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Abstract

This paper is a literature review in the study of contemporary peasant social movements. Peasant social movements, especially in Indonesia, are always interesting because of the complex problems that have yet to be resolved. This paper uses a qualitative method with an Integrated Literature Review (ILR) approach. The search for article data was carried out using the Google Scholar database using the keywords: "peasant social movements", "articulation", and "patron-client relationships". Furthermore, articles were sorted based on predetermined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Articles that have been obtained are then extracted. The study results show that in articulating their interests, peasants often do so by using a combination of internal organizational networks known as resource mobilization theory and external activism better known as political opportunity theory cluster. Articulating their interests through subsequent social movement actors gives rise to patron-client relationships between them. In conclusion, we argue that the emergence of patron-client relationships has an impact on the articulation of interests through social movement actors.
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Introduction

The study of peasant social movements in Indonesia is a study that is always up to date to be researched. For example, some recent research related to social movements was conducted by Sobary (2016) on the social movement of tobacco peasants in Temanggung. In his research, he sees the peasant resistance movement politically and poetically, although he emphasizes more on the internal conditions and processes that occur in it. Some of the issues raised in his research include the world of the movement, leadership, economic and social life, traditions, rites and values, and the poetry of peasant resistance.

Other research can be seen in Speight's (2013) research on "Rebel Organization and Local Politics." In his research, he focuses more on the political situation at the local level with the leadership factor of organizations at the local level in carrying out resistance. While in local politics, Speight (2013) focuses on how local factors themselves can form relationships and become the main agent force in the rebellion, which sees it as a state-building process.

Fuchs (2006) explained Self-organization in Social Movements examines the internal organizational features of social movements. According to the article, the concept of self-organization is one way of thinking about the internal and external, structural and action-based parts of social movements, and supports the concept of dynamic resistance. Although the birth of social movements cannot be predetermined, the complex impact of crisis, resource mobilization, cognitive mobilization, self-production, and movement emergence is an expression of a multidimensional, linear, and deterministic thinking process.
A theoretical study that seeks to combine organizational studies with political discourse can be found in Dellagnelo (2014), which seeks to investigate the feasibility of articulating political discourse with organizational studies. According to them, political discourse is increasingly converging with organizational studies to problematize and understand resistance and other types of social antagonism in organizational contexts, using the relational and contingent features of struggle as a starting point.

Political discourse theory, according to Laclau and Mouffe (2001), is an alternative way to understand the structuration of the socio-political realm by articulating a new notion of the realm and elaborating hegemony theory as a basic framework in political discourse analysis. Finally, Dellagnelo (2014) attempts to explain theoretically how organizational studies and political discourse can contribute to a new understanding of the creation of organizational forms of resistance movements.

Other authors such as Acemoglu et al. (2001) identify individual membership in social movement organizations with the ability to articulate the will of its members which is used to ensure that individual interests can be reflected in decision-making through its membership. Within the organization, their collective will is also accommodated in state policy. This is also the basis for the formation of various non-state forums that are separate from political parties to be able to articulate the will of their group members.

Several studies have also noted the success of various social movements in articulating the will of their group members, for example in Meyer's research (2005) states that since the 1970s, social movement organizations have been influential in making income (wage) policies and employment regulations for workers in Indonesia—various Asian countries. Then the results of research in recent years show increasing recognition of the articulation of organized social movements that have a significant impact on various state policies (Kingsen, 2014; Setiawan et al., 2019).

This paper is intended to explain the linkages between contemporary peasant social movements by focusing on the articulation process and the patron-client relationship that occurs.

**Methods**

The method used is a qualitative method with a literature review approach. The literature review was conducted by searching databases from various references, including books, research journals, journal reviews, annual reports, and data related to the themes of “peasant social movements”, "articulation", and "patron-client relationships". An integrative literature review was then conducted as the strategy used. This is following Torraco's (2005) definition of an integrative literature review, which is a type of research that examines, evaluates, and synthesizes literature representing a subject in an integrated manner to produce a fresh framework and perspective. According to Snyder (2019), integrated literature review is also a great tool for combining research findings to show evidence at a meta-level and identify areas that require further investigation, all of which are important for developing theoretical frameworks and conceptual models.

