government and Kemitraan carried out programmes of socialization for Governor Decree No. 13/2009 in 2010 and 2012. An ad hoc team supported by Kemitraan was also established to conduct training in participatory mapping, a pilot inventory project, and the identification and mapping of customary land in three villages, Bawan, Pangi, and Ramang, in Pulang Pisau District. This pilot project successfully inventoried customary land and issued 112 SKTA (Kemitraan, 2012).

The involvement of Kemitraan in local participatory mapping activates can be further considered in light of the One Map initiative, which began in 2011 in cooperation with the Indonesian and Norwegian governments as part of a REDD+ project (Sanders, da Silva Hyldmo, Ford, Larson, & Keenan, 2017). The One Map initiative seeks to create a single reference land use map that synchronizes government agencies' geospatial information and provides the grounds for motions regarding land use in forests relevant to the REDD+ agreement (Astuti & McGregor, 2015; Mulyani & Jepson, 2016). Several NGOs and grant-making agencies have been actively involved in the discussion and negotiation process with the Indonesian Government to integrate customary maps into the One Map. Kasmita Widodo, the Director of the JKPP (the Network for Participatory Mapping), explained the One Map initiative:

> "The issue of customary maps has been our concern since we had dialogues with [governmental representatives] in several forums that specifically discussed the creation of One Map [...]. What is the position of customary maps within that One Map? We expect that customary maps will be integrated into the One Map as a reference for policies in forestry and other sectors, including [those regarding] the issue of climate change. Thematic maps that are made by ministries and governmental agencies, for instance, license and concession maps as well as land cultivation rights and title maps, can be displayed together with customary territory maps by a government agency, such as the Badan Informasi Geospasial" (Geospatial Information Agency).

Indonesian governments at various scales see the One Map initiative as helping the government enhance economic development by harmonizing environmental protection and

investment through the reduction of overlapping claims between local communities and private companies. For NGOs and grant-making agencies, the One Map initiative is seen as a political opportunity for further recognition of adat rights to land; the integration of official maps with customary maps has been on the agenda of NGOs and donor networks in Indonesia since the emergence of participatory mapping in the early 1990s. This new direction in the participatory mapping movement shows how claims through maps are not necessarily a question of producing new sites for making claims at various scales but are also about the way new sites for making claims are produced across scales. Participatory mapping is as much a global site for making claims as it is a local arrangement.

The practical implications of local governmental involvement in participatory mapping of indigenous claims to land and resources and the rescaling of these claims through the One Map initiative are difficult to determine from our data. However, our study suggests that using participatory mapping to bring indigeneity into the formal channels of political expression has mixed implications for the Dayak and their struggle for customary rights. As Castree (2004) notes, such cross-scalar relations do not come without a cost, and it is argued that they may undermine exclusive indigenous rights to land and nature (see also, Escobar, 2001; Greene et al., 2004). Similarly, scholars suggest that techniques of participatory development are deeply embedded in power and politics, which means that they do not necessarily (though possibly) aim for the best for those on the ground (Kesby, 2007; Korf, 2010). One concrete example of resistance to development techniques relevant to the One Map initiative and its articulation in terms of the REDD+ projects in Central Kalimantan is the NoRedd movement (http://no-redd.com). The fieldwork also confirmed that land dispossession continued during the inventory programme (see also Simarmata, 2015), often by means of land ownership certificates produced through participatory mapping. The head of a village participating in a mapping programme voiced the following concern:

> "We actually want the SKTA programme [to] continue so that Dayak people are protected. The problem is that we are also worried that after SKTA are issued, adat lands will be sold to companies. If that happens, it will be difficult for people to do swidden agriculture and fishing. We might end up working on palm oil plantations" (May 10, 2012).

In this statement, we see the paradoxical effects of the legal mapping of customary land. A formal system for the recognition of indigenous rights to lands and resources has been pursued by the Dayak and many other indigenous groups for years and has been a driver of the development of the participatory movement in Central Kalimantan. However, the price may be a kind of legal landlessness wherein the Dayak as a group lose control over their land. This raises the question of how indigeneity, as a site for making claims, should be understood in terms of the political subjectivities produced by participatory mapping, which will be discussed in the following section.

What types of acts (of citizenship) are produced?
We have discussed how participatory mapping through notions of indigeneity can be seen as a site for Dayak claim making and resistance to state territorialisation as well as a way of ordering subjects to comply with a state logic and to become subjects to global policy around

climate change. The question we now raise is how to understand these political acts based on indigeneity and participatory mapping in terms of citizenship.

