

Articulation of Native Knowledge about the Burning in Field Tradition on Ngaju Women Peasants, Central Borneo, Indonesia Perspective

Evi Nurleni¹, Heru Nugroho², Arie Sudjito³

¹Sociology Department, Faculty of Social and Political Science, UPR

^{2,3}Sociology Department, FISIPOL UGM

Abstract:

There is a struggle between global and local knowledge in understanding the tradition of burning in fields, where the global stigmatizes it as a cause of forest fires that is different from the women cultivator's experience. Generally, burning in fields for the Ngaju people in Central Borneo has historically been safe and environmentally friendly. In fact, forest fires are caused by many factors, such as nature or technocratic mobilization. Stigmatization that successfully concealed the burning behaviour carried out by others. In the concept of knowledge-based violence, the regulations and technocracy controlled by state groups (technocrats-intellectuals) often act unfairly and become hegemony. Hotspot data-based technology causes the tradition of burning politicized and *victim blaming*. The implementation of regulations causes the field to become a criminal locus. Knowledge based-violence violence causes women peasants to become victims and the cultural knowledge becomes silenced. On Ngaju Women peasants, the smoke from the fields articulate as a voice of existence and resistance.

Keywords: Burning in the Fields, Women Peasants, Knowledge Based-violence, Ngaju People, Existence, Resistance.

Introduction

Historically, since the 1950s, Indonesia has been viewed as the lungs of the world, with 87 percent of its territory covered by tropical forests. The Food and Agriculture Organization even described it as having the largest tropical forest in the world, including the forests of Borneo (Tsujino et al., 2016). Furthermore, the tradition of farming is stigmatized as a major cause of deforestation in Central Borneo due to the use of slash and burn techniques (Rizky et al., 2022) (Dove, 1998) (Tsujino et al., 2016) (King, 1982) (Kleinman et al., 1995). Then, since the implementation of massive forest and land fire control regulations in 2015, the tradition of burning in fields has become problematic. Burning aims to create natural fertilizer and produce the best organic rice and is not intended to violate the law or be anti-modern (Gumi, 2022) (Bahri et al., 2018) (Kleinman et al., 1995) (JR, 2019).

The tradition of burning in fields is different from burning land in general, because the Ngaju people have a cultural technique to prevent widespread fires that has been applied for decades. Burning in fields in the Ngaju tradition is called *manusul*, namely the application of a gradual burning technique as follows: (1) Reading the dry season with the moonlight. (2) Examining the position of nearby plantation assets to increase security for assets. (3) Creating boundaries for fire protection; on mineral land with the *manatas*

technique (clearing bushes and wood around the land) and on peat land with the *tabat technique* (fire protection ditch so that the fire does not spread under the peat) and the innovation of drilled wells (2015). (4) The technique of reading the direction of the wind by the fire handler to determine the starting point of the fire that is not against the wind. (5) The gradual burning technique, the fire points start from the outside, the fire moves together from the outside and dies in the center of the field (6) Re-checking the fire around the land, before leaving it. The Ngaju people themselves have customary sanctions for those who burn and spread to other people's gardens, so burning requires caution.

In this regard, understanding the concept of field burning is important to avoid generalizing the tradition of field burning to include burning land in general. In the farming tradition, there are three variations of burning: *manusul bahu*, *manyimpuk*, and *mamehun*, namely limited burning and small fires. They do not burn sporadically as intended by assumptions of global knowledge or regulations. Positioning the concept of field burning as a tradition with proportion makes it negotiable and reduces global stigmatization.

The regulatory perspective considers the act of burning in fields as an act against the law because of the generalization of the concept of burning land. In this case, burning in the fields is culturally safe, but becomes unsafe if the authorities are present.

Meanwhile, the 2021 PERDA which grants permits to burn limited-scale land to indigenous communities has proven to be less effective. Implicit bias regulations, because the subjects of peasants and women peasants are not the same as those of indigenous communities. Thus, burning outside the context of the interests and territory of indigenous communities is considered illegal, including by women peasants. Under these conditions, the tradition of burning as a farming technique has no space to speak. Therefore, it is crucial to accurately articulate cultural voices and knowledge in a fair and equitable manner.

In this study, conceptually, the term silencing of cultural knowledge is proposed as the hegemony of knowledge over the subaltern and knowledgebased violence. Knowledge based violence is characterized by the unavailability of formal channels to listen to the ways of knowing and expressing the cultural knowledge.

