CHAPTER 15

Circulating resource regimes across and beyond Southeast Asia and Oceania

Anu Lounela
University of Helsinki
Tuomas Tammisto
Tampere University
Heikki Wilenius
University of Helsinki

Abstract

Anthropologists have for a long time studied 'cultures' in geographic regions, and thus developed regional ethnographic research, such as Southeast Asian and Oceania-specific studies. Although these regional conceptions have since been challenged by many scholars, they still persist in many anthropological studies. This chapter explores how these regional conceptions became political entities that are historically linked to Western anthropologists working in the area since colonial times. Further, the chapter challenges the regional model of anthropological disciplinary roots and regionalism through our research on circulating resource regimes and related anthropological work. The chapter problematizes notions of fixed and demarcated

How to cite this book chapter:
Lounela, Anu, Tuomas Tammisto, and Heikki Wilenius. 2026. 'Circulating resource regimes across and beyond Southeast Asia and Oceania'. In *Manifold Anthropology: Reordering Relations*, edited by Ilana Gershon and Sarah Green, 367–393. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. https://doi.org/10.33134/HUP-38-16

regions, places and societies. It does so by exploring the production and circulation of resource regimes—such as palm oil and timber—understood here as generating multiple social orders and involving negotiations of belonging and exclusion. Using the notion of the logic of resource extraction and locating regimes (Green 2022), the chapter shows how circulating resource regimes generate multiple and overlapping social orders that connect places and resource-making regimes across national and regional borders, challenging regional conceptualizations and traditional perspectives of 'region' and 'place' or 'culture' and 'community' (Gershon 2019).

Introduction

Plantations are expanding rapidly around the globe, with devastating effects on the diverse landscapes of the regions commonly known as Southeast Asia and Oceania (Berenschot and Dhiaulhaq 2023; Chao 2022; Haraway 2015; Li and Semedi 2021; Nelson et al. 2014). In our research, we attempt to understand how the production of palm oil and the extraction of timber products connect with and disconnect from spaces and places by forming resource regimes involving states, people and companies among others. That is, we use the notion of the logic of resource extraction—the locating regime—to explore hierarchical positions, values and relations, which are produced through these processes (Green 2022). We propose that the logics of resource extraction are linked to how people negotiate and switch between multiple social orders as places become sites of resource production, suggesting what this volume calls a manifold anthropology. Our ethnographic studies focus on different types of commodity plants (oil palm and timber) on the Indonesian side of Borneo and New Britain Island in Papua New Guinea (PNG), where the localization of resource regimes creates connections between and disconnections from people and places resulting in both similar and very different outcomes. In particular, our interests lie in these similarities and differences in relation to the logics of such resource regimes, when they materialize and how they emerge in specific locations in Southeast Asia and Oceania.

Anthropology has long been characterized by the study of 'cultures' in geographical regions, such as in Southeast Asia and Oceania in our case, resulting in region-specific ethnographic studies and literature. When we, as PhD students, set out to do our own ethnographic

fieldwork for our dissertations, we were encouraged to thoroughly examine all of the ethnographic literature relevant to the region and topic of our research projects. Thus, we began our fieldwork through the eyes of academically trained anthropologists with accumulated knowledge of the regional and ethnographic literature. Later, returning from what we treated as the field, we engaged with researchers with a similar regional focus, while of course drawing from general theoretical discussions and scholars.

In this chapter, we explore how our current research and related anthropological orientation challenges the model of disciplinary roots and regionalism that we adopted as young anthropologists. In doing so, we problematize notions of fixed and demarcated regions, places and societies by exploring the circulation of resource regimes, understood as generating multiple social orders and involving negotiations of belonging and exclusion. Our research demonstrates how natural resource regimes connect places and affect the dynamics of social orders across national and local boundaries through the circulation of commodities such as palm oil or timber and through modes of production (see Lounela and Tammisto 2021). To best understand the frontier dynamics of the commodification of nature in Kalimantan and New Britain, scholars must move beyond the perspective of traditional 'region' and 'place' (Green et al. 2024) or 'culture' and 'community' (Gershon 2019) and adopt what the authors of this volume call manifold anthropology (see Introduction).

'Southeast Asia' as a region was a Cold War invention, the product of a locating regime created to protect the geopolitical interests of the US in the region. As such, the US viewed the region as being at risk of a communist takeover, prompting it to intervene in regional politics by forming the South East Asia Treaty Organisation that came into force in 1955. This led to the concept of 'Southeast Asia' (Beng-Huat 2001: 481). Ironically, this focus secured funding for Cornell University's Southeast Asia Programme, which produced analyses critical of US interests in the region (Kahin 1997). Consequently, a residual discomfort persists among some scholars around the usage of the term 'Southeast Asia' (Wolters 1994); yet, despite this discomfort, the European Association for Southeast Asia Studies meets regularly, primarily to discuss regional research.

Similarly, regional conceptions delimiting the islands of Oceania into discrete entities, such as 'Melanesia', 'Polynesia' and 'Micronesia',

are equally problematic. First, they are based on racialized and colonial divisions (Autio 2021: xi–xii; Hau'ofa 2008: 77n2). Second, they give the impression of discrete and essentialized cultural and geographical regions in an area characterized by movement and contact since humans first settled it (Hau'ofa 1994: 152–153). Furthermore, as Epeli Hau'ofa (1994: 153) notes, the notion of 'Pacific Islands', a term coined by European men, conjures the image of bounded islands 'far in the sea', an understanding at odds with the lived realities of the people of Oceania connected by a shared sea.

Important connections also span locations extending rather far back into history. For instance, 23,000 years ago, obsidian from New Britain was traded as far away as Borneo (Bourke 2009: 12)—the two islands and the contemporary connections upon which we focus here. For this reason, 'Asia-Pacific' is equally problematic, because it lumps together hundreds of millions of people into a seemingly undifferentiated region and specifically marginalizes Oceania as an appendage of Asia (Hau'ofa 2008: 45–46). Rather than assuming that either is a bounded entity, such as 'Southeast Asia' or 'Melanesia', or oversimplifying terms such as 'Asia-Pacific', we suggest examining the specific sites and situations of contacts and connections generating places by situating them in relation to each other (Green 2013). For instance, here we discuss how the natural resource economy in general and the production of palm oil and timber in particular create connections between people and places. Some of these connections are legal and bureaucratic, such as companies operating in PNG originating in Malaysia. Other connections materialize in organisms, commodified as 'natural resources', transported across numerous borders from Kalimantan and New Britain to buyers on the global market.

To illustrate the coexistence of different locating regimes in the region, we introduce one further concept. Southeast Asia and Oceania are also conceptually separated in the natural sciences by the Wallace Line, which runs through the Makassar Strait in Indonesia between Borneo and Sulawesi. This line, drawn by biologist Alfred Russel Wallace in 1859, denotes differences in organisms such as animals and plants living on the western and eastern sides of the line. While the line denotes real differences in species—for example, marsupials live only on the eastern side—it also serves as a locating regime drawing conceptual differences between 'Oriental fauna' and 'a different fauna' (see Groves 1983: 105). Some species, such as bats and specific birds, cross

this human-drawn boundary, thereby blurring species differences. The Wallace Line represents the reification of a Eurocentric, colonial perspective (Groves 1983: 105; Sysling 2019: 317), but it continues to carry relevance in the thinking of Papuans and Indonesians, as it was historically used to invoke or deny an 'essential' difference between 'Papua' and 'Malay' areas (Sysling 2019: 329; cf. Green 2022: 206–7). Furthermore, this boundary between the two areas has shifted over time, depending upon political and scholarly interests (Sysling 2019: 329). What interests us here is this coexistence and the interplay between different ways of locating things— political and biological in the case of the Wallace Line, and between resource capitalism and political in our ethnographic examples.

While in certain contexts it makes sense to talk about 'Southeast Asia' or 'Oceania', we should not take such classifications for granted, but instead examine how and why they are used. This holds true for other spatial and regional categorizations as well. Rather than outright assuming that a given place 'belongs' to this or that region, we should examine how and by whom locations and the logic of regimes are constructed and the actual relations—between people, places and things (Green 2013)—that shape them. We do this in our research on the extraction of commodities from nature and their subsequent circulation, to form a specific locating and value regime. The different regimes destabilize the dominant locating regimes of our fieldwork locations: in the riverine Central Kalimantan on the Indonesian side of Borneo (Lounela) and New Britain Island in the island region of PNG (Tammisto), and in the media in Indonesia (Wilenius).

Studies of environmental relations and change have a long tradition in anthropology. Earlier studies since Roy Rappaport (1967) examined fixed landscapes and places with clearly demarcated social groups. In early political ecology, Eric Wolf (1972) developed the view that places are influenced by expanding capitalist structures and interests which impact local decision-making power and systems, depriving peasants of the means of production and producing a specific political ecology. Later scholars of political ecology critiqued the notion that capitalism possesses overwhelming hegemonic power by highlighting how people negotiate and combine various systems (such as subsistence and market systems) in different places. On the one hand, these amalgamations are given meaning through environmental practices and social organizations that interact with global forces (Biersack 2006). On the

other hand, the situated knowledge in the making of resource frontiers, and the effects of capitalism on social relations and modes of production and vice versa, have become important questions (Li 2014; Peluso 2012).

Early economic anthropologists developed theories on exchange, categorizing exchange of goods, money and people into separate spheres with distinct organizing values and social principles (Malinowski 2005; Mauss 2002 [1925]; Sahlins 1972). Some scholars, like Annette Weiner (1992), proposed fundamental distinction between alienable and inalienable objects of exchange. Chris Gregory (1982) characterized 'gifts' and 'commodities' as different kinds of modes of exchange resulting in very different kinds of social relations between the exchangers. Using this typology, he examined the interaction between local and capitalist economies in colonial PNG, where the capitalist economy did not replace local economies but resulted rather in their 'efflorescence', namely the intensification of gift exchange with the incorporation of commodities (Gregory 1982: 6, 115). In his later work, *Savage Money*, Gregory (1997) refined this framework by emphasizing the coexistence and covalence of competing value standards, raising critical questions about their number, relationships and power dynamics within specific historical contexts. Crucially, Gregory (1997: 8–9, 36) highlighted that people actively switch between different value systems and their logics—phenomena that can only be properly understood through field research.

Building on these earlier discussions, we delve into how locating resource regimes simultaneously connect and disconnect people and places, thereby fostering social and material relations that contribute to the formation of multiple social orders. We argue that this process does more than simply alienate things or replace existing orders.

Thus, people actively negotiate their belonging across different, sometimes new, social orders, some of which emerge in relation to commodity economies. We explore how different circulating resource regimes with 'universalizing' logics of commodification emerge as part of multiple social orders when people interact with them.

We recently argued for the usefulness of linking resource-making debates to more recent anthropological theories of value (Lounela 2019a, 2019b, 2020, 2021a, 2021b; Tammisto 2019, 2020, 2024). In other words, the commodification of nature in specific places—translating natural elements into marketable commodities—indicates

how new value regimes are temporarily established in landscapes. An important question becomes who has the power to decide what is valuable or who has the authority to decide or force some logic of the regime onto others? When the logic of a resource regime breaks down, some actors have more authority than others to make the social order dominate (Gershon 2019: 10). In Graeber's terms (2001), it is not simply that values exist in a world of ideas but that they emerge through action, materializing in landscapes or places (Lounela 2021b; Tammisto 2024: 6–9). For instance, palm oil circulates across regions and dominates large areas of Central Kalimantan and PNG, suggesting that some social orders have more power than others to impose a new commodity regime (palm oil or timber) on the landscape, while in other places the planting of oil palm is resisted, opening up the landscape to other logics of locating regimes (Lounela 2021a).

More recently, Anna Tsing (2005: 3) suggested that 'it has become increasingly clear that all human cultures are shaped and transformed in long histories of regional-to-global networks of power, trade, and meaning'. When general models such as capitalism and environmentalism travel across locations, they are translated into local languages and activities during encounters between the specific and the general, or local and global, producing 'friction', as Tsing (2005: 1, 4, 6, 18) contends. However, 'friction' also depends upon perspective. For those planning networks, friction may be the necessary component that grants 'traction' to projects, as Golub and Rhee (2013) note in their study on Papua New Guinean executives in the mineral extraction sector. In these analyses, circulation takes place through moments of encounters and during acts of translation (see also Gershon 2019).

The question, therefore, is not simply about the hegemonic power of capitalist corporations supported by state actors, legislation and national policies. It extends to the people who produce and create corporate-like institutions and state or non-governmental-like organizations, often supported by external actors, albeit through their own volition (see, e.g., Timmer 2010). Consequently, anthropologists have turned to the study of the power and environmental relations emerging from the making of new orders and how they connect with or disconnect from different social organizations through resource extraction. As Gershon (2019: 1) notes, many anthropologists today explore 'what happens when their fieldwork interlocutors live among multiple social orders that are kept distinct yet have porous boundaries'. For example,

in one of our fieldsites, Central Kalimantan on the Indonesian side of Borneo, there are people who identify as the Ngaju indigenous people and consider themselves river people, whose cohesion is based on historically formed river groups with cosmological relations to ancestors and spirits. In this location, a deity called Jata inhabits the water world, while ancestors and spirits of various kinds inhabit the earth and sky and communicate and negotiate with the people (Lounela 2019b). During the Dutch colonial period, the Dayak established agricultural practices by digging rivers further into the swamps and distributing land rights primarily to those considered relatives on one side of the river. On the other side of the river, a different group (sometimes called a clan) could do the same. The maintenance of rivers and the farming of rice, cassava or rubber trees required cooperation, with kinship groups initially forming the core of the river group doing the work. In the 1990s, the logging resource economy and the state's agricultural schemes significantly transformed the landscape (Lounela 2021a; McCarthy 2013). New, more formalized channel groups were formed to ensure and expand Dayak long-term land rights and land cultivation. This was further complicated when the state aimed to produce 'modern' groups of forest farmers who would form a social order of 'efficient' commodity producers by manufacturing timber under the new regime since 2014. This commodity production provided the logic of the new social order, prioritizing economic values, now representing the dominant locating regime.

Furthermore, as the PNG example outlined below illustrates, the oil palm plantation is characterized and generated by its relation to other places, people and networks, namely by its 'relative location', to use Sarah Green's (2013: 303) expression. Some of these relations, such as the connection to international buyers, are deliberate, resulting from the social effort of the people who own and control the plantation, while others are contingent upon it, such as through their connection to local land-owning systems. Some of these relations are deliberately disconnecting, namely through the separation of the plantation from its surroundings through territorial practices. This separation occurs through definitions and mapping when the plantation area is legally and administratively defined as a lease area distinguished from its surroundings, as well as through physical boundary-making in the form of guarded gates along the plantation borders.

Circulating commodities, social organizations and different social orders in Central Kalimantan

Since the 1970s and 1980s, Central Kalimantan has experienced a range of phenomena contributing to the creation of 'resource frontiers' (Barney 2009), including expanding plantations, forestry industries and mines (Astuti et al. 2022; Lounela 2021a). A large amount of the province of Central Kalimantan has been licensed for mining and industrial plantation use. Oil palm plantations have rapidly expanded across the province, affecting livelihood systems not only in the villages that are a part of those schemes but also in neighbouring settlements. This has resulted in debates over 'good' livelihood systems and techniques and the value of nature and proper ways of living. Villages, thus, represent locations connected to other places through commodity production or resisting commodity production.

In the village of Sei Tobun (a pseudonym), many national, regional and global resource regimes have been in operation, especially since the 1960s. In the course of time, the expansion of oil palm plantations and forest logging became connected with large-scale wildfires that degraded forests and gardens. In mid-2000, wary of the powerful oil palm regime, the regional government supported the Ngaju Dayak to mechanize river digging and expanding them further into the peatland. This connected with the development of modern channel groups (*kelompok handel*), distributing land rights to new people and, for instance, planting additional commodity species, initially rubber. Further, a state-regulated social forestry scheme called a 'village forest area' (*hutan desa*) was established in 2013, covering an area of about 7,000 hectares. The scheme was initiated by villagers in collaboration with non-governmental organizations, the regional government, and supported by an international donor agency. The village forest area falls under the control of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, since it is situated in an area designated as a state protected forest. Under the social forestry scheme, responsibility for the management and protection of this forest area was transferred to a newly established Village Forest Peasant Group (Lembaga Peduli Hutan Desa). The purpose of this social forestry scheme was to prevent the spread of oil palm in the village (and three other nearby villages) and to promote a multispecies forest in which people can engage in non-timber forestry activities (Lounela 2019b). The scheme itself was made possible because the

(Ngaju Dayak) governor at the time supported the policy along with climate change mitigation efforts (Lounela 2021a).

After a subsequent change to the national and regional governments a few years later, a new social forestry scheme related to agrarian reform policy was introduced to the village by President Jokowi and the village administration. This was accompanied by a plywood-manufacturing corporation, which built a factory on village land. The social forestry scheme, understood as agrarian reform, was connected to the resource regime of the factory, whereby villagers were asked to form social forestry groups to manage the state forest land and plant rapidly growing timber species (*sengon* or *Falcataria moluccana*). The forest peasant groups could apply for funding to plant *sengon* on land beyond the protected forest area. Subsequently, there were competing and overlapping social orders—forest peasant groups related to the social forestry scheme, and the historically grounded river groups working on the same peat landscape in the village. However, when the timber plantation corporation expanded, encroaching upon village land and alienating villagers from it, the resource extraction ultimately demonstrated how locations are simultaneously connected and disconnected through different locating regimes within a single village and beyond (see Chapter 13 on how material objects, such as food or land, become 'sites' of overlapping value regimes).

The expansion of oil palm plantations on the islands of Kalimantan, Sumatra, Sulawesi and, more recently, West Papua in Indonesia demonstrates the enormous capacity of a single commodity crop and the associated industry to impact landscapes, natural relations, human environmental practices and social organizations, not only in the places where they operate but also in the surrounding areas, as when people adopted the social forestry scheme to stop the expansion of oil palm. For example, in Kalimantan, oil palm plantations occupied roughly 5.7 million hectares according to a satellite imagery analysis from 2014–2016 (Kementerian Pertanian Republik Indonesia 2019), representing a fivefold increase within ten years (Miettinen, Gaveau and Liew 2019). Many of the plantation companies operating in Kalimantan are subsidiaries of Malaysian palm oil companies (Greenomics Indonesia 2014), highlighting the cross-regional linkage of the industry. In Central Kalimantan, the region of this study, oil palm plantations occupy 32 per cent of the land area, which is expected to increase.

Witnessing corporations spread oil palm plantations across state land at an accelerating rate, the Ngaju Dayak in Sei Tobun became worried. In the past, land primarily remained under common property arrangements with multiple and flexible rights (Lounela 2021b). However, these rights are insecure because legally, most of the land in Central Kalimantan is under state control as 'state land', dating back to the Dutch colonial period and the notion of 'waste land', paving the way for the erasure of customary rights to land (Kelly and Peluso 2015; Tsing 2005). Over time, state agencies allocated land rights to companies through various concessions, dispossessing local people of their land. In some cases, companies expanded their operations before obtaining formal permits. As a result, illegal oil palm plantations have proliferated in the region (Astuti et al. 2022), which was also made possible by widespread corruption and nepotistic networks in the province (Berenschot 2018: 1570). Thus, compared to PNG, the resource-locating regime differentially impacted land tenure systems and social orders due to the violent nature of commodity circulation and governance in Indonesia (Li and Semedi 2021). However, resource-making models also create similar social organizations, with wage labour practices and ecologies contributing to the multiple social orders in these locations and across regions, topics we discuss in the next section.

Circulating resource models and multiple social orders

In Indonesia as a whole, as well as in Central Kalimantan, people can access state land via multiple channels if their customary rights are restricted or removed. Most recently, the agrarian reform programme launched by President Joko Widodo promoted social forestry programmes as a means of accessing state land in specific localities (Resosudarmo et al. 2019: 1). Such programmes are linked to resource- and nature-making projects by companies, non-governmental organizations, international donors or national programmes, including agrarian reform programmes (Lounela 2021a).

In the village of Sei Tobun, various projects have encouraged the Ngaju to become entrepreneurs (producing rubber, timber, fruit trees or other cash crops) and to set up modern peasant organizations that do business with various actors (Lounela 2021a, 2021b; Lounela and Wilenius 2023). The Ngaju residents report that people's land tenure

rights on state land, which they also partly consider their customary land, overlap with the newly formed modern peasant groups' areas mentioned earlier. Overlapping tenure rights and social organizations cause tensions, since some people fear losing their land rights. In addition, joining a peasant group means that, at least initially, people should plant the fast-growing tree species *sengon* for the resource industry. In many cases, the leaders of these organizations were ultimately from somewhere else, or actors with some authority in other social organizations (e.g. priests, customary heads, river heads and so on), playing an active and decisive role. Moving across multiple social orders, villagers have a long tradition of flexibility and inclusive sociality. Flexible forms of sociality—river groups—extended along the rivers where people are autonomously engaged in environmental practices and share harvests or labour among themselves, but today they also actively engage as corporate-like organizations (Lounela 2021b). Thus, multiple social orders relating to the river groups, canal groups, village forest area groups and forest peasant groups are shaped by the circulating and locating regimes, raising questions of belonging and resulting in rather porous boundaries and their negotiations (Gershon 2019).

Central Kalimantan has had a new national focus during Joko Widodo's presidency, since his politics emphasize infrastructure investment (Lounela and Wilenius 2023). When construction of the abovementioned plywood factory began in the village, Widodo himself visited the building site (Lounela 2021a; Lounela and Wilenius 2023: 6), demonstrating the national interest in Sei Tobun. However, the political regime acted in concert with actors from the resource economy, framing the factory in a novel manner: as a dynamic site of entrepreneurship, an up-and-coming location for investments and modernization.

As we have shown elsewhere (Lounela and Wilenius 2023), in creating the factory, a capitalist extractive logic was implemented by the nation-state. This connection became quite clear on regional news websites and in newspapers, where it was made legible to the public through an obvious genre of political intervention: the working visit (*kunjungan kerja*) (Kabupaten Pulang Pisau 2017). Familiar to all Indonesian news consumers, featured in politician-financed puff pieces (see Aspinall and Berenschot 2019: 225), working visits are displays of paternal care by a political figure. In this case, the news media

told the public that the villagers would become entrepreneurs, supplying the rapidly growing *sengon* wood to the plywood factory through a mutually beneficial relationship. But, in a narrative twist, Sei Tobun did not become a hotbed of economic activity as predicted in the national media. Bit by bit, the state-sponsored neoliberal narrative announced during the working visit fell apart: *sengon* was not bought locally; instead, *ramin*, another natural wood product, was transported from a logging site situated upstream. Factory wages stood below the regional minimum wage, and ultimately accidents began occurring—specifically, something began haunting the factory (Lounela and Wilenius 2023: 10–12). Sei Tobun appeared on the national map again—and in our Google Alerts—but this time framed as a different, familiar genre for the national public: ghost stories (*cerita misterius)*.

For a brief time, a critical narrative against the government-sponsored development plans circulated in the media. These narratives were framed nationally as a ghost story, regionally as critical coverage against the plywood company and locally as stories of spirit possession and other supernatural events. This variegated criticism reflected how the factory was situated within various social orders: as an exemplary site of state-sponsored entrepreneurial development, as a source of commodities for an extractive capitalist system and as a sacred site for the Ngajus and their ancestors. These conflicting orders came together, changing their shape when translated and upscaled for different publics. Provincial politicians completed another working visit to the factory, verifying some of the rumoured problems and promising to address them in future talks with the company. This, apparently, proved sufficient to assert the dominance of the political locating regime. Critical coverage of the situation in the mass media, including descriptions of the supernatural events, stopped.

For the inhabitants of Sei Tobun, the situation was different: a more-than-human social order—the ancestors–spirits–human landscape—delivered a reminder of its presence through dreams and appearances, demanding recognition of 'their place' on the land that had now become corporate property, a site claimed. Sei Tobun residents were concerned about their exchange and social relations with these ancestors, whose anger was threatening the cosmological social order. They had to react to the ancestors' claims by occupying a road on corporation land. This economic locating regime closed the land frontier temporarily: villagers were denied access to 'corporation land'

if they were not employees or if there was no reason for the company to grant them access. The closure of this ancestral landscape created tensions because it threatened the continuity of more-than-human social relations within the landscape.

At the same time, villagers reported that they had all rushed to plant *sengon* in another location which many considered Ngaju customary land, but which in the state maps was categorized as state land, after the president's visit when the factory was launched in the village (Lounela 2021a). However, producing quality timber meeting the company's standards proved challenging given the quality of the peat soil and variable water conditions. Furthermore, wildfires destroyed many plots of trees before villagers could sell them to the corporation. The forest peasant groups entered the commodity species cultivation and commodification of trees, which would possibly reduce rubber and rice cultivation, and had long historical roots among the Ngaju. People were frustrated by the excessively low wages, the low price of the wood and the uncertainty of being able to sell the wood on the markets due to its 'low quality', despite their willingness to engage in this commodity economy (Lounela and Wilenius 2023).

Here one could also argue that forms of value 'leak' between different social orders, disrupting one at the expense of the other, as Timo Kaartinen shows in Chapter 14 with his example of the preference for rubber cultivation and the commodity economy over subsistence rice cultivation, only with specific labour and sharing patterns during the rubber boom—that is, when the price was good (see also Lounela 2021a).

The timber social forestry scheme (agrarian reform in the national discourse) is a specific logic of the economic locating regime, producing a social order of commodity production and corporate organization for timber production. At the same time, it produces uncertainty as people become dependent upon the (new) market economy exchange, which is affected by the ecological conditions of the peat and by fire disasters (if the trees burned, grew distorted, etc.). Paradoxically, the logic of private property alongside the logic of common governance under the authority of the state (social forestry on state land) represents components of the commodity value regime. This complex situation creates overlapping and multiple social orders, such as the cosmological, commodity resource, and state-promoted social orders, which materialized through the transnational timber industry.

This ethnography of multiple social orders in Central Kalimantan illustrates how national locating regimes connect with global and national economic resource regimes, which extend into riverine landscapes, such as in the form of a plywood factory accompanied by social forestry (Lounela 2021a; Lounela and Wilenius 2023). When people sell customary land, which they formalize as their own private property through the help of the village chief and company, their connections to spirits and ancestors are severed as their access to the factory location is restricted: new forms of exclusion and boundary-making take place. The Ngaju were forced to disconnect from the 'unseen' because they sold the land (Lounela and Wilenius 2023: 13), and their relationships with their ancestors and spirits were thus threatened.

Papua New Guinea: plantation connections

In this section, we describe how an oil palm plantation in the Wide Bay area of the Pomio District on New Britain Island, PNG represents both a clear, bounded spatial unit and a place serving as the materialization of different social orders, relations and translocal networks. Indeed, 'place' does not represent the locally situated opposite of 'global'; instead, place serves as the grounded site where global–local articulations—quite literally—take place, as Aletta Biersack (2006: 16–17) notes. That is, the relations shaping a place are both local and global, resulting in a multilocal interaction (Biersack 2006: 15–17; Rodman 1992: 641–42, 647, 652; Tammisto 2024: 6–9). As we show, in Wide Bay, different social orders—especially local landholding communities and the plantation—coexist, because communities next to the plantation have *not* been dispossessed of their lands and as the material and environmental basis for local social orders has not been changed (see Gregory 1982: 115). This means that people from these communities have more leeway to negotiate their belonging in the different social orders, for example by moving between the plantation and the village (see Tammisto 2019). These two orders also have clear spatial and administrative borders between them, but they are materially connected, and their relative location to one another is crucial.

The Tzen plantation owned by the Malaysian company Tzen Niugini in Wide Bay is a physical place, as well as an example or instance of the more general plantation form—a means of organizing agricultural production. The plantation form is a translocal production, value and

governance regime. That is, it is a constellation of land, labour and capital intended to produce a particular agricultural commodity, usually for export, and which depends on a large supply of cheap labour and land and is characterized by rigid class differences and divisions of labour (Bernstein and Pitt 1974: 514; Dennis 1980: 219, 237; Li and Semedi 2021: vi, 1; Mintz 1986: 47). The plantation is a form of governance, because social life and the environment are reshaped to meet the needs of production (Dove 2012: 30). More so, plantations have been, and are, means of occupying and 'pacifying' frontier areas and bringing them under state control (Chao 2022: 37; Dennis 1980: 219; Tammisto 2024: 167–68, 183–84).

Plantations have been and continue to be based on racialized oppression and violence (Chao 2022: 10; McKittrick 2013: 2–3, 8–9). These general processes manifest themselves in different ways and in different combinations on actual plantations, which are always specific and contextual instances of the more general plantation form. For example, plantations during the early colonial era in New Guinea were both the reason for and a key means of colonial annexation accompanied by violent racist practices, such as the floggings characteristic of German plantations (Hempenstall 1989: 137). The oil palm plantation in Wide Bay was connected to postcolonial state formation through the provision of infrastructure and the creation of state-like spaces (Tammisto 2024: 174–77), and is now characterized by more structural, racialized violence and prejudice, as exemplified by the view among plantation managers that locals working on the plantation 'are not yet accustomed to work' (Tammisto 2019: 25).

In truth, local workers arriving from rural villages are accustomed to extremely hard agricultural work in their swidden gardens, performing exhausting physical labour on plantations. Local people, accustomed to controlling their own work, did, however, often find controlled and alienated labour on the plantation distasteful or problematic (Tammisto 2019: 25). Spurious comments by a plantation manager that people do not yet know how to work obfuscate the fact that political relations on the plantation are often at odds with people's unwillingness to submit themselves to such conditions, rather than an indication of their lack of skill (Dove 2012: 195, 225; Tammisto 2019: 22). In fact, the inhabitants of Wide Bay are not only proficient at hard agricultural work—paid or not—but also in combining different value regimes in their lives. People moved to plantations to earn money,

pursue commodity relations and at times to escape the obligations of village life, only to leave plantations when fed up with the controlled and commodified work (Tammisto 2019: 31–33). More so, people in Wide Bay are quite attentive to the different social relations that produce different places and to the social relations manifested within them. By moving between places like a plantation and their home villages, people moved consciously between the various value regimes and political and social orders in order to pursue different values (Tammisto 2019: 31–33).

The Tzen oil palm plantation in the north-western corner of Wide Bay is a relatively clear spatial unit or place. It is distinguished from the surrounding areas most concretely by the straight rows of oil palms and terraced hills. On the roads leading to and from the plantation stand gates with guard posts, separating the plantation from its surroundings. Within the plantation lie several compounds, including living quarters for workers, workshops, an aid station, a store and an office compound; at the top of a hill stands the manager's house, a compound for expert workers and their mess hall. The plantation is in many ways an enclave, an area clearly delimited from its surroundings. Indeed, life on the plantation is ordered according to the requirements of production (Tammisto 2024: 172–74), with that order maintained by security guards either working for the company or as contractors.

But, like all enclaves, it is 'entangled' in multiple ways with its surroundings (see Appel 2012; Käkönen 2023; Tammisto 2024: 177–78). Women from the surrounding communities come to sell fresh food they have grown on the communal lands on the plantation marketplace—or by setting up makeshift stalls in the worker compounds—as well as by selling food directly to the cook in the mess hall. This is an example of how the different social orders of local peasant agriculture on communally owned land and the plantation mode of production articulate with one another, and how peasant women make use of the plantation. Conversely, the plantation company benefits the affordable food produced by peasants and sold to its workers, as it allows for lower wages. Similarly, the plantation relies more widely on the rural peasant sector for the reproduction of labour, as many workers come from the rural communities of Pomio, grow their own food on the plantation or receive it from rural kin (Tammisto 2019). This coexistence of different social orders is possible because the surrounding

rural communities control their own lands (see Gregory 1982: 115; Tammisto 2024: 287).

Another important relation that generates or defines the Tzen plantation in Wide Bay (and all other plantations) is its relation to markets. Plantations, as noted above, produce agricultural commodities, typically for export and for global markets. The commodity produced by the Tzen plantation is palm oil—namely, oil pressed from the fruits of the oil palm, a crop covering about 7,500 hectares of land on the plantation. Oil palm companies cannot export the fruit of the oil palm because it spoils relatively quickly. Thus, it must be pressed into oil in a mill within 24–48 hours of the harvest. This means that, to function, oil palm plantations must lie near a palm oil mill. