Customary assets conflict and their impact on social relations fragmentations

Konflik aset adat dan dampaknya terhadap merenggangnya relasi sosial

Bayu Adhinata
Department of Government, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Warmadewa
Address: Jalan Terompong, Sumerta Kelod, Denpasar, Bali 80239
E-mail: bayuadhinata@warmadewa.ac.id

Abstract

This research focuses on studying conflicts involving traditional villages in fighting over the ownership status of the Temple of Death *(Pura Dalem)* as an asset that must be owned by a traditional village. Conflict involving two traditional villages in Bali, namely Kemoning and Budaga Village in Klungkung, resulted from a claim of ownership by one of the parties ahead of a massive celebration tribute to this temple's birth centuries ago. The ownership claim led to rejection from another party, who said their traditional village was also entitled to the Temple of Death. This mutual ownership claim then escalated into an open conflict that resulted in casualties and injuries between the two parties. This research seeks to outline the root problems of this conflict and describe the actors, dynamics, and impacts of the conflict. This study used a qualitative approach through in-depth interviews with five informants consisting of two key informants (former heads of the Kemoning and Budaga Villages), one Klungkung resort police officer, and two people Kemoning and Budaga Village residents. Moore, Mitchell, Furlong, and Kriesberg use several perspectives to analyze the social conflict. The results showed that the problem of the two traditional villages lies in the inaccuracy of historical data, besides that there are different perspectives between the two parties about the existence of this temple, excessive control, and dominance in the management and poor communication caused the emergence of a hostile relationship pattern, raising mutual claims over the ownership of this Temple of Death. The dispute that led to this clash created an increasingly tenuous relationship between the two traditional villages.

Keywords: traditional village; ownerships claim; conflict

Abstrak

Penelitian ini berfokus pada studi konflik yang melibatkan desa adat dalam memperebutkan status kepemilikan Pura Dalem sebagai aset yang harus dimiliki oleh desa tradisional. Konflik yang melibatkan dua desa adat di Bali, adalah Desa Kemoning dan Budaga di Klungkung, adalah akibat dari klaim kepemilikan oleh salah satu pihak menjelang perayaan penghormatan besar terhadap dibangunnya pura ini berabad-abad yang lalu. Klaim kepemilikan menyebabkan penolakan dari pihak lain yang mengatakan bahwa desa adat mereka juga berhak atas Pura Dalem ini. Klaim kepemilikan bersama ini kemudian berkembang menjadi konflik terbuka yang mengakibatkan korban dan cedera di antara kedua pihak. Penelitian ini berupaya menguraikan akar permasalahan dari konflik ini serta menggambarkan aktor, dinamika, dan dampak yang terjadi setelah konflik. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif melalui wawancara mendalam terhadap lima informan yang terdiri dari dua informan kunci (mantan kepala Desa Kemoning dan Budaga), satu petugas kepolisian resor Klungkung, dan dua orang dari warga Desa Kemoning dan Budaga. Untuk menganalisis konflik, beberapa perspektif tentang analisis konflik sosial digunakan oleh Moore, Mitchell, Furlong, dan Kriesberg. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa masalah dua desa adat ini terletak pada ketidakakuratan data historis, selain itu ada perbedaan perspektif antara kedua pihak tentang keberadaan pura ini, kontrol yang berlebihan dan dominasi dalam pengelolaan dan komunikasi yang buruk menyebabkan munculnya pola hubungan yang bermusuhan menimbulkan saling klaim atas kepemilikan Pura Dalem ini. Perselisihan yang menyebabkan bentrokan ini akhirnya menciptakan pola hubungan yang semakin renggang antara kedua desa adat.

Kata kunci: desa adat; klaim kepemilikan; konflik

Introduction

Balinese traditional villages have a healthy social organization system to create harmony for their people. One of them is Tri Hita Karana, three things that can bring prosperity and obtain this by carrying out a harmonious relationship between God and humans, fellow humans, and the environment.

Another way is *Paras-Paros Salunglung Sabayantaka*; it means together when happy and unhappy. Despite that philosophy, it does not mean the traditional village in Bali can evade conflict. Windia et al. (2009) mentioned that customary conflicts could arise if there are a customary violation and the disharmonious village atmosphere. The conflict between traditional villages or between social groups inside the traditional village is frequently about seizing village assets that have economic value, boundary issues, village expansion, and conflict caused by traditions that have been carried out from time to time and binding the traditional society. In Bali, traditional society is a community that has a particular living area with life and religious style based on Hindu thought, and also has a customary land tenure. The conflict between traditional villages caught in Bali's public attention was the conflict between Kemoning and Budaga Village in Klungkung. These two neighboring villages were involved in the disputed agenda regarding ownership of the Temple of Death *(Pura Dalem)*. Bali's traditional village has three main temples for worshiping God's manifestation, Temple of Death is a temple to revere Lord Shiva, and these are very common; there is also an ancestral grave beside this temple to hold the ngaben ritual to incinerate the dead. As a result of this conflict and dispute, these two traditional villages have been involved in violent conflict in 2011.