The collection of research data to be used as literature was carried out through several stages. First of all, collecting documents through the google scholar database by using the keywords "peasant social movements", "articulation", and "patron-client relationships" in the search (title/abstract/keywords). Furthermore, filtering is done by reviewing the abstract to find out which research is relevant to the researcher's topic of discussion as a basis for discussion to be analyzed using the integrative literature review method. In addition, the data used will not be limited to the article. But will use other relevant sources as supporting data for this research, such as government documents, research journals, and books.
Results

Peasant Social Movements

According to Killian (1964), "the origin of social movements is the coexistence of contrasting value systems and groups in opposition to each other," which are therefore considered different components of social life. Changes in social structure and normative order are considered part of the mechanism of social evolution, whereby new ideas emerge in people's brains. Individuals are "forced" to challenge the social order through various forms of nonconformity when traditional norms no longer provide a satisfactory structure.

A social movement emerges when discontent spreads and established institutions become less flexible and unable to respond. In other words, social movements as defined by Eyerman & Jamison (1991) are organized collective actions aimed at social change, or rather groups of individuals who seek to express dissatisfaction in public and seek to change the social base and find politics unsatisfactory.

Sztompka et al. (2004) broadly describe social movements as (1) Groups of people acting together. (2) The common goal of action is a particular change in society, which is determined equally by the participants. (3) The collectivity is relatively dispersed but lower in degree than formal organizations. (4) The action has a relatively high degree of spontaneity but is not institutionalized and has an unconventional form. So social movements are loosely organized collective actions, without any institutionalized way to bring about changes in their society.

Perrow (2000) asserts that "social movements are a form of coordinated collective action". Then according to Bosi (2016), social movements are not political parties or interest groups, but rather stable political entities that have regular access to political power and political elites; nor are they mass trends or trends that are unorganized, momentary, and aimless. Some of the characteristics of social movements are that they are "engaged" in a conflictual relationship with a identified enemy; connected by strong informal networks; [and they] share a distinct collective identity (Porta & Diani, 2006). Social entities can be considered as social but informal entities that are organized and engaged in extra-institutional conflict oriented towards specific goals; these goals can be specific and narrowly aimed at policy or more broadly aimed at social change.

One of the contemporary social movement theories is the political opportunity theory. Political opportunity theory is one of the main theories used by social movement scholars to see collective community action in the form of protests, social movements, and revolutions in progress. Through political opportunities, McAdam (1997) explains that political opportunities can be utilized in two principles, namely the momentum of collective action and the results of a movement's activities. In addition, several other studies (Goldstone, 1980; HP Kitschelt, 1986; McAdam, 1997) observe external conditions to see the success of a social movement with a focus on the role of political opportunity structures and public opinion as facilitation or prevention of movement. Whereas Gamson's (1990) research looks more at social movements on the role and internal characteristics of the group (type of goals, action strategy, level of organization, etc.). Similarly, Zald et al. (1987) and Davis et al. (2005) focus more on internal analysis of organizational structures and processes within them.

Eisinger (1973) explains the various phenomena of the emergence of social movements, revolutions, and nationalist movements by linking them to the theory of political opportunities. According to Eisinger, revolutions do not occur when certain groups of people are under pressure. However, collective action in the form of revolution arises when the political and economic system that is in a closed condition is open and utilized by challengers to fight back. In his study, Eisinger concluded that social movements develop when political opportunities open up. McAdam (1997) adds that "any change that shifts the balance of political and economic resources between a state and its challengers, that weakens a state's ability to reward its followers or opponents or to pursue coherent policies, or that shifts domestic or external support from the regime, increases opportunities".
In addition, Tarrow (2011) includes regime change conditions as opportunities where the regime consists of ordinary relationships between the government, established political actors, challengers, and outside political actors, including other governments. Regime change is a change that introduces new actors into these relationships, reduces the power of regime members, or imposes new relationships between them. Tarrow then emphasizes that forms of political tension increase when change actors gain the support of external resources to get out of trouble or achieve desired goals. Political opportunity theory is always associated with external resources (Tarrow, 2011). These external resources are utilized by change actors through opening access to political institutions and divisions within the political elite.