Method

This study uses a qualitative-descriptive approach to describe the cultural knowledge of *Ngaju women peasants*. Epistemologically, this study uses an ecofeminist-subsistence perspective. This perspective focuses on (1) the subject or key informant is the women farmer (2) research data is obtained through *daily conversation* and *daily activity*. (3) data collection tools are participant observation and daily conversation. Daily conversation is a space for personal dialogue and free and equal *sharing of experiences*.

The research location focused on 3 (three) Ngaju farming communities, namely *Oloh Mantangai Hulu*, in Kapuas and *Oloh Marikoi* and *Oloh Dahian Tambuk* in Gunung Mas. The reasons for selecting these three villages are related to practical reasons, namely affordability, and theoretical reasons, namely the typical representation of land related to the implementation of regulations. Tumbang Marikoi Village in Damang Batu District, Gunung Mas Regency has active women peasants, and Dahian Tambuk Village in Mihing Raya District, Gunung Mas Regency has inactive women peasants. Tumbang Marikoi and Dahian Tambuk Village represent semi-permanent mineral soil farming. Meanwhile, Mantangai Hulu Village, Mantangai District, Kapuas Regency has semi-active peasants and represents semi-permanent peatland. Mantangai Hulu is the most interesting research locus because the village has historically been part of the national agricultural sector development project scheme since PLG, REDD+ and the current *food estate*. The research was conducted adapting to a 6-stage farming cycle or for 1 (one) year. The field study was

conducted from April 2023 to June 2024. The number of informants was 10 women peasants. In this study, it is also important to consciously choose the term *Oloh Ngaju* instead of *Dayak Ngaju*. This is related to the ecofeminist-subsistence perspective as listening to non-class voices and the *daily conversation method*. Informants in daily conversations always refer to themselves as Orang Ngaju.

Reformulation of Epistemic Violence-Spivak

Epistemic violence is a term used by Spivak in two of her works. The first, 1988's "*Can the Subaltern Speak?*", describes when subalterns are prevented from speaking for their own interests because others claim to know theirs (Spivak, 2019). Spivak states that Western intellectual knowledge pushes non-Western forms of 'knowing' to the sidelines. Western knowledge denigrates cultural forms of epistemology by calling them myths and wisdom. Local knowledge also cannot be heard because it loses space to speak due to the stigma of being non-scientific. If indigenous subaltern knowledge wants to be heard, it must adopt modern Western language, thought, and reasoning. Thus, subaltern people can never truly express their indigenous ways of knowing.

Second, in the study "*The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archive*" refers to the hegemony of western culture over the knowledge (*sati*) of widowed women. Western knowledge misreads the motives and desires of local people's actions. Spivak calls it an articulation of the subject that is practiced in a harsh and oppressive manner. Knowledge from colonial archives solely aims to reduce Ranees to an 'object of knowledge'. Spivak said "*if we notice that explanations and discourses are irreducibly fractured by the epistemic violence of monopoly imperialism...*" (Spivak, 1985). This condition causes subaltern women to be unable to speak because they are ostracized by the monopoly of imperialist knowledge.

In her study, Spivak also describes epistemic violence in the form of *the silencing* of local knowledge (Spivak, 2012). Local groups lost their voices in the colonial administration and their contributions to the national historical context were ignored. In this case, the contestation of the interests of the "Inner Subject" pursuing capitalist interests shaped power relations. The Inner Subject "excluded" local groups because they did not align with their interests. This exclusion of local subjects made them non-class subjects. Non-class subjects who wanted to survive chose silence. Often, the choice of silence of non-class subjects was rational because it was more suitable and secure within the circle of hegemonic power relations.

Furthermore, this adaptation of Western interests and culture disrupts the authentic voices of local populations and leads to the subordination of indigenous knowledge. The subordination of local knowledge by patriarchal-capitalist Western knowledge constitutes epistemic violence. One socio-epistemic form of this violence is the practice of undermining the ability of certain groups to speak. They are inadvertently heard as elitists when they politically protest hegemony, which appears as resistance. They are intentionally seen when they implement survival politics that contradict interests, which appear as creating non-imperialist spaces (Dotson, 2011).