Several perspectives explain the cause of the social conflict; Mitchell (1981) stated that conflict arises because there is a relationship between two or more parties with incompatible goals. Moore (1986) stated that the conflicting units' characteristics in social conflicts are in situations and conditions where these units do not mutually agree. Social conflict occurs when two or more parties believe they have different goals and desires. There are differences in resources between the parties involved affecting the conflicting tools used by each party. The opposing party wants resources controlled by one party because they promise large profits. Moore (1986) also stated that conflict could occur because of two or more parties fighting over a value and competition between the parties to get the status of power or scarce or limited resources. This value is related to the values of life concerning beliefs or religiosity, ethics, and morals. Conflicts related to values can occur if the parties have different values that clash and cause or worsen the situation (Furlong 2005). Moore (1986) mentions five causes of conflict: data problems, interest, structure, value, and relations between individuals or groups.

Conflict is divided into substantive and affective conflict. Substantive conflict is the perception that exists among group members with a disagreement on issues concerning goals, critical decisions, procedures for achieving goals, and the accuracy of choice of actions. Meanwhile, affective conflicts are perceptions among group members that lead to interpersonal clashes characterized by anger, distrust, fear, frustration, and other forms of negative influence (Pelled 1996, Chaudhry & Asif 2015). Conflicts related to identity arise and originate from disagreements about identity itself. According to von Benda-Beckmann & von Benda-Beckmann (2012), identity is the result of the identification process in social relations. Identity also allows people to tell their day-to-day relationships and relate them to past stories. Collective identity has normative and cognitive meaning; it means to understand themselves and form norms of behavior. Collective identity also has a function in identifying individuals, groups, and organizations (Arjawa 2014). In social societies, there is a social structure, consolidated, and intersected. The consolidated society is more likely to develop a strong group identity, and group cohesion is more easily created even more robust. In this type of community, conflict awareness tends to be high so that when conflicts occur with other groups, the conflicting intensity also has a higher tendency. Meanwhile, in an intersected community, awareness of conflict is more challenging to develop so that the conflicting intensity tends to low (Mas'oed et al. 2001).

Kemoning and Budaga Village practice the use of the Temple of Death together; and by another traditional village, such as Kerobokan Pakraman Village in Badung and Padang Sambian Pakraman Village in Denpasar City. This research conducted by Priyanto et al. (2012) explains that two neighboring traditional villages were once involved in conflict regarding the use of the Temple of Death; however, that problem resolved peacefully. These two traditional villages agreed to divide the grave land, one side for the Kerobokan and the other for the Padang Sambian. There is still one Temple of Death used by each traditional village (Priyanto et al. 2012). The same conflict was also between Kemoning and Budaga Village; however, it was inversely proportional to the Kerobokan and Padang Sambian cases because between Kemoning and Budaga involved clashes and claims over the temple.

In other research, the conflict between traditional villages happens because they try to build the temple's identity to maintain its ownership-based social identities, such as ancestry, caste, and social structure. The temple does not trigger conflict; however, is the target of the owner's sensitivity, and if this intersects with the interests of tourism and another economic development sector, conflict can easily affect solidarity and lead to massive acts (Arjawa 2014). Kumar (2013) explains the conflicts that occur due to differences in addressing temples' existence and ceremonial processions in the Temple of Death. Kumar (2013) examines the Klungkung Customary Middle Council's leadership role in the conflict between Kemoning and Budaga Village. The council's settlement efforts in reconciling the two warring parties carried out through mediation and deliberation; however, the effort was unsuccessful in reconciling the two parties because the role of the Klungkung Customary Middle Council had not been maximized in creating harmony between the two traditional villages of Kemoning and Budaga (Kumar 2013).

Clashes between the Kemoning and Budaga Villages gave rise to casualties and damaged some public facilities. In the past, these two traditional villages used this Temple of Death and ancestral grave together in daily routine rituals or on certain days, such as a death ceremony or better known as *ngaben* in Bali. Large ceremonies to commemorate the existence of a Temple of Death are also done together; however, social changes that happened in traditional village society gave rise to a dispute about the ownership of the Temple of Death. In the end, they reacted by installing a sign called *wawengkon* according to each version of these two traditional villages, and this led to the clash between them. The problem to be addressed in this research is how the conflict began; it is dynamic and impacted between Kemoning and Budaga Village.

Research Method

This research was conducted in Klungkung, to be precise in two traditional villages involved in the conflict, Kemoning, and Budaga Village. This research applies a qualitative method to explore and understand the meaning of social issues built through the informant (Creswell 2010). This method also gives researchers the flexibility to describe and tell the informants' experiences, facilitating them to interpret events and objects personally and socially and obtaining data in this study by conducting in-depth interviews with five informants. This study's informants obtained purposively, based on the experience and understanding and the informants' involvement in the conflict. Two informants were crucial, the former head of the traditional village who had previously led their respective traditional villages in the conflict. In addition, one informant was a police officer from the Klungkung resort police, who was also involved in handling the conflict. The last two informants were residents of the Kemoning and Budaga, who had witnessed and were involved in the conflict—obtaining data by conducting in-depth interviews with informants, recorded for later listening, and written in the interview transcript. The transcribed data were then reduced and selected to obtain appropriate data related to this research. All selected data were analyzed using social conflict theories from Moore, Mitchell, Furlong, and Kriesberg. Some of these experts' theories and concepts explain how social conflicts can arise, escalate, and trigger clashes or open conflicts.