Meanwhile, Piven & Cloward (1977) identify variables that foster a social movement, namely first, social movements arise when the level of access to political institutions is open. Second, when the political balance is being shaken while a new political balance has not been formed. Third, when the political elite experiences a major conflict the conflict is utilized by the actors of change as an opportunity. Fourth, when the actors of change mobilize the support of elites in the system to make changes. Kriesi (2002) then added to his analysis by emphasizing the importance of considering formal and informal institutional structure factors and the strategies used by change actors. McAdam (1997) also added the importance of considering the following aspects, such as access to political parties, government capacity to implement policies, and alliance structures. The internal process includes aspects, members, established solidarity incentive structures, communication networks, and leaders.

In the model of the political process developed by McAdam (1997), the internal process of the recruitment system is carried out in a way that, firstly, individuals can be recruited into the ranks of movement activists based on their involvement in organizations that serve as a network of associations from which new movements emerge. Curtis Jr. & Zurcher Jr. (1973) in their study, the authors provide convincing data to support their assertion that most recruits are drawn from the vast "multi-organizational field" in which all groups emerge. Secondly, local community organizations can be a major source of movement participants through what Oberschall calls 'block recruitment'. In this pattern, fewer movements emerge from established organizations because they represent an amalgamation of such groups. Oberschall (1973) concludes: "Mobilization does not occur through the recruitment of large numbers of isolated and solitary individuals. Mobilization occurs as a result of the recruitment of already highly organized blocks of people and participants".

At the micro level, the analysis focuses on questions of identity and human behavior concerning social movements. Pichardo (1997), claims that the convergence of the macro and micro levels provides a unique historical perspective on social movements related to new forms of middle-class radicalism. This book offers a unique perspective on social movements and the larger sociopolitical environment, as well as how individuals enter, respond to, and change the system. Sztompka (2004) uses the phrases internal and exterior movement dynamics, while Pichardo (1997) constructs the terms micro and macro. Many analysts explain this particular role of social movements by examining the internal dynamics among the agents.

They consider social movements as one of the main ways of reorganizing modern society (Sztompka, 2004), as agents of social change (Killian, 1964) as historical actors (Touraine, 1985); as agents of change in political life or carriers of historical projects (Eyerman & Jamison, 1991). Some say that "mass movements and the conflicts they generate are the primary agents of social change" (Adamson & Borgos, 1984).

To look at the impact of social movements, Giugni & Yamasaki (2009) distinguish three main explanations of the impact of social movements, namely: direct impact, indirect impact, and combined impact models. The direct impact model suggests that movements can have a positive impact on policy if they are carried out alone and without external support. The indirect impact model views movements as having an impact through a two-step process, first by influencing aspects of the external environment, political alliances, and public opinion, and then by ensuring that all these factors influence policy. The collective effects model argues that movement impact will occur when political allies or supportive public opinion (or both) agree with the movement's mobilization. He then distinguishes three variants of the
collective action model, depending on the specific combination of these factors. In this case, the impact of the protest on policy will be greater when political coalitions and public opinion create a favorable environment for change.

Laclau and Mouffe's work represents a significant innovation from dominant political theory regarding agents of social change, the structuring of political space, and the nature of history (Laclau, 1977; Laclau & Mouffe, 1987). In his explanation, Escobar (1992) then asserts that:

"To be sure, conventional views of politics have produced pre-understandings that shape any "normal" understanding of politics, rooted in everyday structures and practices (including the state, interest groups, forms of rationality and behavior such as strikes, visible mobilizations, etc.). Redefining this situation cannot be achieved without changing political discourse. These are ... fundamental political questions that must be answered in the fields of history, politics, and dominant representations. Only by rethinking politics in this way will another historical space that records popular experience open up" (Escobar, 1992).

