various analytical vocabularies--among others are morality (Fassin 2015), aesthetics (Ghertner 2015), affect (Jakimow 2018, Shoshan 2016, Masco 2014), and materiality (Fehérváry 2013, Hull 2012). Nevertheless, little of these contributions have been borne out of Indonesian-based ethnographic works. This panel is an attempt to use contemporary theoretical development on variations of ruling techniques to comprehend governmental practices in Indonesia. Thus, our first question is, how does the Indonesian government(s) rule? What are the spectrums of governmental practices that we can unearth from ethnographic cases in Indonesia? The answers to this question shall not be unitary as we define the state as a multi-spatial, multi-scalar, and disaggregated entity (Gupta 2012, Ferguson & Gupta 2002).

Furthermore, over the last decade, the question of (im)possibility of politics (e.g. practices that challenge or furthering state power) has always been a specter for scholars dealing with the modalities of rule. This specter has been addressed in two ways. First, deriving from Foucauldian conception of power, the state appears as a ubiquitous entity leaving no room for individuals to exercise their politics (i.e., governmentality; see Rose 2006; Foucault 2004). Second, deriving from a less invasive conceptualization of power, the possibility of subversive politics can be found in diminutive practices that challenge the state power (Scott 2009, Li 2007, Scott 1987). While both frameworks are fruitful in thinking about the implication of state power to the practice of politics, we wish to transcend this binary of domination and resistance. Given the dearth of sustained conversation of the implication of introducing new analytical vocabularies to the question of the modality of rules to the practice of politics, we arrive at our second question: how can investigating non-calculative modality of rule contributes to our anthropological understanding of the (im)possibility of politics? Can we possibly transcend the binary?

Our panel invites papers that concern non-calculative modality of rule (i.e., forms of governing technique not anchored in scientific, mechanical, and rational practices), politics beyond domination/resistance, or both. We welcome papers from various topics of ethnographic research including health, politics, economy, education, infrastructure, development, non-governmental organizations, and gender and sexuality across times.
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This paper proposes the concept of corporate governmentality as a possibility to rethink forms of governance other than the state. Reformulating La Perriere (Foucault 2007, 96), corporate governmentality refers to a set of groups, collectives or institutions that we called the corporations and how these corporations conduct power and using methods with its specific relations to men, material things and events. In recent years, anthropologists shifted their interest on power from focusing on state actors to corporate actors and forms of power practices shaping societies and engages in people’s daily life (Benson & Kirsch 2010a; Partridge et al.2011; Rajak et al.2011; Welker et al.2011). Anthropologists observe the disastrous impact of corporate operations toward the environment (Kirsch 2014; Welker et al. 2011, Benson & Kirsch 2010b), while in the field of disaster studies, scientists from various disciplines also examine the role of corporations in industrial and technological disasters (Gephart 1993, Rajan, 1999 & 2002, Dyer 2002, Button
The paper, combining the anthropology of corporation and disaster studies, will examine corporate power, through corporate governmentality, deal with disastrous mudflow and managing affected Sidoarjo population in East Java. I want to propose the Lapindo mudflow disaster as an object of governmentality conducted by the Corporation. While the State has the reason to exist (raison d’Etat), which is called the governmental reason “to improve the condition of the population, to increase its wealth, its longevity and its health” (Foucault 2007), the case study offers that corporation also has the reason to exist. Its reason and main objectives are to improve its internal members by gaining maximum profit, provide wealth to its shareholders and owners of the mode of production, and to secure the continuation of capital accumulation. This is the nature of corporations and their tendency to do everything to secure the continuation of profit and accumulation. This is not the will to improve (Li 2007) but to accumulate…corporate governmentality and the will to accumulate!

Keywords: anthropology of corporation, disaster studies, corporate governmentality, mudflow disaster, and accumulation.

BACKGROUND

Corporate activities in natural resource extraction are potentially destructive to human and its surrounding environment. The case of Lapindo Mudflow disaster demonstrates that corporations are facing the risk to become destructive in their daily extractive operations. Lapindo Brantas Inc., one of the subsidiary company of Energy Mega Persada (EMP) Corporation, owned by Bakrie family, hold the Brantas Block concession since the 1990s. After ten years conducting a successful operation in Wunut village, Porong, Lapindo Inc in 2006 expands their natural wells drilling operation in the village of Renokenongo, Porong, East Java. The drilling well operations in Banjir Panji 1 (BJP-1), Renokenongo turn into a disaster. The mud from the drilling well spread fast and became a tragedy for villagers living around the drilling area. The earth continues to produce the mudflow, and geological scientists predict that it will last for two decades (Davies et al. 2011, 523).

OBJECTIVE

The case of Lapindo Mudflow disaster is an example of corporations as powerful actors in the contemporary capitalist society. This paper will focus on corporate power in deploying tactics and strategies in the post-disaster situation to avoid responsibilities and further damages to their corporate existence. Corporate ability to deploy tactics and strategies by calculated means, programs, and technology of power is a form of power that I identify as corporate governmentality. Reformulating La Perriere (Foucault 2007, 96), corporate governmentality refers to a set of groups, collectives or institutions that we called the corporations and how these corporations conduct power and using methods with its specific relations to men, material things and events. The qualitative data gathered from fieldwork visit in Porong for two months in 2011-2012 and eight months in 2018-2019. The research also uses primary and secondary documents from the media, government institutions, and corporate reports to observe government and corporate behaviors and policy.

DESCRIPTION

If we follow Foucault the object of state’s governmentality is the population. Population as an abstraction or conceptual category is central for social scientists since Malthus and followed by Marx in his critique of political economy (Foucault 2007, 77). I would argue that in Marxian
sensibility, the object of capital, i.e., capitalist enterprise, i.e., corporation, is also the population. The next logical question is that what is the difference between the standpoint of the state and capitalist corporation toward population? The state as Foucault and his followers (Scott 1998, Tania Li 2007), assume population as an object of improvement where the state rationality is to generate prosperity and wealth for its entire population. While from the standpoint of capital, the population is the source of value creation, and its surplus population becomes an endless source of storage for labor power (Marx 1990, 796). Thus, for capitalist enterprises, their rationality toward population is to ensure the accumulation of capital.

Both state and capitalist enterprises have a similar interest in the population but have different rationality and objective. Our attention should re-orient toward the relation of power between state, capitalist enterprises, and population. The Lapindo Mudflow case study will illustrate how state and capitalist enterprises hand in hand cooperating to resolve the crisis and managing affected population. Michel Foucault described a program as a “set of calculated, reasoned prescriptions in terms of which institutions are meant to be recognized, space arranged and behavior regulated” (2000b, 231 see Li 2007, 2, 6, 270-281). In the case of Lapindo Mudflow, I define programming disaster as the power making in the network between state-corporation-population relations by producing calculated plans and operating mechanisms to achieve specific aims and rationality in normalizing disaster.

**FINDINGS**

Program or calculation plans are not working automatically. There are actors involves through various programming phase in designing, implementing, and operating corporate objective in managing the disastrous event and affected population. One anonymous financial security institution published a research document and clearly outlined several possible scenarios for the Corporation in managing the post-disaster event (Anonymous 2006, 31, 37). First, the mudflow needs to be known as a natural disaster. Second, an independent party declares natural disaster status. Third, state funds can be used to tackle the cost of the disaster. These three solutions are the perfect calculability for the Corporation in handling the disaster. There are three features of corporate power in achieving its primary objective preventing further losses in terms of financial and business operations. The three features are 1) the ability to influence the political decision through the political network, 2) reducing business risk with strategy, and 3) deploying the technology of power toward the affected population.

1. The ability to influence political decisions in political networks is one of the primary keys of corporate strategies in implementing the program objective. One of the mechanisms in influencing the political decision is through political barter exchanging interests and needs in the political marketplace. The main objective of this political barter is to gain disaster status as natural. In 2008, the Legislative Monitoring Team for the Mudflow affair concluded the disaster was a natural phenomenon (Tempo 2008, 23). One of the legislator and politician from one of the political parties in the Parliament admitted that there was some compromise in conclusion outlined by the Monitoring Team (Setyarso 2008, 28).

2. The Corporate objective in the business network was to minimalize the impact of Lapindo Mudflow on the entire corporate structure and business network. The strategic action is to cut “the infected” network from the main corporate business network. EMP Corporation, as the mother corporation made a spin-off (separation) by selling the share ownership of Lapindo to another corporation or investment group. The spin-off attempt finally happened in July
2007 when EMP was no longer financially consolidating Lapindo (ENRG, 2007). EMP Corporation press release on 14 November 2006 appointed MLC (Minarak Labuan Co. Ltd) to undertake Lapindo’s responsibility toward the affected villagers and the mudflow affairs (ERNG 2006b). MLC’s responsibility in the agreement also covered all the operational costs of Lapindo in Brantas PSC and Lapindo’s financial requirements relating to Sidoarjo mudflow mitigation effort (ERNG, 2007).

3. Although the Corporation can consolidate its power in the political and business network to secure cooperation in the national level, the Government cannot make regulations if affected villagers do not accept and recognize government solutions to the problems. The Government needs consent from the population of the affected villagers since it is related to the government’s credibility, position, and image as a political authority. The Corporation deploys two forms of technology of power to execute the program at the local level. In dealing with village politics, the first strategy is to borrow the state’s political technology by using the village as the technology of power.

The village as a technology of power has a similar administrative function to the “police” and the same objective in controlling population (Breman 1980, 10; Foucault 200d, 14, 415-16). The village as a political and administrative unit and its actors from village leaders to local brokers or intermediaries play important roles as the local operators. They are effective devices to control and conduct the affected villagers to follow the scenarios based on the corporate land deals program.

The Corporation installs Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as the instrument of submission toward the affected population. Marina A. Welker (2009) revealed the importance of Corporate CSR in managing the security of the local population around Newmont’s copper and gold mine in West Nusa Tenggara. She identifies “the CSR industry implicitly endorses drawing civilians into the sphere of corporate security through community development” (2009, 147). From the corporate security manager, Welker finds out that “Corporate security begins in the community” (2009, 147). The Corporation is conducting CSR as the second technology of power in making submissive affected 3 villagers. One of the village leaders from affected villages cooperating with the MLC Company created a community development program by establishing a CSR center.34 The village leader said that during 2009 both affected villagers and the Corporation were mediated in a meeting. The meeting resolves that both the Corporation and affected villagers became brothers, and the creation of community development facilitates this brotherhood. The Javanese values of cooperation and mediation through the community forum between the Corporation and affected villagers should be work as a mechanism in resolving disputes. The discourse of cooperation and brotherhood between corporations and affected villagers through the medium of community development are effective to make the affected villagers submissive. In the case of Lapindo mudflow, both village and CSR as technologies of power deploy as part of corporate governmentality instruments to arrange the relationship between the Corporations and affected villagers.

34 In-Depth interview, 2 February 2012
CONCLUSION

Power relations in the contemporary capitalist society are complex. Instead of thinking the State as the only powerful actor in managing the population, we should also consider corporations as one of the non-state actors capable of controlling the population. We might call this power corporate governmentality or put another name corporationality (corporate – rationality), corporate mentality (corporate mentality to borrow govern – mentality). Perhaps the word “Corporation” itself is sufficient and adequate to represent power embodied inside this institution, but the aim is to illustrate that “govern,” the art in governing or “conduct of conduct” does not exclusively belong to the state. The Lapindo Mudflow case study offers to re-orient our view that Corporations also has the, ability, intelligibility and capacity to deploy some technology of power in the relations with the state and population.
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