Results and Discussion

Bali traditional village from colonialism to the present

Before Indonesia's independence and even before the kingdom's era, there were people with traditional lifeways. An agricultural and religious style characterizes this traditional society. At that time, the community's life was united by a leader or by some elders, and this society had material and non-material assets and was managed based on common interests. They also lived and controlled an area consisting of forest, mountain, river, and beach, containing various vegetation and animals, and they were free to take it. This society had written and unwritten legal rules that were obeyed by everyone (Astiti 2010). This society had different names in Indonesia; in general, they know as customary law society or just traditional society. They also had genuine autonomy, self-rule. In Bali, this customary law society knows as *desa adat* (traditional village). Bali's traditional village

society is not much different from other customary law societies; however, it has a Hindu-style life specificity. The existence of a Trinity Temple characterizes it as a place of worship. In Bali, the word *'adat'* is newly known and was popularized since Dutch colonialism at the beginning of the 20th century. The Dutch colonial government used the traditional village to differentiate a local village government established in the region. This local government in a rural area was then known as *desa dinas* or *keperbekelan* (administrative village government); however, the construction and traditional settlements occurred in the Dutch colonial era; this does not eliminate the historical facts of Bali from ancient times, which were already familiar with the alliance of village people known as kraman. In contrast, the place or area of residence where the community resided was called *desa pakraman* (traditional village). This kind of thing was known long before the concept of nation-state was born in Europe and, therefore, the age of traditional village is much older than the modern state born after the French Revolution (Dwipayana 2005).

Soeharto's New Order Government continued Bali's Dutch colonialism construction by dividing village schemes into the traditional village and *desa dinas* (administrative village government). The term *dinas'* refers to an area occupied by several residents as a legal community unity with the lowest government organization below the sub-district government. It has the right to organize their household with the Republic of Indonesia's unitary state's ties. In this definition, the village government can implement various government activities and services, called the village government or administrative. The traditional village, on the other hand, is bounded by the term *desa dresta*, that is the village as a unit of customary law community which has had a unity of tradition and social life rules of a Hindu community for generations, which has a particular area and is entitled to manage their household (Sumarjo 2018, Windia 2010).

After the onset of the reform era, by the enactment of Bali Province Regulation Number 3 the Year 2001, the traditional village in Bali was placed as a customary law community, having had the unity of tradition and social manners of Hindu society for generations in the boundaries of *Kahyangan Tiga* or *Kahyangan Desa*, which have certain territories and assets and are entitled to manage their households. The name of *desa adat* changed to *desa pakraman* (traditional village), and there was a small scope community of traditional village named *banjar*, which is part of sub-village. The head of a traditional village called *bendesa*, while the head of the administrative village is village head, or in the local context is *perbekel*, according to *keperbekelan*. At the banjar level, the unit headed by *kelihan* and *banjar* has two roles as customary and administrative to support the traditional village and administrative *(dinas)* village together (Sanjaya & Sugiartha 2013).

Bali's traditional village will look the same as any other customary village; however, although they have the same essential character, each traditional village is an autonomous village, which causes the difference between every traditional village. Besides that, there is a conception of *desa kala patra*; it means place, time, and context, which causes the autonomy to be healthy. The difference interprets as something that must be recognized and valued following the place, time, and context prevailing in each ancestral village. Every traditional village also has a right to be different from each other. It is justified inside Bali society's life order, leading to the term *desa mawacara*, defined as a self-governing traditional village according to custom tradition following place, time, and context. The differences between each traditional village with an autonomous nature make traditional villages in Bali have diverse variations. The boundaries between one traditional village in Bali and another signed by natural boundaries, such as rivers, cliffs, mountains, and hills. Besides the natural boundaries, the traditional village also has another typical natural boundary called *bengang*. These natural boundaries are defined as an abandoned and neglected area so that it becomes an area filled by high-density scrub. Usually, this area grows several lush and towering plants, such as banyan and ficus trees. Besides using natural boundaries, traditional society also uses boundary signs, such as *laba pura* (village-owned land), ditch, and village boundary monument (Arida et al. 2004). In general, Bali's traditional village does not yet have clear boundaries, even though the society considers that boundary exists, as, sometimes, that boundary has not yet been drawn into a map.

Moreover, the traditional village has not yet formulated its boundary, causing the border's condition to become vague. This condition happens because no written agreement regarding boundaries has been agreed upon by neighboring villages or known by government officials. There is a tendency that customary village boundaries are only formulated unilaterally based on unwritten data, and when the customary rules arrange, the boundary comes up without confirmation from neighboring villages. Changing times and advanced technology make the territory of the traditional village vaguer. The area that traditional society lived in the past was categorized as a remote area and separated by natural borders; however, today, that area is more developed into a modern-looking village visible through permanent concrete bridges and buildings. Some of the lands are privately owned or by legal entities. The community activity in the past era was only inside the village scope; however, it has been widened into other traditional villages. Livelihoods have changed from agriculture to the trade and service sector. The traditional village borders present more problems because of land-use change and changes in the environment's shape into a massive and rapid residential and industrial complex. These changes cause borders to become vague because, previously, borders could be determined from the shape of the land, and it has changed because the environment has changed. In the end, the border that was formerly marked by lands, river, a small river, and other natural shape borders has not just become vague; however, completely vanished.