Escobar (1992) further explains the autopoiesis condition of social movements, assuming that "as self-producing and self-organizing entities, social movements can be autopoiesis". Through their actions, they establish a distinct presence in their social and cultural environment. They create themselves and the social order in general through their organizational processes (the series of relationships or articulations between key elements). It is then necessary to examine the internal organization of these units and the history of their interaction with the environment, which he explains:

"We characterize the interaction between movements and the environment in terms of politics, economic conditions, and the like. (In a sense, we as observers do not see social movements but rather experience the field of our categories through our observations and theorizations). Moreover, we tend to think that it is these latter categories that determine what happens within the movement, and this is only partially true since it is the movement's organization that largely determines its structural change, even if it is triggered by its interrelationship with its environment" (Escobar, 1992).

The result of this historical interaction is the creation of a world of life and social order. Therefore, social movements must not only reflect the current crisis or other principles but must also be understood based on the rationality and organization they produce. The emergence and development of the peasant social movement are indicated by the unresolved problems of agricultural structural disparities and rural poverty. Under conditions of opportunity and political opportunity, peasant social movements are very easy to grow and develop. The desire of peasant to continue to fight for their land rights fairly and the constant pressure from the state and corporations further increase the degree of agrarian structural tension.

**Articulation of Peasant Interests**

One of the main themes of 21st-century peasant studies is the interaction between the state and society, as well as peasant movements and land mobilization. (Bernstein et al., 2008) Mobilization gives a key role to peasant action against policymakers, and the interaction between state and society emphasizes the importance of politics "from below" and gives equal weight to reformist initiatives from "state actors" (policymakers) "from above". Rachman (2017) emphasizes the condition of Indonesia, that currently there are open political opportunities, which make it possible to carry and raise the land access agenda into the arena of public policy-making at the local, national, and even international levels. Therefore, policy advocacy through peasant social movements is currently the right keyword as one way to resolve unresolved agrarian conflicts.

Several recent studies have attempted to link agrarian conflict with political activity in the context of state policy. Thomson (2011) analyzed the relationship between violence and agrarian conflict in Colombia, describing how Colombia experienced capitalist development with violence and poverty. Kapstein (2014) explains that the current problem of high land inequality can lead to rebellion. Land is the most important asset for peasants, they will fight hard against tenure reform. And more importantly, redistributive demands are at the heart of the rebellion. Furthermore, Peters and Richards (2011) point out that it is the insurgency movement that eventually becomes the agenda for national plans to improve agricultural production and understanding of long-term agrarian problems.
Conflicts in the political sphere often arise when violent actions are preceded by legitimate claims that such actions can be carried out in the name of political change. According to Stewart & Strathern (2002), violent actions can be justified by the legal theory of self-defense or by legal doctrine in cases of oppression under tyrannical regimes in the doctrine of human rights. Brubaker (2015) concludes that the root of communal violence is political. Violence can take the form of 'visible violence' or 'invisible violence' (Galtung, 1996) and in some cases can also be a phenomenon that creates stigmatization (Stewart & Strathern, 2002). The advocacy process, in this case, is also seen in the context of civil disobedience as a form of justice crisis in society, a natural law that automatically occurs in society. Dworkin (in Kress & Anderson, 1989) divides types of civil disobedience into integrity-based, justice-based, and policy-based. This research will also examine acts of civil disobedience within a policy framework, which is an integral process to change policy.

Interest articulation, popularized by Almond and Coleman (1960) describes the various ways in which interests are embedded in political systems and processes. De Léon et al. (2009) explain that benefit articulation means articulating interests that are typically articulated by interest organizations or groups and, more importantly, specific desires that are conveyed to relevant key governance actors, such as legislatures. According to him, "The term interest articulation refers to the way citizens express their needs, views and demands to government... Interests can be articulated by individual citizens or by groups of citizens who organize to represent their collective interests" (De Leon et al., 2009). In the context of class struggle, Laclau (1990) then adds that "classes cannot assert their hegemony without articulating society in their discourse; and this particular form of articulation is in the case of a class that seeks to confront the power bloc as a whole, to assert its hegemony".

In general, the concept of articulation according to Newton and Deth (2016) can be interpreted as the extent to which citizens or community groups can influence the political decisions of the state through various democratic institutions in a political system. According to them, the success of articulation is determined by the institutional architecture that regulates the roles and positions of actors at various levels, as well as the level of competition between actors representing their social interests. As the result of a long process, this articulation can also be interpreted as a dynamic result of the interaction between the structure of political institutions, competition between interests, and patterns of participation and mobilization of community groups. The logical consequence is that social movement organizations are ultimately involved in political struggles with the government to influence state political decisions.

According to McAdam et al. (1996), social movements generally seek to achieve a clear set of goals, including changing state policy. However, social movements also often aim to influence indirect targets. However, social movements also often aim to have an indirect impact. These indirect goals or objectives include the activities, perspectives, and outcomes of the actions of other collective actors, as well as the scale of life of its members. They further explained that to understand the articulation of social movements, literature can be used to conceptualize social movements through a political process approach that focuses on the dynamic relationship between actors vertically. The political process approach identifies social movements as ongoing challenges to influence policy decisions and policy change that often have movement origins, observable peaks and declines in activity, and use a combination of conventional and unconventional collective action (McAdam, 1997; Tarrow, 2011; Tilly & Tarrow, 2015).

From this perspective, the articulation of a social movement can be seen through its public actions, and its influence includes state and organizational responses and their ongoing impact on further challenges facing the state. Social movements can influence each other by informing state responses to collective action, identifying potential strengths and weaknesses in political structures, and/or influencing changes in the external environment to restructure political opportunities (Gamson, 1992). When the state alters the costs and benefits of collective action and develops new techniques to control collective action, it indirectly facilitates, encourages, or hinders movements to adopt collective action strategies. Social movement articulations can periodically grow and decline as the state responds to movement challenges and the opportunities available to new movements change (Tarrow, 2010).
The development of social movement literature suggests that political parties can shape movements and vice versa social movements can shape political parties (Costain & McFarland, 1998; Goldstone, 1980; McAdam, 1997). As an alternative to the framing theory, McAdam et al. (1996), for example, point out that social identities and subject constructions are created by political processes through lobbying, mass action, and access points to government. In addition, the role of parties in defining movements towards specific goals, including the establishment of various political regimes, has been well developed, for example, Desai (2015), states that the left in India utilized social movements to articulate blocks of different political regimes that supported two types of policy regimes.

According to McLaverty (1991), advocacy is a stage of the policy dialectic process, which is an action aimed at changing policy about people who are perceived to lack capacity or groups who are unable to struggle to have a voice in the systems and structures that impact their lives. Advocacy involves a deliberate process (Sprechmann & Pelton, 2001) that influences public policy-making (Jenkins, 1987) or influences the social or societal agenda (Schmid et al., 2008) and builds political will in its activities.

According to Bourdieu, the arena is a field of struggle, where actors struggle to improve their objective position. Being in the arena of struggle, actors apply various strategies, i.e. "the active deployment of objectively oriented 'lines of action', obeying regularities and forming coherent and socially intelligible patterns" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). However, the strategic choices available to actors are limited by their objective position in the arena, which is determined by the particular distribution of capital and their view of the capital market (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). In more detail, the process of political struggle (Bourdieu's view) can be explained in terms of a reducible 'concept of the realm of struggle' (field) that governs other realms or fields (Bourdieu, 2011, 2012). However, according to Bourdieu, in all societies, some dominate, and those who are governed. This distinction is inherent in the basic principles of social organization, and its dominance is greatly influenced by the situation, resources, and strategies of the actors. He further explained that the actors occupy their respective positions which are determined by two dimensions, first based on the amount of capital they have, and second based on the weight of their overall capital composition.