Prior to 1998, indigeneity did not have legal status in the Indonesian legal system of land rights. Although a type of authoritarian multiculturalism was expressed by the New Order through the slogan "unity through diversity" (Li, 2000), the possibilities for diversity were restricted to those that did not challenge the nation's unity. An extension of the official position, as Li (2000) notes, held that all Indonesians were considered indigenous to Indonesia and that indigeneity could thus not be used as a site for claiming exclusive customary rights within the framework of existing legal structures of the Indonesian state. The long-lasting presence of indigenous Dayak in the regional government in Central Kalimantan did not change this situation as they were unable to represent Dayaks as indigenous peoples with particular rights. Nevertheless, the cartographic-legal strategy contested the spatial foundation of the state through the creation of indigeneity as a site for Dayak struggle by establishing a conception of identity that differed from the state's definition of indigeneity and multiculturalism. Political agency was created, in the vocabulary of Isin (2009), by staging participatory mapping as an act that challenged the existing script for accepted political behaviour as determined by the state. As an act of citizenship, participatory mapping provides the Dayak with the power to transform the state.

It should be noted that such actions contesting the state's hegemony through participatory mapping by the Dayak peasants were not intended to diminish the state's legitimacy as a legal political institution. Instead, as seen above, participatory mapping and affiliate transnational networks became part of Dayak peasants' negotiations with the state to secure rights to their land and have their claims recognized as legitimate. Although the state was considered the main problem and had long denied the Dayak's fundamental claims and their ability to be members of the state, they continued, like many indigenous people in Latin America (see, for example, Canessa, 2014), to fight for a relationship with the state, even as the state continued its politics of dispossession and marginalization (Langer, 2009). A community member who was joining a mapping programme in which a local NGO aimed to help local communities to identify potential land use for inclusion in local spatial planning expressed this relationship as follows:

> "We need international business to by our products, [and] we need international organisation as long as the visions are the same: to produce something from the forest. But we should have the control ourselves. It is not much help to get from [the government], but they should help us to bring back the rubber gardens [owned by local communities]" (April 19, 2016)

The excerpt and the programme in which this person was involved illustrate the mixed attitude towards the state and its role in securing control over land and production. The state is seen both as an enemy and a potential resource for making claims and for gaining control of resources. Nevertheless, the long-term pattern of engagement with the state has had the aim of inclusion in rather overturning the state or negotiating exclusion from it. Claims of customary rights through participatory mapping can, in a sense, be regarded as claims of the right to make claims (as indigenous people within the nation state), which can be seen as an

act that supports the state. Indigeneity thus became both a script of the (regional) state and a possible basis from which the Dayak could act within existing norms and notions of citizenship. Ironically, this implies that participatory mapping lost much of its transformative power as it could no longer rely on indigeneity as a site for transformative acts that challenged the basis of citizenship as a state institution. Instead, the construction of an indigenous state (at the province level) paved the way for participatory mapping to become part of the state's strategy for making land governable.

Canessa (2014) illustrates this point with Latin American examples of how discourses of indigeneity can be enabling for marginalized peoples who would not otherwise have access to international courts or the global mobilization of interest groups. This is what Li (2000) calls the 'tribal slot'. However, as Canessa argues, indigeneity may be inadequate for addressing conflicts between different groups of indigenous people within a nation state and even less adequate for conflicts between indigenous people and an indigenous state. Both lines of conflict are apparent in the Central Kalimantan case, which raises important critical questions about the transformative power of participatory mapping. The implications of the Indonesian state's embrace of indigeneity is therefore not obvious. As Li (2000, p. 174) has noted, the "discourse on indigenous people in Indonesia has emerged from new visions and connections that have created moments of opportunity, but there are no guarantees". It should be recalled that indigenous people have long been present in the provincial government (van Klinken, 2002, 2006), although only recently has indigeneity become a legal principle in the province for making claims as citizens. Hence, following the perspective of Isin (2009), participatory mapping enabled the Dayak to make legal claims to land as citizens, but political agency was restricted to the reproduction of the basic order of society, which implies the subordination of Dayak peasants. Similarly, the legal-cartographic strategy associated with the participatory mapping movement in Central Kalimantan gave the Dayak the right to make claims but not necessarily to access or utilize customary land for their own resource extraction.

This situation is not unique to Central Kalimantan. As Peluso et al. (2013) note, "Contrary to expectations, land formalization is becoming a means of enabling wealthy international and elite domestic actors to acquire land and benefit from its productions or from speculation". In the present case, the Dayak secured legal recognition of their customary land, but the land had to be enrolled in the state land system as a potential commodity, enabling the dispossession of land for purposes such as integration into the global economy or global political initiatives related to climate policy. A member of the Borneo Climate online open discussion group expressed this situation in the following way in a posting (May 03, 2012):

> "When customary land has already got land certificates then it is just a step ahead toward land loss, legally. The lands will gradually be transferred to businessmen and those who have money. Never come back. Land certificate will change into bank notes. When it happens, *adat* communities, full of awareness and happiness, hand over their land for money. And just see. Two or three days they will complain to anybody with tears in their eyes. Complaining [about] their land loss. The land has changed into palm oil plantations, mining areas, real estate, or whatever".