Borders written inside the standard codec *(awig-awig)* only mention the village neighbor's name without clear border or territorial lines. In reality, the traditional village must be compromised and deliberated with its neighbor village. Traditional villages in Bali have different customary codecs between one and another regarding its autonomy and habits. It includes the determination of boundaries that intersect between one standard codec and another. The difference in determining the standard codec boundary has a high risk of causing friction between traditional societies. If there is no explicit agreement between two neighboring villages regarding village boundaries, there can be a potential conflict.

The disputing actors in Kemoning and Budaga Village conflict

The conflict between the two traditional villages began at the beginning of a significant event to commemorate the birth of this Temple of Death. The polemic regarding the seizure and claim of ownership of the Temple of Death developed mainly because of the differences in opinion regarding this temple's identity related to implementing a big temple ceremony. This problem caused friction that developed into disputes involving large numbers of people. It began with the rejection of Kemoning's identity on the temple's name, and Kemoning issued a statement stating the Temple of Death was in their rights. It was then opposed Budaga with a counter-statement containing the refusal to embed the identity of Kemoning in the name of the Temple of Death. Kemoning claimed this Temple of Death as local wisdom and an unseparated part as an eternal component of the traditional village from their ancestors' age. On the contrary, Budaga argued that ownership of the Temple of Death since the beginning was co-owned by Kemoning and Budaga (Adhinata 2016). The conflict then escalated, and the two factions strengthened their position and perception. The Kemoning factions believed that the Temple of Death was in their rights, so the name of that temple was Kemoning Temple of Death. WM, the Kemoning's former chief, stated:

> "We (Kemoning) think the giving of Kemoning's name or identity is right because from the beginning, this Temple of Death is ours, and we took care of this temple since the age of our ancestors. The temple is implicitly using the name of the traditional village where the temple locates."

However, from the Budaga perspective, the Temple of Death does not need a Kemoning identity because, to date, the temple does not have a clear written identity, and people only know the name as the temple in the west *(Pura Dalem Kauh)*, ND stated:

> "We (Budaga) still insist that ceremony without Kemoning's identity or name and do not want to accept the history of the existence of the Temple of Death. That history has faded, and the story is not true. A new history must be made."

Kemoning thought the big ceremony was impossible to do without giving an identity to the Temple of Death because it would be written and put into the Purana (a kind of book on how to conduct a large ceremony according to religious leaders). Because of the necessity to use Kemoning identity, there was a sense of disappointment on the Budaga side so that it led to efforts to postpone and frustrate the ceremony and explicitly stated that the big ceremony was impure or not holy (Adhinata 2016). Disputes and other types of conflict potentially happened because two or more warring factions were fighting over each other to obtain value or competition to get power status over scarce and limited resources (Moore 1986). According to Moore (1986), this Temple of Death is considered a scarce and limited resource by the two traditional villages because there is no land to build this temple and ancestral grave included in it. This Temple of Death is a contested value and contains an element of trust or religiosity and scarce resources.

Furlong (2005) mentioned that conflicts related to values could occur if the parties have conflicting values and cause or worsen the situation. These disputes trigger by differences in perspective and perception regarding the existence of the Temple of Death. The former chief of Kemoning Village assumed that Budaga Village was trying to expand their territory by taking a portion of Kemoning traditional territory without confirming Kemoning as a neighbor village, WM as the Kemoning Village former chief stated:

> "Budaga did not have the Temple of Death and their status only as a keeper and steward; it is on this basis that it causes claims of the customary asset by using administrative boundaries with the Temple of Death into the Budaga traditional territory and West Semarapura districts. The argument that is developed by Budaga is from the 1992 Klungkung Regency Government plan to expand the area of the capital city of Klungkung Region and named it the city of Semarapura. Then the name of *keperbekelan* (administrative village) was reformed into six districts, and the location of the Temple of Death is in West Semarapura district, the same as Budaga Village in the district of West Semarapura; however, in a traditional village context, the Temple of Death is located in Kemoning Customary territory."

According to Kemoning customary law, their territory expanded to the west, bordering with the Jinah River and Budaga Village (Desa Adat Kemoning 2016). On the contrary, ND, the former chief of Budaga Village, stated:

> "The Budaga traditional territory also includes The Temple of Death, so ownership claim by Kemoning not true and a customary border that claims by Kemoning according to the historical story and their customary law what written is not entirely true. History about Kemoning village boundaries is fictitious, and Kemoning customary law which explains the boundary of the village was made in 1985 because at that time Kemoning as a traditional village took part in a village competition so that the boundaries stipulated including The Temple of Death which claimed without Budaga consent as a neighboring village."

The statement of WM, Budaga Village former chief, was objected to by his rival, the Kemoning Village former chief, who stated:

> "According to Provincial Law Number 3 the Year 2001 about the traditional village, the one important component of the traditional village is Kahyangan Temple. It means a traditional village should have three temples, such as Temple of Desa *(Pura Desa)*, to worship Brahma the creator, Temple of Puseh *(Pura Puseh)* to worship Vishnu the preserver and Temple of Death *(Pura Dalem)* to worship Shiva the destroyer in Balinese-Hindu practice tradition. With that provincial law, traditional villages in Bali then identified themselves as a pure customary village. That is something the Budaga did not understand, so we Kemoning have the rightful claim to that Temple of Death because we are one of the ancient villages and took care of that temple from thousand years ago."