In the context of macro politics and the context of political struggle, after the New Order regime came to power, there are at least three battle arenas available (Rachman, 2017). First, the arena of struggle at the level of state policy and especially the policies and management of the government bureaucracy. This arena is important because the main extent of the operation of global business and economic interests on agrarian issues in Indonesia today is the change in several state policies and management of the government bureaucracy in the field of agrarian and natural resource management. Of course, with all the economic and political power and influence they have, they will easily insert the agenda and content of changes in agrarian policy and natural resource management by their interests, namely opening agricultural land in Indonesia into a free market scene. where all economic forces from anywhere can play and interact to then dominate the scene.

The second arena of struggle is the wider public arena. Whether we realize it or not, we are still often trapped in discussing agrarian reform from an exclusive perspective, i.e. not associating or trying to link it with the broader social structure of society and the interests of the groups within it. The analysis of agrarian reform groups only shows explanations that have a direct impact on the victim group, which is considered the group with the most interest in the idea of agrarian reform, namely the poor peasants. Whereas in the reality of daily life, this group cannot be separated from the interaction and influence of other community groups or other social elements besides economic, political, and legal elements.

The third arena is at the level of organizing and strengthening people's organizations, especially organizations of peasants and poor peasants. History shows that agrarian reform must be driven by people's organizations, especially peasant organizations in rural areas. Because it is they, and other poor communities, who have a direct interest in agrarian reform and the establishment of agrarian justice, only with strong people's organizations can control power be exercised over the strategies and agendas prepared by other parties, either because of the good nature of the new government regime or because
of their interests, especially if all of these strategies or agendas are still not in line with the vision of agrarian reform that promotes agrarian justice.

Discussion

The study of patron-client relations took place in two main waves. In the first wave in the 1960s and 1970s, pioneering intellectuals, mostly anthropologists, conducted research in agrarian countries in Southeast Asia and Latin America. The focus was on the patron-client relationship that characterized the relationship between landlords and their peasants in these communities. Hence, patron-client is defined as a social relationship in which a more privileged individual (patron) exchanges goods for the loyalty of a less privileged person (client) (García-Guadilla & Pérez, 2002; Taylor, 2004).

Scott (1993), for example, is famous for his research findings that the relationship between landlords and smallholders in many countries in Southeast Asia provides a model of how interactions between peasants and landlords are formed. Across the study areas, tenants provide services and labor to the landlords they serve, and in return, they receive protection and assistance when they face life's difficulties. By tying themselves into such relationships, clients sought security in a harsh and uncertain living environment. Seen from Scott's perspective, it can be explained that the patron-client system organizes the economic and social structure of a given society. It is a system that has existed from ancient times to modern times thanks to the informal relationships, norms, and values attached to it, which allow each subject to obtain what is necessary for survival in the social structure.

Some researchers generally see patron-client as a special form of social relationship. For example, Lemarchand and Legg (1972) write that patron-client can be "viewed as a more or less personal type of relationship between actors (i.e. patrons and clients), or sets of actors, of highly unequal wealth, status or influence that is based on conditional loyalty and involves mutually beneficial transactions." Later Scott (1993) sees patron-client as a type of social relationship that is more or less personal. Later Scott (1993) saw patron-client as a "dyadic" or two-way relationship between two people of unequal status and power and based on the above description, a mutually beneficial relationship. The prototypical relationship between landlords and peasants, this relationship is seen as multi-faceted and lasts for a very long period.

Then some other researchers explain that consensus norms of solidarity play an important role in patron-client and this relationship involves trust and maintained interaction between patron and client (Eisenstadt & Roniger, 1980; Scott, 1993). Scott (1993) further explains that, given the often hidden nature of patron-client relationships, this is a necessary condition for theorizing about patron-client relationships. This initial wave of research on patron-client relationships gave rise to what might be considered a "culturalist" understanding of patron-client, which focuses on how social norms and ideas shape the relationship between patrons and clients.