Thus, the reformulation of Spivak's concept in this study is as follows. First, knowledge-based violence is a formulation of epistemics. Knowledge-based violence is violence and injustice based on knowledge. Violence is based on the hegemony of knowledge. Knowledge-based violence addresses knowledge practices that hegemonize the ways of thinking and speaking of local subjects or distort cultural knowledge by adapting ways of thinking and speaking to modern-Western knowledge. Therefore, articulating practices of knowledge hegemony is the same as articulating practices of injustice and knowledge-based violence.

Second, the Insiders are local subjects who are exploited to win the interests of the capitalist-patriarchal

economy and become colonial agents. The adjustment of capitalist-patriarchal economic interests by the Insiders shapes the hegemonic practices of social classes. The Insiders, due to their status and position, contribute to practices of injustice and epistemic violence against local subjects.

Third, non-class subjects are local subjects whose political and economic existence is not found or is not visible within the government's social class. Non-class subjects are culturally, economically, and politically hegemonized because their ways of thinking and acting do not align with their interests (capitalist-patriarchal economics). so, in this article the farmers are called peasants, not peasant or farmers; as articulate of consciousness that the term peasant and farmers has a hegemonic mindset.

Regulation Implementation-Based Violence

Another issue in knowledge-based violence is the hegemony of insider knowledge that represses non-class people. In the context of the tradition of burning in fields, hegemony and repression are based on regulatory implementation. The conceptualization of burning in fields as a cause of forest and land degradation and deforestation has long been an arena for knowledge struggles. Global knowledge since the 1950s has identified cultivation as the primary cause of deforestation in Indonesia. This knowledge has become a nearly standardized stereotype and is accepted today without evaluation. This influences Insider knowledge, which is almost entirely directed toward winning the interests of projects to control the rate of deforestation, including in the drafting of regulations.

The interest aspect causes an imbalance in the articulation of knowledge regarding the tradition of burning in fields between subjects. Regulations perceive the tradition of burning in fields as deforestation and resistance. Therefore, regulations on forest and land fire control have become symbolic markers of power that legalize repression against the tradition of burning in fields. In this case, the implementation of regulations contributes to creating victims of injustice and epistemic violence, as illustrated in the following two situations.

First, the implementation of regulations on forest and land fire control between 2015 and 2021. The tightening of regulations was essentially aimed at suppressing and controlling forest and land fires following the national haze disasters of 2015 and 2019. However, the prohibition on clearing land by burning contained within the regulations had significant social and economic impacts on the lives of Ngaju women peasants. Since 2015, the tightening of regulations on forest and land fire control has become a symbolic sign of state hegemony that represses all traditional practices, both burning and farming. When regulations declared burning in the fields illegal and resistant, farming has since become fraught with risks. Meanwhile, the livelihood of the fields is highly dependent on the tradition of burning.

Regulations become a repressive tool of power when legal articles grant full authority to officials to legally and forcibly stop the tradition of burning in fields. This power is represented by the work of law enforcement and articles on criminal sanctions, namely fines and imprisonment. In implementing regulations, law enforcement is given full authority to forcibly stop burning in fields and impose criminal sanctions. This includes the legality of dropping *waterbooms* by helicopter in 2018 when the burning tradition was carried out by the Mantangai Hulu people and the arrest of peasants between 2019 and 2022 in West Kotawaringin, Kapuas, and North Barito. Although in fact the burning permit procedures referred to in the regulation have been fulfilled by farming communities or women peasants, the clause on preventing smoke disasters gives officials the authority to intervene in hotspots and designate peasants as environmental criminals.

Regulatory-based repression led to physical violence against women peasants in Mantangai Hulu during

the repressive *waterbombing campaign*, and psychological violence during arrests and the increasingly widespread no-burn banner campaign. Ngaju women peasants are in a traumatic state. because the story of the arrest of the peasants and the banners became terror. In this case, regulatory-based repression of the tradition of burning in the fields becomes a practice of epistemic violence, in which women peasants and the tradition of burning in the fields are victims. However, the victims become invisible to knowledge because they are hidden behind the authority and power of those in charge of implementing the regulations. In the repressive implementation of regulations, women peasants lose their voices because regulations become a kind of *remote control* that suppresses their voices to the smallest possible extent (voiceless). According to Spivak, this silencing of non-class subjects' voices is a form of epistemic violence. The practice of epistemic violence becomes invisible because the authority given to the police to act is in accordance with criminal articles. The practice of regulation-based violence is represented in the work of security officers and criminal sanctions that are repressive, non-dialogical, and power relations. Regulations silence all farming activities and encourage the tradition of burning to the point of being illegal and resistant to the government.

The tradition of burning in fields has become controversial due to differing interests between the government and women peasants. The government's generalization of burning as all deforestation has rendered local interest in the tradition of burning in fields invisible. Insiders articulate burning as a resistance and pragmatic act of non-class subjects, while non-class subjects articulate it as a strategy of adaptation and durability for survival.

Today, women peasants face the dilemma of realizing that the tradition of burning in their fields contributes to smoke pollution. However, stopping burning has far-reaching implications, not only economically but also for the cultural existence of the Ngaju people. Meanwhile, the reality is that burning activities in the large plantation sector contribute even greater pollution. From the perspective of women peasants, repression of tradition is an injustice. In this regard, Orang Dalam (Indigenous People) are negligent and fail to understand the significant and practical need for the tradition of burning in their fields as a work system and a farming technique.

Second, the reality of the implementation of the 1998-2003 forest and land management regulations and the 2019-2023 forest and land fire control regulations has been the eradication of traditional practices and cultural sites of the Ngaju people. In practice, the implementation of these regulations has hegemonized all traditional knowledge and procedures for local forest and land management. For the government, implementing these regulations aims to halt the rate of degradation and deforestation. However, in the agricultural sector, which relies on tradition for its operations, forcibly ending these traditions is tantamount to culturecide for the Ngaju people.

Cultivation is understood as the loss of at least the following important cultural elements. (1) the loss of active peasants, farming traditions and the fields themselves, so that women peasants become *landless lords*. (2) the loss of subsistence community ethics, driven by the fact that the fields are not producing, so local people are dependent on markets and instant sources of money. (3) the loss of local rice seeds because the seeds have expired for approximately the last 5 years. (4) the loss of traditional rituals, customary laws and cultural objects inherent in the farming tradition that are not practiced. (5) the loss of the existence of customary lands and forests whose determination coincides with the clearing of land in the farming tradition. (6) the loss of the capacity and system for expanding people's plantation assets in the technique of shifting fields. (7) the loss of a strong reciprocal work system. (8) the loss of the Ngaju people's new year celebrations (9) the loss of the fluidity of the Ngaju people's gender roles. (10) the loss of women's

independent food capacity, resulting in food scarcity, malnutrition and crime (11) the loss of family food security capacity.

In the implementation of repressive regulations, entire cultural knowledge systems, the ecological expertise of women peasants, and local conservation systems are systematically undermined; with Indigenous people ignoring all cultural knowledge practices. This conscious underestimation constitutes a practice of knowledge-based injustice. The hegemony of global knowledge prevents Indigenous people from expressing cultural knowledge. Because of their position and standing, Indigenous people favor government interests and cannot equally voice local interests.

Forest and land fire control regulations prioritize global interests over the well-being of local communities. This perspective influences policymaking. Thus, the conceptualization of regulations is seen as a way for the apparatus to subjugate cultural knowledge. The neglect and subordination of entire local knowledge systems to regulatory conceptualization is a form of knowledge-based injustice. This neglect and subordination result in broader injustices, such as the neglect of living space, economic injustice, and the criminalization of women peasants.

Regulations, in reality, act as a state restraint to shape the subject's obedience. The total subjugation of non-class subjects to hegemony is knowledge-based violence, but the violence becomes invisible because the victims are hidden behind the legality and authority of regulatory implementation. On the other hand, regulations render women peasants' defenses and negotiating positions *powerless*. The prohibition on burning in the fields renders the fields "nameless subjects" and "unrecognized by the peasants themselves," because fields without burning can no longer be called fields. peasants are alienated from the way they have always worked.

As victims of violence, women peasants lose their ability to fulfill their role as food providers for their families because their fields cease to produce. Women peasants forced to stop burning in their fields are under pressure from food scarcity. Therefore, the implementation of regulations contributes to the stability of dryland rice production. In this case, the Insiders fail and neglect to understand the practical and basic needs of the community regarding dryland rice as a symbol of prosperity for Ngaju peasants. And the loss of dryland rice stability is a form of Insiders' failure to ensure the welfare of their own community group. The conditions that make subjects' food insecure and impoverish them are a structural practice of epistemic violence.

Violence Based on the Image of Hotspots

Another issue in knowledge-based violence is the practice of Insiders championing the interests of the capitalist-patriarchal economy or becoming agents of capitalism. As agents, scholars who consolidate themselves as Insiders will seize projects that can be funded by capitalists. Consolidated scholars are those who, due to their position and standing in the practical sphere, become local capitalists. The process of consolidating themselves as legal agents involves utilizing interest-based scientific and technological mechanisms and integrating concepts of scientific knowledge that align with the interests of the capitalist funding system. At this point, knowledge mechanisms have the potential to marginalize and subordinate cultural knowledge as non-knowledge on the one hand.

On the other hand, Insiders marginalize the interests of non-class people who do not align with their interests. In this case, the use of technology that is based on interests contributes to injustice and epistemic violence. The use of interest-based technology prevents non-class subjects from speaking about their actual conditions. In this context, the use of remote sensing data makes fire hotspot images hegemonic an-

d uncontestable, as illustrated in the following situation.

The Indonesian government uses 2 (two) data sources for reporting fire points, namely the agriculture and environmental services using data from *the National Aeronautics and Space Administration* (NASA) in 2015. and the National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB) and the Food Security Agency used data from the National Institute of Aeronautics and Space (LAPAN) satellite in 2019. NASA satellite imagery has long been of global importance, depicting agricultural locations as sources of fire hotspots. Meanwhile, LAPAN satellite imagery is based on the One Map Policy (KSP), which is designed to provide data for determining the Regional Spatial Plan (RTRWP) and resolving spatial conflicts in Indonesia. Therefore, data based on fire hotspot imagery technology has the potential to be adjusted to suit interests. Data has the potential to hide the factual reality of data reports. Fire hotspot images become a hegemony of knowledge that closes the space for local people's voices to be heard.

Therefore, it is certain that NASA satellite reports will describe hotspots originating from agricultural land, including small palm plantations, whether carried out intentionally or uncontrolled on peatlands (Nasa, 2015) (Koplitiz et al., 2016). Meanwhile, remote sensing from LAPAN in 2019 will describe fire hotspots in abandoned land on the Trans Borneo road (Palangkaraya-Tumbang Nusa and Pulang Pisau); large oil palm plantations in Sukamara, Lamandau, Seruyan, East Kotawaringin, Katingan, Gunung Mas and North Barito Regencies; and agricultural land and plantations of farming communities in 14 districts of Central Borneo (PPID | KLHK, 2020) (Triwibowo, 2019) (Endrawati, 2018). This report hegemonizes all national and global knowledge that the hotspots based on this satellite imagery are absolute truth. Therefore, in the fire image report, it is certain to burden the farming tradition.

In this case, the sensing report *simplifies* data to suit government interests. This adjustment to global interests results in the neglect of data from district offices and the factual experiences of women peasants. At the district office itself, accurate fire hotspot data, as indicated by satellite imagery, is unavailable. The database used by the district BNPB office is derived from police data. Such data simplification ontologically systematically destroys factual reality, while epistemologically, the tools used to capture reality generalize and simplify reality for the sake of interests. Ignoring the factual conditions of non-class subjects is a form of epistemic injustice.

Remote sensing of fire hotspots in the experience of women peasants does not present the factual conditions of human dynamics in the mapped area. Women peasants understand that accusations of being the cause of forest fires are difficult to deny when viewed from the global fire hotspot image. Because the burned land is in their former farming area, most of which they no longer use. For example, the 2015 ex-PLG land fire, the factual conditions according to the experience of women peasants that caused the fire were (1) deliberately set fires by charcoal sellers to obtain charcoal (2) land vulnerability due to the construction of ex-PLG canals by the government which triggered peatland drought during El Nino weather (3) fire hotspots due to friction between wood (natural fire) during El Nino weather (4) deliberately set fires for purposes other than farming. However, due to the hegemony of knowledge, technology, imagery and fire hotspot data are no longer debatable. The tradition of burning in the fields becomes easier to accuse as the cause of fires. In this case, imagery and fire hotspot data make it easier to *victim-blame* women peasants and catch the perpetrators of forest fires. The condition of placing subjects unable to speak in their factual conditions is a form of knowledge-based violence practice.

This distortion of technological interpretation is important to note, as the use of technology controlled by state groups, utilizing technocrats and intellectuals, often leads to unfair practices. The image of deforestation and burning is always identified with community groups, even though the facts cannot be

fully proven. At this point, satellite imagery of fire hotspots becomes a tool of power, facilitating the identification and arrest of peasants as environmental criminals. Technology becomes something that cannot be resisted, preventing women peasants from speaking out and being heard equally and fairly by those within the community.

Epistemic Violence Shapes Knowledge Regimes

Based on the field findings above, the practices of epistemic violence against the tradition of burning in the fields apply in the hegemony of Insider knowledge that represses and stigmatizes the way of thinking of non-class people in implementing regulations; and the practice of Insiders winning capitalist-patriarchal economic interests or becoming capitalist agents through the distortion of satellite imagery technology for hotspots. In other words, the practice of knowledge-based violence is injustice based on data politics, violence based on regulatory hegemony and violence of data distortion based on satellite imagery technology for hotspots. The knowledge perspective thus empowers the apparatus to repress, stigmatize and marginalize the subjects and knowledge of *Ngaju* women peasants.

In the context of knowledge hegemony, practices of knowledge-based injustice and violence, through the implementation of regulations, the use of technology, and data politics, shape knowledge regimes. Knowledge becomes a regime when it becomes the sole truth, thus silencing all ways of thinking and knowing among local people. In the context of *Ngaju* women peasants, they are unable to speak within their indigenous traditional and cultural knowledge.

The conditions of women peasants are under the following knowledge regimes: (1) under the regulatory knowledge regime, the tradition of burning in the fields becomes resistance and a criminal act; (2) under the technological and environmental knowledge regime, the image of fire spots becomes hegemonic and peasants become environmental criminals. Under these knowledge regimes, women peasants become *unable to speak* not because they have no voice, but because hegemony has taken over the speaking space (speechless) of *Ngaju* women peasants.

So how can women peasants speak out in such a context? In this context, the subsistence women's movement is articulated as the ecofeminist-subsistence movement. This understanding holds that the actions of *Ngaju* women peasants to maintain the tradition of burning in their fields are, on the one hand, an act of resistance against the regime of knowledge. But on the other hand, it is a subsistence movement for the purpose of food and cultural security. The act of maintaining the tradition of burning in their fields is correlated with the act of defending their fields, food, and culture. Therefore, the act of maintaining the tradition of burning in their fields is a movement of subsistence durability. And from an ecofeminist-subsistence perspective, it is a movement to voice liberation from regimes of knowledge. It is also a political action to demand the liberation of farming traditions from unjust government repression.

Smoke in the Fields Is Voice of Existence and Resistance

Culturally, women's involvement in carrying out actions is nothing new for the *Ngaju* people. Women, especially mothers, are often involved in the fields and forests to provide for their families. They play a crucial role in maintaining the sustainability of forests and fields, as they are their breadwinners. It is also crucial for women to ensure that burned land remains a field, without causing harm to others, as is customary law. However, the tradition of burning has now become an act that directly contradicts state law.

Socio-culturally, the articulation of the act of burning in a field is referred to as "the act of creating smoke".

The act of creating smoke comes from the cultural concept that smoke is a means of communication with the Goddess of Fortune. Thus, burning in the fields contains religious aspects and implicit voices that ideologically connect the action with their inner voice. For women peasants, smoke is the sound of existence that declares that they're still alive in this land. For women peasants, burning in the fields is no longer a cultural issue but a political issue. So, the smoke is a voicing of demands for recognition of the existence of women peasants as productive subjects.

Burning in the fields is a wordless voice in the repressive pressure of regulation; when sound cannot be conveyed in words, it will be conveyed through symbols and actions. So smoke is the sound of resistance. Smoke is a sign that field matters are not just stomach matters, but life matters. For women peasants, smoke is the sound of resistance. For women peasants, the act of burning in the fields is no longer a personal issue but a political issue. So, the act of creating smoke to *survive is political*.

So, abstracting smoke as sound and demand is resistance. Smoke is a way for women peasants to send a message to concerned ears, because the state has not been on their side for a long time. Through smoke from the fields, women sent bills to the state to pay for material and non-material losses due to the ban on burning in the fields. The demands of women peasants are not about the amount of money, but about returning the right to farm.

Restoring the right to burn in the fields is linked to the right to obtain sufficient food and prosperity. The right to obtain safe and comfortable food is a basic right of peasants. Restoring the right to burn in the fields is a way out of poverty and towards food prosperity for Ngaju women peasants. The demand to grant permission to burn in fields on a limited scale on peatlands is a demand to fulfill the right to life and an effort to reject dependence on charitable government assistance.

In knowledge-based violence, women peasants cannot speak not because they have no voice, but because of the hegemony of knowledge. Insider Knowledge has an epistemological weakness in capturing their voices. So, through burning in the fields, women peasants abstract their existence from hegemony. The articulation of the tradition of burning in the fields is a strategy to speak without words under the pressure of repressive regulations. Burning in the fields is the voice of resistance of women Ngaju peasants, who politically cannot be represented on other subjects. By burning in the fields, women peasants speak out in their own voices.

The act of burning in the fields was an everyday action of women peasants; through their daily actions they convey their voices as victims who survive at their lowest point. Those who survive, adapt, fight and are beaten back, but still survive. Thus, burning in the fields is a political act to demand the liberation of the fields and a demand for the role of the state to create workspaces in the fields that are friendly and safe for women and children.

Thus, creating smoke in the fields is an ecofeminist-subsistence movement and a voice of resistance that cannot be delegated to others. Creating smoke in the fields is a voice demanding justice from the government for the reality of state violence that has infiltrated the lives of Oloh Ngaju women peasants. Therefore, knowledge of state deforestation and the tradition of burning is not a binary opposition but a relational one, because removing women from the forests and fields is a form of violence against humanity.

Conclusion

The articulation of everyday actions in the fields is an emancipatory action. Listening to the voices of women peasants through their daily actions and the tradition of burning in the fields is an emancipatory act. The voices expressed through daily actions and traditions reflect the experiences of victims of

knowledge-based violence. Seeing the reality of the Ngaju's women peasant through knowledge-based violence is a tactic for expressing cultural knowledge. Forms of knowledge-based violence against peasant women; the government creates power relations through data politics, hegemony over regulatory implementation, and the use of fire hotspot imagery. This hegemony leads to injustice and violence based on data, regulation, and technology, where non-class subjects are stigmatized, marginalized, silenced, and excluded.

Knowledge-based violence offers a fresh perspective on how inappropriate conceptualizations of tradition can create injustice and violence. Hegemony and violence then create victims: culture, women, and nature. Knowledge hegemony shapes knowledge regimes. In knowledge-based violence, women peasants are unheard not because they cannot speak, but because of the hegemony of knowledge regimes. They may have much to say, but hegemonic knowledge has an epistemological weakness in capturing their voices, which reflects a broader issue of marginalized perspectives being overlooked in societal discourse. Creating smoke from the fields is a culturally based act of resistance. So through burning in the fields, women peasants abstract their existing selves as an act of showing themselves to the government that they still inhabit their territory well. Burning in the fields serves as a form of political resistance expressed by women Ngaju peasants, and this form of resistance cannot be accurately represented by others.

Reference:

1. Ant/Arie. (2019). *Demanding the Release of Farmers, Dayak Residents 'Storm' the Muara Teweh District Court*. Balanganews.Com.
2. Anugrah, N. (2021). *PPID | Ministry of Environment and Forestry | FoLU Net Carbon Sink Does Not Equal Zero Deforestation*. <https://Ppid.Menlhk.Go.Id/Berita/Siaran-Pers/6267/Folu-Net-Carbon-Sink-Tidak-Sama-Dengan-Zero-Deforestation>. <https://ppid.menlhk.go.id/berita/siaran-pers/6267/folu-net-carbon-sink-tidak-sama-dengan-zero-deforestation>
3. Bagade, U., Jogdand, Y., & Bagade, V. (2023). Subaltern Studies and the Transition in Indian Historical Writing. *Critical Philosophy of Race*, 11 (1), 175–208. <https://doi.org/10.5325/CRITPHILRACE.11.1.0175>
4. Bahri, S., Supriatna, N., Sjamsuddin, H., & Wiyanarti, E. (2018). The Shifting Cultivation of Bauma Tahutn Tradition in the Dayak Kanayatn People in West Borneo. *International Conference on Science and Education and Technology 2018 (ISET 2018)*, 247 (Iset), 423–430. <https://doi.org/10.2991/iset-18.2018.86>
5. Barri, MF, Setiawan, AA, Oktaviani, AR, Prayoga, AP, & Ichsan, AC (2018). Relentless Deforestation (Portrait of Deforestation in North Sumatra, East Borneo and North Maluku). In *Forest Watch Indonesia* (pp. 1–62).
6. Central Borneo BPS. (2023). *Complete results of the 2023 agricultural census, Phase 1, Central Borneo Province*.
7. Chakrabarty, D. (1998). Minority Histories, Subaltern Pasts. *Economic And Political Weekly*, 33 (9), 473+475-479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18125441.1998.10877327>
8. Dotson, K. (2011). Tracking Epistemic Violence, Tracking Practices of Silencing. *Hypatia, SPRING*, 26 (2), 236–257. <https://www.jstor-org.ezproxy.ugm.ac.id/stable/23016544?seq=1>
9. Dove, M.R. (1998). Living Rubber, Dead Land, and Persisting Systems in Borneo: Indigenous Representation of Sustainability. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde*, 154 (1), 20–54. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27865405>

10. Gramsci, A. (1999). Selections from the prison notebooks. In Q. Hoare & G.N. Smith (Eds.), *The Electric Book Company Ltd* (Transcribe). The Electric Book Company Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429355363-27>
11. Guha, R. (1982). On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India. In *Oxford University Press* (pp. 1–8). Subaltern Studies 1 : Writings on South Asian History and Society. <https://archive.org/details/dli.bengal.10689.12743/page/n33/mode/2up>
12. Gumi, M. (2022). Provide Fair Treatment for Farmers in Central Borneo. *Kalteng Today*. <https://kaltengtoday.com/berikan-perlakuan-adil-bagi-peladang-di-kalteng/>
13. JR. (2019). Farmers Are Not Environmental Criminals, Free Innocent Citizens From the Clutches of the Law. *Voice of Justice*. <https://sinarkeadilan.com/peladang-bukan-penjahat-lingkungan-bebaskan-warga-tak-bersalah-dari-jeratan-hukum/>
14. King, V. T. (1982). Ethnicity in borneo: An anthropological problem. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 10 (1), 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853182X00038>
15. Kleinman, P. J. A., Pimentel, D., & Bryant, R. B. (1995). The ecological sustainability of slash-and-burn agriculture. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 52 (2–3), 235–249. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8809\(94\)00531-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8809(94)00531-1)
16. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417500002632>
17. Louai, E. H. (2012). Retracing the concept of the subaltern from Gramsci to Spivak: Historical developments and new applications. *African Journal of History and Culture (AJHC)* , 4 (1), 4–8. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJHC11.020>
18. Pirard, R., Gnych, S., Pacheco, P., & S., L. (2015). Zero-Deforestation Commitments in Indonesia: Governance Challenges. In *CIFOR Info brief* (Vol. 132). <https://doi.org/10.17528/cifor/005871>
19. Pr/BKK/BBU. (2020). Stop Criminalizing Farmers, Central Borneo DPRD Asks Judge to Release. *Dayak News* . https://dayaknews.com/headline/stop-kriminalisasi-peladang-dprd-kalteng-minta-hakim-bebaskan/#google_vignette
20. Ritzer, G. (2012). Sociological Theory. In *Encyclopedia of Social Theory* (9th ed.). The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412952552.n87>
21. Rizky, F.K., Alhayyan, R., & Shahreiza, D. (2022). Indonesian Government Policy in Forest and Land Fire Management. *Budafest International Research and Critic Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 5 (1), 959–971. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i1.3693>
22. Said, E. (1991). Orientalism. In *PENGUIN BOOKS PENGUIN*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.8501059>
23. Spivak, G. C. (1985). The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives. *History and Theory* , 24 (3), 247. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2505169>
24. Spivak, G. C. (2019). Can the Subaltern Speak? *Historians Without Borders*, 46–56. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351244756-5>
25. Tsujino, R., Yumoto, T., Kitamura, S., Djamaluddin, I., & Darnaedi, D. (2016). History of forest loss and degradation in Indonesia. *Land Use Policy* , 57 , 335–347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.05.034>