The situation shows a conflict situation that indicates disagreement and conflict, meaning a contention between two parties or more individuals or groups. That situation also explained that cooperation could not be done. Kriesberg (1982) said social conflict occurs when two or more parties believe they

have different goals and desires. The same thing said by Mitchell (1981), conflict occurs because of a relationship that has an incompatible goal between the parties. The relationship that is not in line, in this case, is the identity of the Temple of Death, which is indirectly related to ownership of the traditional territory. The relationship was not in a line translated by the situation and inconsistent behavior between the two traditional villages. This dispute also shows that the conflicting units' characteristics are in situations and conditions of disagreement, and both or more of these parties believe they have different goals and desires.

Moore (1986) states that to analyze conflict's root to identify conflict causes: issues concerning data, interests, structure, values, issues concerning relationships between individuals and groups. In the case of the Temple of Death disputes, the problem with data lies in the difference of perspective regarding the data and their interpretation. This difference sees in each party's perspective regarding the existence and ownership status of the Temple of Death based on the data held by each party, which is not necessarily accurate. Furthermore, substantive importance lies in each party's disagreement on traditional territories, including the Temple of Death, which are the objectives of these two traditional villages. Next, the problem of the structure caused by the unequal control over ownership and distribution of resources is, in this case, the Temple of Death in question. The fourth problem is values due to the different criteria in evaluating ideas and behavior in responding to religiosity's values in this temple's ownership. Finally, is the problem regarding the relationship of individuals and groups caused by a healthy emotional state between the communities in addressing the problem, improper perceptions of each party and the stereotypes that were built, and poor communication which occurred to increase the distance of hostility between the residents of these two traditional villages.

Conflict dynamics and its impacts

A big ceremony to commemorate the Temple of Death's existence planned to be held on 27th July 2011; however, the preparations had been made since a year earlier. The committee was formed in February the same year; however, there was a problem that arose, the identity embedded on the letterhead of this Temple of Death was the identity of Kemoning. Then came the ripples of rejection of the use of this identity because many residents who joined the temple management alliance believed that this temple did not have a Kemoning identity. On 27th March 2011, Kemoning Village residents held a meeting to respond to the polemic, and the meeting result was about the status of the Temple of Death. On 1st April 2011, Kemoning Village released a resolution according to the previous meeting. The resolution decided that 1) The Temple of Death belongs to Kemoning Village, 2) residents of Kemoning Village as the rightful owners of this Temple of Death and the others only as prayer, 3) the keeper of the Temple of Death chosen by residents of Kemoning, 4) big or small ceremony under consent by the Temple of Death clergyman, and 5) this decision to take effect as determined (Desa Adat Kemoning 2011).

To respond to the Kemoning's resolution, Budaga Village conducted a meeting on 8th April and 10th April 2011. The result 1) openly discuss the name and ownership of the Temple of Death, 2) all parties who received a decree from participating in contributing ideas so that problems regarding the name and ownership of the temple can be immediately resolved, 3) all parties who participate in taking care of the temple immediately to hold further talks (Desa Adat Budaga 2011). Budaga objected to the Kemoning resolution. The Klungkung Regency Government intervened and invited the warring parties to solve the problem; however, the meeting on 21st April 2011 did not produce final decisions regarding the identity and ownership status of the Temple of Death. Two days after talks deadlock Kemoning and Budaga involved in a billboards war along the road to the Temple of Death. This billboards war caused the regent of Klungkung to intervene once again and issue a statement that essentially revoked the Kemoning's resolution and assigned a big ceremony committee to continue his work. Regarding the Temple of Death's identity, it should be discussed after the big ceremony was over. With the regent's decision, the big ceremony was then still carried out however was taken over by Kemoning, and then the parties who disagreed took action such as throwing a bottle and burning tires near the Temple of Death and the *ngaben* ceremony, which was prohibited during the ceremony, took place.

After the Klungkung Regent and Klungkung Chief Police Resort intervened, on 22nd June 2011, Kemoning and Budaga agreed to pulldown the billboards. In the process of removing the provocative banners, Kemoning and Budaga almost got involved in a clash. Billboards with a jumbo banner entitled "The Kemoning Temple of Death Big Ceremony Plans" were removed by Kemoning and suppressed a banner entitled "Welcome to Budaga Traditional Village Territory." The Kemoning surged west and stopped at the T-intersection toward the Temple of Death, while hundreds of Budaga residents had waited long at that location. Budaga occupied the entrance to the Temple of Death, and the residents of two villages were about to clash (Sinarpos 2011). This condition led the Klungkung police to deploy police personnel to secure the situation to prevent physical contact between the Kemoning and Budaga factions. Although the police apparatus deployed to control the situation, the situation was still tense, and both parties were on standby to anticipate each other's movements. On 24th June 2011, there was still tension between these two factions, and then, on 30th June 2011, the Kemoning Chief reported to the police the case of the Temple of Death seizure, causing the tension to rise again. A signpost was installed on the street on 24th June 2011, entitled "Budaga Traditional Village Territory," while Kemoning residents were conducting the *melasti* ceremony to Watu Klotok beach as a sequence of the Temple of Death big ceremony. WM, the former chief of Kemoning Village, stated:

> "The territory claimed by Budaga with that signpost is Kemoning customary territorial. The signpost installation was carried out without the knowledge and any confirmation or notification to the Kemoning village. Upon installation of the territorial signpost, Kemoning expressed objection and declared that signpost installation as a seizure act of Kemoning traditional boundaries and was done in secret without information and confirmation."