This reasoning by scholars as well as local activists explains why dispersion and various forms of land grabbing continue, albeit within a legal framework that now recognizes indigeneity as a site for exclusive rights to land. Participatory mapping has thus become an integral form of "neoliberal citizenship" (Sparke, 2006) or "neoliberal multiculturalism" (Hale, 2005). The multicultural ideology promoted during the authoritarian Suharto regime was limited, but the same can be said of the new neoliberal multiculturalism that developed in Indonesia during the recent era of democratic reform. Therefore, one can question whether state involvement in the participatory mapping of customary land was a result of previous counter-mapping and its success in challenging the state or whether the state successfully absorbed the participatory mapping movement and notions of indigeneity into a state logic with its own language of regulation through legal maps. Our empirical observations do not offer a clear answer but suggest that the answer must be in the middle. Although the regional state has embraced the notion of indigeneity and internalized practices of participatory mapping, at least partly for the sake of its own interest, the struggle continues through new formations. The fieldwork provides clear examples of how the process of making claims on customary land through participatory mapping created a foundation for a new awareness among the Dayak in terms of the struggle to control resources. As one informant from a community involved in participatory mapping claimed when discussing recent developments in participatory mapping, "*we now know better how to use the government to advance our own interests*".

In summary, transforming the principle of citizenship into acceptance of indigeneity as a legal basis for making claims does not necessarily translate into indigenous control of customary land and resources. This understanding is in line with Wainwright and Bryan (2009), who contend that maps and laws are not sufficient instruments for settling indigenous claims. Maps, they argue, can only be effective in making such claims if attention is paid to indigenous peoples' efforts to transform their social and spatial relations in ways that may transcend the concepts of territory and property. Similarly, several researchers contend that participatory mapping per se does not resolve issues related to the control of land (Bryan, 2009; Dewi, 2016; Reyes-García et al., 2012; Wainwright & Bryan, 2009; Warren, 2005a, 2005b). In the words of Sletto (2015, p. 2), "Participatory cartographies thus emerge as an ironic and troubling reproduction of cartographic domination through erasure despite its emancipatory aims as a project of visibilization and emergence on behalf of the subaltern". However, this does not imply that the cartographic- legal strategy for gaining indigenous rights in Central Kalimantan has been useless or that partnership with the government was a mistake in terms of gaining rights to customary land. One POKKER SHK activist explained this issue as follows:

> "[W]e see participatory mapping both as a tool for land struggle and as an arena for raising political awareness about indigenous land rights. We train people to use GPS and to map their land. We assist them in exploring their history regarding their relations to land, water, and forests in their areas. For us, participatory mapping can be used for kaderisasi (cadre formation) and political education. That is why we train local peasants, not students. Why? Training and educating local peasants in mapping and advocacy is very important because they are social groups who directly face land problems. We want them to solve their own problems" (May 2012).

Our informants, particularly NGO activists such as the POKKER SHK activist cited above, highlight how collaboration with the state in combination with engagement in transnational activist networks has revitalized the political capacity of the movement.

5. Concluding remarks

In this paper, by approaching participatory mapping processes as acts of citizenship, we have revealed indigenous citizenship as more than concern about particular rights at a particular place and a particular time. Indigenous citizenship, we argue, develops over time and through connections across scales and is composed of an assemblage of actors that transcends the borders of the state and expands the formerly exclusive relationship between the state and citizens in the making of citizenship. Hence, we suggest that understanding the construction of indigenous citizenship through participatory mapping requires us to suspend the conventional notion of scale as hierarchical. Doing so also requires us to challenge the territorial fixity that often appears in citizenship studies (Isin, 2007). Isin's (2009) concepts and vocabulary of citizenship may provide a direction for advancing a dynamic perspective of indigenous citizenship. By applying the concepts of acts together with an open approach to actors and sites/scales as a basic analytical lens through which to understand citizenship, we are able to explore the question of membership (or the lack thereof) and reveal some of the changing conditions in the making of indigenous citizenship through participatory mapping.

This processual perspective emphasizes that participatory mapping as a cartographic-legal strategy, despite being obviously useful, cannot provide a final answer to the problems that Dayak peasants face in terms of control over land and resources. Similar to other techniques of participation (Kesby, 2007; Korf, 2010), participatory mapping has obvious limitations. We have shown, through the notion of indigeneity, that participatory mapping has enabled the Dayak and their associates to challenge the foundation of national citizenship by redefining the basis for making claims to local customary land and resources. However, as reflected in the case of Central Kalimantan, the political character of indigeneity has changed as the state has embraced the idea of indigeneity and included it in the legal foundations of the state as well as through its incorporation into the global discourse on climate change. One could argue that the Dayak in Central Kalimantan have won their struggle against the state because they have secured the right to raise exclusive claims to land and resources as indigenous people. However, Dayak peasants could also be said to have lost as they continue to face land dispossession and marginalization, albeit now under the auspices of the indigenous state. The victory of gaining these new rights should not be underestimated. However, we argue that legal rights are insufficient to enable Dayak peasants to make a decent living from the land on which they have lived for centuries and the associated resources. The recognition of legal claims through participatory mapping is therefore not likely to be the end but rather the beginning of Dayak peasants' struggle for rights to customary land. This underscores the importance of understanding participatory mapping as a process that involves the continuous creation and redefinition of knowledge (Kitchin, 2014; Sletto, 2015). It is not so much a matter of becoming proper citizens of the state but of the continuous construction of citizenship. It is also about how participatory mapping is changing from a cartographic-legal

strategy into part of a growing political awareness emerging from the Dayak peasants' engagement with maps, legal instruments, national political actors, global social justice movements, and the state apparatus.

The processual perspective as it appears in the investigated case is also interesting because it both underscores and challenges Isin's (2009) clear distinction between acts from active citizens using existing scripts for acceptable behaviours and acts from activist citizens who transgress existing norms to claim rights. We have seen how maps and mapping, combined with the notion of indigeneity, appeared as powerful acts that challenged the non-indigenous state. In the words of Isin, participatory mapping through national and transnational political networks working on issues related to land use and resource extraction from tropical forests became an act of citizenship that transformed citizenship as a foundation of the state. However, the creation and use of maps as part of a cartographic-legal strategy are also deeply rooted in the formation of the state and control over its territory and citizens. Hence, the strategy largely relies on existing routines and institutions within the state, which are reinforced through the practice of participatory mapping. Mapping, as a means of identifying private or community-based ownership of land and resources, is an example of such a state-based institution. Thus, participatory mapping simultaneously challenges, produces and reproduces the state. As seen in the construction of indigenous citizenship through participatory mapping in Central Kalimantan, this challenges the clear distinction between active and activist means of making claims of citizenship as they are mutually constitutive. We suggest that this distinction between being active and being an activist is most relevant and useful in terms of how it is used analytically rather than for identifying particular acts. The distinction is particularly interesting as it prepares the ground for identifying the dialectic between the two forms of acts and possibly within the same act, such as an act of participatory mapping. It is this dialectical process between acts as being active and acts as being an activist that seems to be the driving force behind the dynamic process of the creation of indigenous citizenship in Central Kalimantan through involvement in participatory mapping.

References

Allen, A., Lambert, R., Apsan Frediani, A., & Ome, T. (2015). Can participatory mapping activate spatial and political practices? Mapping popular resistance and dwelling practices in Bogotá eastern hills. *Area*, *47*(3), 261-271. doi:10.1111/area.12187

Allen, J. (2016). Topologies of power: Beyond territory and networks. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Arendt, H. (1968). The origins of totalitarianism. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Arnold, L. L. (2008). Deforestation in decentralised Indonesia: What's law got to do with it? *Law, Environment and Development Journal, 4*(2), 1-31.

Arora-Jonsson, S., Westholm, L., Temu, B. J., & Petitt, A. (2015). Carbon and cash in climate assemblages: the making of a new global citizenship. *Antipode*, *48*(1), 74-96. doi:10.1111/anti.12170

Asher, K., & Ojeda, D. (2009). Producing nature and making the state: Ordenamiento territorial in the Pacific lowlands of Colombia. *Geoforum*, *40*(3), 292–302. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2008.09.014

Astuti, R., & McGregor, A. (2015). Responding to the green economy: How REDD+ and the One Map Initiative are transforming forest governance in Indonesia. *Third World Quarterly*, *36*(12), 2273-2293. doi:10.1080/01436597.2015.1082422

Borras Jr, S. M., & Ross, E. B. (2007). Land rights, conflict, and violence amid neo-liberal globalization. *Peace Review*, *19*(1), 1-4. doi:10.1080/10402650601181915

Bryan, J. (2009). Where would we be without them? Knowledge, space and power in indigenous politics. *Futures*, *41*(1), 24-32. doi:10.1016/j.futures.2008.07.005

Bryan, J. (2011). Walking the line: Participatory mapping, indigenous rights, and neoliberalism. *Geoforum*, *42*(1), 40-50. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2010.09.001

Canessa, A. (2012). New indigenous citizenship in Bolivia: Challenging the liberal model of the state and its subjects. *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies*, *7*(2), 201-221. doi:10.1080/17442222.2012.686335

Canessa, A. (2014). Conflict, claim and contradiction in the new 'indigenous' state of Bolivia. *Critique of Anthropology*, *34*(2), 153-173. doi:10.1177/0308275X13519275

Castree, N. (2004). Differential geographies: Place, indigenous rights and 'local' resources. *Political Geography*, *23*(2), 133-167. doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2003.09.010

Colchester, M., Jiwan, N., Martua Sirait, A., Firdaus, A. Y., Surambo, A., & Pane, H. (2006). *Promised land: Palm oil and land acquisitions in Indonesia. Implications for local communities and indigenous peoples.* Moreton-in-Marsh, UK: Forest Peoples Programme.

Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (2001). *Participation: The new tyranny?* London, UK: Zed Books.

Coombes, B., Johnson, J. T., & Howitt, R. (2012). Indigenous geographies I: Mere resource conflicts? The complexities in indigenous land and environmental claims. *Progress in Human Geography*, *36*(6), 810–821. doi:10.1177/0309132511431410

Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking 'Participation': models, meanings and practices. *Community Development Journal*, *43*(3), 269-283. doi:10.1093/cdj/bsn010

Cotula, L. (2012). The international political economy of the global land rush: A critical appraisal of trends, scale, geography and drivers. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *39*(3-4), 649-680. doi:10.1080/03066150.2012.674940

Crampton, J. W. (2009). Cartography: Performative, participatory, political. *Progress in Human Geography*, *33*(6), 840–848. doi:10.1177/0309132508105000

Cumbers, A., Routledge, P., & Nativel, C. (2008). The entangled geographies of global justice networks. *Progress in Human Geography*, *32*(2), 183-201. doi:10.1177/0309132507084818

Deininger, K., & Binswanger, H. (1999). The evolution of the World Bank's land policy: Principles, experience, and future challenges. *World Bank Research Observer*, *14*(2), 247-276. doi:10.1093/wbro/14.2.247

Delanty, G. (2000). *Citizenship in a global age: Society, culture, politics*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Delanty, G. (2007). Theorizing citizenship in global age. In W. Hudson & S. Slaughter (Eds.), *Globalisation and citizenship. The transnational challenge* (pp. 15-29). London, UK: Routledge.

Dewi, R. (2016). Gaining recognition through participatory mapping? The role of adat land in the implementation of the Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate in Papua, Indonesia. *Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies*, *9*(1), 87-105.

Dove, M. R. (2006). 'New barbarism' or old agency among the Dayak? Reflections on post-Suharto ethnic violence in Kalimantan. *Social Analysis*, *50*(1), 192-202. doi:10.3167/015597706780886

Earth Innovation Institute. (2015). Central Kalimantan land governance assessment. Retrieved May 2016 from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTLGA/Resources/Central_Kalimantan_Final_Report.pdf

Escobar, A. (2001). Culture sits in places: Reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization. *Political Geography*, *20*(2), 139–174. doi:10.1016/S0962-6298(00)00064-0

Fairhead, J., Leach, M., & Scoones, I. (2012). Green grabbing: A new appropriation of nature? *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *39*(2), 237-261. doi:10.1080/03066150.2012.671770

Fried, S. G. (2003). Writing for their lives: Bentian Dayak authors and Indonesian development discourse. In C. Zerner (Ed.), *Culture and the question of rights: Forests, coasts, and seas in Southeast Asia* (pp. 142-183). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Gellert, P. K. (2010). Extractive regimes: Toward a better understanding of Indonesian development. *Rural Sociology*, *75*(1), 28-57.

Greene, S., Banerjee, S., Bannister, K., Brush, S., Castree, N., Dhillion, S., . . . Castro, N.R. (2004). Indigenous people incorporated? Culture as politics, culture as property in pharmaceutical bioprospecting. *Current Anthropology, 45*(2), 211-237.

Hadi, K. (2007). Pasak adat di bawah atap negara birokrat (Order) Baru [Adat under the roof of the New Order's bureaucratic state]. In B. Susanto (Ed.), *Masih(kah) Indonesia?* [Is Indonesia still there?] (pp. 203-258). Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Penerbit Kanisius.

Hale, C. R. (2002). Does multiculturalism menace? Governance, cultural rights and the politics of identity in Guatemala. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, *34*(3), 485–524. doi:10.1017/S0022216X02006521

Hale, C. (2004). Rethinking indigenous politics in the era of the 'indio permitido.' *NACLA Report on the Americas, 38*(2), 16-21.

Hale, C. R. (2005). Neoliberal multiculturalism: The remaking of cultural rights and racial dominance in Central America. *Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, *28*(1), 10-28. doi:10.1525/pol.2005.28.1.10

Harley, J. B. (1988). Maps, knowledge and power. In D. Cosgrove & S. Daniels (Eds.), *The iconography of landscape* (pp. 227-312). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Harley, J. B. (1989). Deconstructing the map. *Cartographica*, *26*(2), 1-20. doi:10.3138/E635-7827-1757-9T53

Isin, E. F. (2007). City.State: Critique of scalar thought. *Citizenship Studies*, *11*(2), 211–228. doi:10.1080/13621020701262644

Isin, E. F. (2008). Theorizing acts of citizenship. In E. F. Isin & G. M. Nielsen (Eds.), *Acts of citizenship* (pp. 15-43). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Isin, E. F. (2009). Citizenship in flux: The figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity*, *29*(1), 367–388. doi:10.1057/sub.2009.25

Isin, E. F. (2012). Citizens without nations. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *30*(3), 450-467.

Isin, E. F., & Turner, B. S. (2007). Investigating citizenship: An agenda for citizenship studies. *Citizenship Studies*, *11*(1), 5-17. doi:10.1080/13621020601099773

Kemitraan. (2012). *Tata kepemerintahan dalam sektor kehutanan, ringkasan capaian Forest Governance Program (FGP 2) 2011-2012*. Partnership for Governance Reform Indonesia.

Kesby, M. (2007). Spatialising participatory approaches: The contribution of geography to a mature debate. *Environment and Planning A*, *39*(12), 2813-2831.

Kitchin, R. (2014). From mathematical to post-representational understandings of cartography: Forty years of mapping theory and praxis. *Progress in Human Geography*. doi:10.1177/0309132514562946

Korf, B. (2010). The geography of participation. *Third World Quarterly*, *31*(5), 709-720.

Kurniawan, N. I., & Rye, S. A. (2014). Online environmental activism and internet use in the Indonesian environmental movement. *Information Development, 30*(3), 200-212. doi:10.1177/0266666913485260

Langer, E. D. (2009). Bringing the economic back in: Andean Indians and the construction of the nation-state in nineteenth-century Bolivia. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, *41*(3), 527–551. doi:10.1017/S0022216X09990174

Larson, A. (2004). Formal decentralisation and the imperative of decentralisation 'from below': A case study of natural resource management in Nicaragua. *European Journal of Development Research*, *16*(1), 55-70. doi:10.1080/09578810410001688734

Li, T. M. (2000). Articulating indigenous identity in Indonesia: Resource politics and the tribal slot. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *42*(1), 149-179. doi:10.1017/S0010417500002632

Li, T. M. (2002). Ethnic cleansing, recursive knowledge, and the dilemmas of sedentarism. *International Social Science Journal*, *54*(173), 361-371. doi:10.1111/1468-2451.00388

Li, T. M. (2007a). Practices of assemblage and community forest management. *Economy and Society*, *36*(2), 263–293. doi:10.1080/03085140701254308

Li, T. M. (2007b). *The will to improve: Governmentality, development, and the practice of politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lindayati, R. (2003). Shaping local forest tenure in national politics. In N. Dolsak & E. Ostrom (Eds.), *The commons in the new Millennium: Challenges and adaptations* (pp. 221-264). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McCall, M. K., & Dunn, C. E. (2012). Geo-information tools for participatory spatial planning: Fulfilling the criteria for 'good' governance? *Geoforum*, *43*(1), 81–94. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.07.007

McCarthy, J. F. (2004). Changing to gray: Decentralization and the emergence of volatile socio-legal configurations in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *World Development*, *32*(7), 1199-1223.

McCarthy, J. F., Vel, J. A., & Afiff, S. (2012). Trajectories of land acquisition and enclosure: Development schemes, virtual land grabs, and green acquisitions in Indonesia's Outer Islands. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *39*(2), 521-549.

Mulyani, M., & Jepson, P. (2016). Does the 'one map initiative' represent a new path for forest mapping in Indonesia? Assessing the contribution of the REDD+ initiative in effecting forest governance reform. *Forests*, *8*(1), 14. doi:10.3390/f8010014

Niezen, R. (2003). *The origins of indigenism: Human rights and the politics of identity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

NN.

NORAD. (2010). Multistakeholder forestry program - Milestones and challenges, 2010. *Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation*. Retrieved from

https://www.norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/2010/multistakeholder-forestry-program-milestones-and-challenges-2010/

Ong, O. (2006). *Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Pacheco, P. (2004). What lies behind decentralisation? Forest, powers and actors in lowland Bolivia. *European Journal of Development Research*, *16*(1), 90-109. doi:10.1080/09578810410001688752

Peluso, N. L. (1995). Whose woods are these? Counter-mapping forest territories in Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Antipode*, *27*(4), 383-406. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8330.1995.tb00286.x

Peluso, N. L., Afiff, S., & Rachman, N. F. (2008). Claiming the grounds for reform: Agrarian and environmental movements in Indonesia. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *8*(2-3), 377-407.

Peluso, N. L., Kelly, A. B., & Kevin, W. (2013). Context in land matters: Access effects and history in land formalization. In Commoners and the Changing Commons: Livelihoods, Environmental Security, and Shared Knowledge, the Fourteenth Biennial Conference of the International Association for the Study of the Commons. Bloomington, IN: IASC.

Persoon, G. (1998). Isolated groups or indigenous peoples: Indonesia and the international discourse. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde*, *154*(2), 281-304. doi:10.1163/22134379-90003899

Postero, N. (2007). *Now we are citizens: Indigenous politics in postmulticultural Bolivia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pramono, A. H., Natalia, I., & Janting, Y. (2006). *Ten years after: Counter-mapping and the Dayak lands in west Kalimantan, Indonesia*. In *Survival of the Commons: Mounting Challenges and New Realities, the Eleventh Conference of the International Association for the Study of Common Property*. Bloomington, IN: IASCP.

Pye, O. (2010). The biofuel connection – Transnational activism and the palm oil boom. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *37*(4), 851-874. doi:10.1080/03066150.2010.512461

Pykett, J., Saward, M., & Schaefer, A. (2010). Framing the good citizen. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *12*(4), 523–538. doi:10.1111/j.1467-856X.2010.00424.x

Radcliffe, S. A. (2015). Geography and indigeneity I: Indigeneity, coloniality and knowledge. *Progress in Human Geography*, *41*(2) 220–229.

Radcliffe, S. A. (2017). Geography and indigeneity II: Critical geographies of indigenous bodily politics. *Progress in Human Geography*. doi:10.1177/0309132517691631

Radjawali, I., Pye, O., & Flitner, M. (2017). Recognition through reconnaissance? Using drones for counter-mapping in Indonesia. *Journal of Peasant Studies*. doi:10.1080/03066150.2016.1264937

Refstie, H., & Brun, C. (2016). Voicing noise: Political agency and the trialectics of participation in urban Malawi. *Geoforum*, *74*, 136-146. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.05.012

Resosudarmo, I. A. P. (2004). Closer to people and trees: Will decentralisation work for the people and the forests of Indonesia? *European Journal of Development Research*, *16*(1), 110-132. doi:10.1080/09578810410001688761

Reyes-García, V., Orta-Martínez, M., Gueze, M., Luz, A. C., Paneque-Gálvez, J., Macía, M. J., & Pino, J. (2012). Does participatory mapping increase conflicts? A randomized evaluation in the Bolivian Amazon. *Applied Geography*, *34*, 650-658. doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2012.04.007

Rosaldo, R. (2003). Introduction: The boarderes of belonging. In R. Rosaldo (Ed.), *Cultural citizenship in island Southeast Asia: Nation and belonging in the hinterlands* (pp. 1-15). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Safitri, M. A. (2009). The mystery of formalising informal land tenure in the forest frontier: The case of Langkawana, Lampung, Indonesia. In J. M. Ubink, Á. J. Hoekema, & W. J. Assies (Eds.), *Legalising land rights: Local practices, state responses and tenure security in Africa, Asia and Latin America* (pp. 549-574). Leiden, Netherlands: Leiden University Press.

Sanders, A. J., da Silva Hyldmo, H., Ford, R. M., Larson, A. M., & Keenan, R. J. (2017). Guinea pig or pioneer: Translating global environmental objectives through to local actions in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia's REDD+ pilot province. *Global Environmental Change*, *42*, 68-81.

Sassen, S. (2005). The repositioning of citizenship and alienage: Emergent subjects and spaces for politics. *Globalizations*, *2*(1), 79-94. doi:10.1080/14747730500085114

Savino, L. (2016). Landscapes of contrast: The neo-extractivist state and indigenous peoples in "post-neoliberal" Argentina. *Extractive Industries and Society*, *3*(2), 404-415. doi:10.1016/j.exis.2016.02.011

Schattle, H. (2008). *The practices of global citizenship*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Simarmata, R. (2015). Kedudukan hukum dan peluang pengakuan Surat Keterangan Tanah Adat [The legal position and the opportunity of recognition of statement letter of customary land]. *Kemitraan Partnership*. Retrieved from http://www.kemitraan.or.id/sites/default/files/Hasil%20Studi%20SKTA%20Kalteng%20by%20Ricardo%20Simarmata.pdf

Sletto, B. (2002). Boundary making and regional identities in a globalized environment: Reordering the Nariva swamp, Trinidad. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *20*(2), 183-208. doi:10.1068/d325

Sletto, B. (2009). 'Indigenous people don't have boundaries': Reborderings, fire management, and productions of authenticities in indigenous landscapes. *Cultural Geographies, 16*(2), 253-277. doi:10.1177/1474474008101519

Sletto, B. (2015). Inclusions, erasures and emergences in an indigenous landscape: Participatory cartographies and the makings of affective place in the Sierra de Perija, Venezuela. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 33, 925–944. doi:10.1177/0263775815604927

Sparke, M. B. (2006). A neoliberal nexus: Economy, security and the biopolitics of citizenship on the border. *Political Geography*, *25*(2), 151-180. doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2005.10.002

Staeheli, L. A. (2008). Citizenship and the problem of community. *Political Geography*, *27*(1), 5-21. doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2007.09.002

Staeheli, L. A. (2011). Political geography: Where's citizenship? *Progress in Human Geography*, *35*(3), 393–400. doi:10.1177/0309132510370671

Staeheli, L. A., Attoh, K., & Mitchell, D. (2013). Contested engagements: Youth and the politics of citizenship. *Space and Polity*, *17*(1), 88–105. doi:10.1080/13562576.2013.780715

Tsing, A. (2004). *Frictions: An ethnography of global connections*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

van Klinken, G. (2002). Indonesia's new ethnic elites. In H. S. Nordholt & I. Abdullah (Eds.), *Indonesia: In search of transition* (pp. 67-105). Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Pustaka Pelajar.

van Klinken, G. (2006). Colonizing Borneo: State-building and ethnicity in Central Kalimantan. *Indonesia*, (81), 23–50.

Wainwright, J., & Bryan, J. (2009). Cartography, territory, property: postcolonial reflections on indigenous counter-mapping in Nicaragua and Belize. *Cultural Geographies*, *16*(2), 153-178. doi:10.1177/1474474008101515

Warren, C. (2005a). Community mapping, local planning and alternative land use strategies in Bali. *Geografisk Tidsskrift-Danish Journal of Geography*, *105*(1), 29-41. doi:10.1080/00167223.2005.10649524

Warren, C. (2005b). Mapping common futures: Customary communities, NGOs and the state in Indonesia's reform era. *Development and Change*, *36*(1), 49–73. doi:10.1111/j.0012-155X.2005.00402.x

Warren, C., & McCarthy, J. (2002). Customary regimes and collective goods in Indonesia's changing political Constellation. In S. Sargeson (Ed.), *Collective goods, collective futures in Asia* (pp. 75-101). London, UK: Routledge.

Wilson, P. C. (2008). Neoliberalism, indigeneity and social engineering in Ecuador's Amazon. *Critique of Anthropology*, *28*(2), 127-144.

Zimmerer, K. S. (2015). Environmental governance through "speaking like an indigenous state" and respatializing resources: Ethical livelihood concepts in Bolivia as versatility or verisimilitude? *Geoforum*, *64*, 314-324. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.07.004

---

[i] Customary land rights here refer to the concept of *adat,* a term used in Indonesia to describe complex customary systems, including rights to land and resources. However, *adat* also refers to a wide range of traditional rules, conventions, principles, and beliefs.

[ii] The word 'Dayak', which has become standard in the literature on Borneo, was a loose colonial term referring to indigenous, non-Muslim, and non-Chinese inhabitants of Borneo, most of whom are, or were, swidden cultivators residing in the interior of Borneo. Dayak includes several ethnic groups (Dove, 2006).

[iii] For instance, the Governor of Central Kalimantan, Teras Narang, is also the head of the National Dayak Adat Council. Sabran Achmad, the head of the Dayak Adat Council of Central Kalimantan, was a lawmaker from the Golkar Party and a co-founder of the Central Kalimantan Province. The Mayor of Palangkaraya, Riban Satria, is the head of the Dayak Adat Council of Palangkaraya. Mantir L. Nusa, the head of the Dayak Adat Council of Katingan District, is also a local legislator in Katingan. Arton S. Dohong is the head of the Dayak Adat Council and is the acting Bupati of the Gunung Mas District.

[iv] The Forest Governance Program is funded by the Government of Norway and has been implemented by PGRI since August 2007. Central Kalimantan has been one of the main targets of this programme due its large forest area and its potential problems. Through this programme, Kemitraan aims to fund and support multi-stakeholder partnerships that improve forest governance, deliver more equitable benefits to primary forest stakeholders, and encourage more sustainable management of forest resources (NORAD, 2010).