Social scientists using this approach often observe that patron-client relationships are nurtured and facilitated by a particular morality in which "mutual expectations between parties are informed by the values and rituals of the communities concerned" (Scott, 1993). In this approach, patron-client practices are primarily associated with moral forces imposed by reciprocal or dyadic norms. Therefore, such practices are more likely to be found in societies where moral customs and "concepts of honor" and "orientation" evoke a strong sense of interpersonal obligation (Eisenstadt & Roniger, 1980). The emphasis on the cultural foundation of patron-client and the surrounding social expectations remains a strong tradition in the literature on the subject (Schaffer & Baker, 2015).

Various studies then explain that patron-client relationships can be viewed as positive and some see them as negative. For example, while Fonchingong (2004) considers patron-client as a debilitating aspect of culture that negatively impacts social structure and development, (Keef er, 2005) sees it as a means for underprivileged communities to gain access to resources that have been out of their reach. Therefore, any attempt to restrict patron clients may result in the rejection of the wider community and the underprivileged's access to the productive resources they deserve.
Then according to Aspinall & Berenschot (2019), a more instrumentalist interpretation of patron-client politics became more prominent in the second wave of research on patron-client politics that began in the 2000s. This second wave was triggered by the growing realization among most political scientists that political exchange, despite some early predictions, did not simply disappear due to democratization and modernization. Aspinall & Berenschot (2019) further explain that reflecting a broader trend in the discipline of political science, political scientists now place more emphasis on causal inference and the systematic identification of patterns, studying patron-client micro-fundamentals.

Some recent studies have looked at the "broker" as a key facilitator in patron-client relationships and understood broker relationships more succinctly and pragmatically where the role of social hierarchy has received less attention than in patron-client relationships that have been a hallmark of agrarian relations in established societies (e.g. Stokes, 2005; Weitz-Shapiro, 2012). Researchers are beginning to see the personal character and unequal nature of patron-client political relations. Instead, they increasingly recognize that patron-client relationships can be pragmatic and market-like arrangements over which the patron does not always have strong control (e.g. H. Kitschelt & Wilkinson, 2007; Nichter & Nunnari, 2022).

In articulating these interests, social movements can be seen from the size of the impact they have on the structure of social change expected by the organization by placing the potential capacity of the movement to realize various kinds of social change. Actors involved in social movements make the articulation of social movements a mode of social change at various levels of the arena, namely at the level of state policy, the level of the wider public, and the level of local community organizations. Social movements produce or affect changes in society at large not only after their structures are completed, but also over time since the beginning of their internal self-renewal and regeneration processes. In addition, changes in society at large that occur outside the influence of the movement, generate feedback on its development, not only after its completion but over time as its gradual development constantly changes the career, momentum, speed, and direction of the movement. The formation of motion and the formation of new structures are interrelated, stimulate each other, or hold each other. There is a continuous interaction between the internal morphogenesis part and the external parts that renew and regenerate themselves.

**Conclusion**

In the context of peasant social movements, several theories are still relevant to look at peasant social movements in Indonesia. For example, Scott (1993) sees that moral motivation is the main reason for the emergence of the peasant movement so that the reaction has great moral strength. The reaction is in the form of a defensive movement and aims to restore traditional rules that guarantee the economic security of peasants because morally these rights guarantee human physical needs for survival. Similarly, we see that peasant movements and protests are usually simple and often center on the myth of a just and equal order. In general, such movements or reactions arise because of crisis conditions due to a value system that is no longer following actual reality. In other words, peasant movements emerge as new contradictions continue to develop in an increasingly commercialized and capitalistic agricultural sector.

This paper does not attempt to establish a general theory but rather focuses on local dynamics, presenting the results of a literature review. The debate is more focused on discussing their forms of collective action with the facts of today's most progressive and militant movements, and describing how these movements can articulate their interests. Furthermore, for the continuation of this research, it is necessary to conduct further research on the failure of the state in resolving peasant conflicts on both a local and national scale, as well as the socio-economic impacts of peasant social movements.
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