The signpost that Budaga installed used iron and zinc plate material with a length of the field that protruded into the middle of the road to prevent passing ceremony instruments. Kemoning then respectfully asked the Budaga chief to remove that signpost immediately. The Kemoning also said that if the signpost were not pulled out, then the Kemoning would install the customary signpost and boundary in the correct location, as WM stated:

> "Kemoning residents willingly installed the boundary sign following those listed in the Kemoning customary law and regulations, and that matter had already been reported to Budaga. Because there was no answer to the objections and the request to pull out the signpost, Kemoning residents then installed the correct boundary."

The Budaga listened to the installation plan and tried to oppose the installation efforts. This matter caused residents of Kemoning and Budaga to come up from the east (Kemoning) and west (Budaga), respectively, and prepare themselves with weapons. The conflict escalated and could not be dammed again, so that an open conflict occurred on 17th September 2011. On that incident, initially, the residents of both Kemoning and Budaga were in the eastern and western regions separated by police guarding the intersection of Klungkung hospital (location of clashes). MB, the Klungkung resort police officer, explained the situation of the clashes:

> "The situations heated up because of a stone thrown from somewhere. The two factions then became violent and could not be dammed, and suddenly there was a stone-throwing between Kemoning from the east and Budaga from the west with police in the middle and trying to banish the masses."

The mobile brigade's police officers were overwhelmed by the increasingly violent period of throwing stones at each other, resulting in two mobile brigade members hit by a stone. Then the police took repressive actions by firing warning shots and trying to push into the two factions to keep their distance. The clash heated up, and the police again fired into the air and toward the crowds' feet. Some residents injured due to rubber bullets and both factions panicked and snuggled up to each other while residents who were still at the scene chased by the police who confiscated the weapons they were carrying. The clash ended and left twenty-six residents injured, from Kemoning and Budaga,

due to being hit by the police's bullets. The victims from each faction rushed to Bintang Hospital and Klungkung Hospital. Meanwhile, two mobile brigade members suffered leaking wounds on the head and a broken nose caused by stones. One victim from Budaga, named Ketut Ariaka, was rushed to Sanglah Hospital in Denpasar in critical condition due to being hit by a bullet in the head and eventually died (Budhiana 2011).

As mentioned before by Kriesberg (1982), the difference of resources between factions determines the tools of conflict used by each faction and the resource that is controlled by one faction wanted by the opposing party. In this conflict, it seems Kemoning, being dominant, tried to control the ownership and order of the Temple of Death. They did not want and did not allow the other party to take the temple. Budaga also committed and insisted that the temple was their asset, so leading to open conflict and clashes. In this conflict, the parties had strong authority and were not quickly subdued by each other, so the view that arose between the two parties was that each party had different perceptions about this issue, and there was an absence of acceptable alternatives by all parties. There is disagreement about goals, critical decisions, procedures for achieving goals, and accuracy in choosing actions to develop perceptions. It is also highly probable that these perceptions develop and give rise to interpersonal clashes characterized by anger, distrust, fear, frustration, and other forms of negative influence (Pelled 1996). Perceptions held by both parties in this situation influenced the emotional state of both. Each party had a strong feeling about this problem so that the emergence of fear, anger, frustration, and distrust of each other is a form of perception that was originally substantive to be effective.

Violence between groups generally occurs when a group experiences deep disappointment, and a powerful sense of identity emerges in their community, then the group's cultural symbols are used as a means to carry out movements that lead to violence. Feelings of frustration in themselves will become a movement that leads to violence, namely when there is a mobilization of group cultural symbols to burn psychologically individuals who are part of or bound by the group's identity so that group members readily sacrifice themselves as part of the movement (Rohmawati 2018). The clash arises if examined more deeply because there is an identity that fought. The identity formed because it allows us to tell the day-to-day social relations and relate this to past stories. Because identity is a result of the identification process that arises in social relations; Temple of Death's identification formed due to relations between identities owned by Kemoning and Budaga and was always related to past stories about the position and whereabouts of the temple. Differences in identification processes that strengthen awareness of collective identity tend to trigger the conflict. Besides that, as conveyed by Mas'oed et al. (2001), the type of customary village community is a type of consolidated society that is more likely to develop healthy group identity patterns and group cohesion more easily created and even more robustly. In this type of community, conflict awareness tends to be high so that when conflicts occur with other groups, the conflict intensity also tends to be high.

The impact arising from this conflict does not give too many significant problems to life dimensions, such as economic activities, health, or education; however, what feels to be the symptoms of change is social relations. The impact on social relations can be known, for example, the pattern of relationships that are not harmonious between the two co, as evidenced by the residents of the Kemoning and Budaga Villages who were accustomed to working together in the traditional religious activities that took place at the Temple of Death. The relationship between two sets of residents limited to the activities in that Temple of Death; however, other temples in Kemoning. In the Kemoning Village, ancient temples existed since the 9th century AD; until now, their existence and continuity have always been guarded and cared for by residents. Before the conflict, the residents of Kemoning and Budaga used to pray at every temple in Kemoning. It reported by NW, a citizen of Budaga:

> "Budaga residents used to pray in the temples in Kemoning when there was a *piodalan* ceremony. Not only that, when there was a death, residents of Budaga also used to mourn and join in mutual assistance to help the implementation of cremation in Kemoning."

The same thing said by one of the Kemoning residents, YS stated:

> "Kemoning residents before the conflict were accustomed to mourn in Budaga and join in mutual assistance to help carry out the death ceremony in the village. Residents of both villages also conducted inter-village marriages with Budaga residents married to Kemoning, and some Kemoning residents married to Budaga."

From this explanation, the two villages have a brotherly relationship connected by their respective citizens. That cause by inter-village marriage between individuals; however, the relationship slowly faded after the conflict and dispute over ownership of the Temple of Death. Relationships that used to be good slowly became distant. As acknowledged by the residents of Kemoning and Budaga, residents of the two villages only spoke naturally, not like they used to. Even at the funeral ceremony, the residents no longer mourned each other or offered mutual assistance in helping the implementation of the ngaben ceremony as well as when there were piodalan ceremonies in the temples in Kemoning; the Budaga residents no longer prayed to Kemoning as had been the custom of the residents. It recognized that there were differences in the participation in praying at this Temple of Death for the piodalan ceremony, as stated by WM:

> "When there is a division of who carries out the piodalan ceremony, if the Budaga people who have the turn to perform piodalan, Kemoning residents always come to pray at this temple; however if the Kemoning people get the turn, the Budaga people who come to do prayers can be counted because very few residents of Budaga come. Budaga residents came to Kemoning only for the benefit of piodalan in the Temple of Death because Jero Mangku (temple priest) came from Kemoning. That position was a hereditary spiritual position that could not be replaced by parties outside the Jero Mangku family."

Aside from the negative impact on stretching social relations, public services' impact was not so pronounced because these two traditional villages are, in administrative affairs, in a different district. Budaga Village is in the West Semarapura District, while Kemoning Village locates in the South Semarapura District, so that, in the official affairs, it does not have a significant impact. Meanwhile, the relative impacts on the economic activities of the citizens did not have a significant impact. Only a few Kemoning residents who owned a grocery shop felt their income reduced because, before the conflict, many Budaga residents shopped at their stall, and, after the conflict, very few Budaga residents shopped.

Both parties, Kemoning Village and Budaga Village, admitted that they could not restore the condition as before. Both of them also said this condition might last for the next few years, and they could not guarantee the rebuilding of the excellent relationship they used to have; however, the positive thing from this conflict feel is that they see this conflict as a bitter experience or lesson in community relations. This experience provides a new perspective on the high price of peace. After a conflict, the community can be more patient and restrain themselves and be grateful for the results. It means that all things that fought following each party's ideas and desires will not always be achieved according to their desires; however, they try to accept it.

Conclusion

Traditional Bali villages have diversity and are different from one another; although traditional Bali villages look similar, there are differences regarding the daily life order between one traditional village and another. Bali's traditional villages have a philosophy of harmony in life; this does not guarantee that traditional villages are not one hundred percent free from conflict. Balinese customary societies who live homogeneously based on Balinese Hindu teachings can fight with each other. The conflict can be in the form of a struggle over ownership of the temple, as happened in the Kemoning and Budaga Villages in Klungkung Regency, Bali. The conflict between the two traditional villages was due to disagreement over who had the village's assets' rights and ownership, namely The Temple of Death.

Problems began to emerge because of one of the villages' desire to make this Temple of Death their own. The Temple of Death is a scarce resource due to limited land used to build on. Starting from preparing a large ceremony at this temple to commemorate this temple centuries ago, the Kemoning Village claimed the temple as its own by embedding the name Kemoning in the activity. It was opposed by Budaga Village, which also felt that it had a share of the temple so that the conflict developed more broadly and strengthened the people of these two villages' perceptions and views—leading to ignite the fires of hostility. The root of the problem can be identified; first, due to the absence of accurate data regarding the Temple of Death's historical conditions. Second, there are different perceptions of each party regarding this Temple of Death. Third, excessive control and dominance over the management of this Temple of Death. Fourth, there are different criteria of religiosity in responding to the ownership of the Temple of Death and, finally, relationships among individuals or groups of Kemoning and Budaga that are not good enough to increase distance and sharpen hostility between the two traditional villages.

Conflicts that are already on the surface then escalate and lead to open conflict. Tensions, both physically and non-physically, colored the conflict between the two villages before finally erupting into clashes involving large numbers. This clash caused casualties and injuries from both sides of the conflict. This clash resulted from conflicting situations and behavior between Kemoning and Budaga Villages in which both did not agree with each other and believed they had a different goal of having this Temple of Death. This conflict eventually had an impact on relationships that already felt tenuous. Post-conflict recognized that the two villages had tenuous social relations because the dispute's seeds were still embedded due to the conflict's experience.

References

Adhinata MBP (2016) Upaya penyelesaian sengketa wilayah adat: Studi kasus sengketa kepemilikan Pura Dalem dan Setra antara Desa Pakraman Kemoning dan Desa Pakraman Budaga. Thesis, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta.

Arida S, Sardiana K, & Windia WP (2004) Mengelola Konflik Batas Wilayah: Panduan Penyelesaian Konflik dan Pembuatan Peta Desa Bagi Prajuru Adat. Denpasar: Uluangkep Press.

Arjawa GBPS (2014) Identitas kepemilikan Pura Dalam hubungan dengan perkembangan pariwisata dan konflik sosial di Bali. Masyarakat, Kebudayaan dan Politik 27 (3):131-142. https://doi.org/10.20473/mkp.V27I32014.131-142.

Astiti TIP (2010) Desa Adat Menggugat dan Digugat. Denpasar: Udayana University Press.

Budhiana N (2011) Bentrokan di Kemoning dan Budaga tewaskan warga. Antara Bali, 17 September. [Accessed 4 April 2016]. https://bali.antaranews.com/berita/14206/bentrokan-di-kemoning-dan-budaga-tewaskan-warga.

Chaudhry AM & Asif R (2015) Organizational conflict and conflict management: A synthesis of literature. Journal of Business and Management Research 9:238-244.

Creswell JW (2010) Penelitian Kualitatif dan Desain Riset. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Desa Adat Budaga (2011) Surat Keputusan Paruman Prajuru Desa Adat Budaga. Semarapura.

Desa Adat Kemoning (2011) Surat Keputusan Paruman Agung Desa Adat Kemoning. Semarapura.

Desa Adat Kemoning (2016) Awig-awig Desa Adat Kemoning. Semarapura.

Dwipayana AAGNA (2005) Desa Mawa Cara: Problematika Desa Adat di Bali. Yogyakarta: IRE.

Furlong GT (2005) The Conflict Resolution Toolbox: Models & Maps For Analyzing, Diagnosing, and Resolving Conflict. Ontario: John Wiley & Sons Canada.

Kriesberg L (1982) Social Conflicts. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Kumar DS (2013) Peran kepemimpinan Majelis Madya Desa Pakraman Klungkung dalam resolusi konflik sosial masyarakat studi kasus bentrok antara warga Kemoning dengan warga Budaga Semarapura Klungkung Bali. Thesis, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.

Mas'oed M, Maksum M, & Soehadha M (2001) Kekerasan Kolektif: Kondisi dan Pemicu. Yogyakarta: P3PK UGM.

Mitchell CR (1981) The Structure of International Conflict. London: Macmillan.

Moore CW (1986) The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher.

Pelled LH (1996) Demographic diversity, conflict, and work group outcomes: An intervening process theory. Organization Science 7 (6):615-631.

Priyanto IMD, Suandi IW, Bunga D, & Purwanto IWN (2012) Peranan prajuru desa dalam penyelesaian sengketa perebutan tanah kuburan (Setra) (Studi kasus di Desa Pakraman Kerobokan dan Desa Pakraman Padang Sambian). In: Menggagas Pencitraan Berbasis Kearifan Lokal, 26 September. Purwokerto: Universitas Jenderal Soedirman. 445-459.

Rohmawati R (2018) Antropologi kekerasan agama: Studi pemikiran Jack David Eller. Sabda: Jurnal Kajian Kebudayaan 13 (2):179-190. https://doi.org/10.14710/sabda.13.2.179-190.

Sanjaya DB, Sugiartha W (2013) Harmonisasi, integrasi Desa Pakraman dengan Desa Dinas yang multietnik dan multiagama menghadapi pergeseran, pelestarian, dan konflik di Bali. Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora 2 (2):265-274. https://doi.org/10.23887/jish-undiksha.v3i2.4469.

Sinarpos (2011) Dua desa di Semarapura nyaris bentrok. [Accessed 22 April 2016]. https://www.sinarpos.com/2011/06/dua-desa-di-semarapura-nyaris-bentrok.html.

Sumarjo (2018) Eksistensi awig-awig dalam menjaga harmonisasi Desa Adat Tenganan Pegringsingan, Kabupaten Karangasem, Bali. Habitus: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosiologi, Antropologi 2 (1):27-39.

Windia IWP (2010) Bali Mawacara: Kesatuan Awig-awig, Hukum dan Pemerintahan di Bali. Denpasar: Udayana University Press.

von Benda-Beckmann F & von Benda-Beckmann K (2012) Identity in dispute: Law, religion, and identity in Minangkabau. Asian Ethnicity 13 (4):341-358. https://doi.org/10.1080/14631369.2012.710073.

Windia IWP, Parimartha IG, Astiti TIP, & Putra ND (2009) Customary conflict and banishment Kasepekang at Bungaya Traditional Village, Karangasem Regency, Bali: In the perspective of cultural studies. E-Journal of Cultural Studies 3 (1):1-7.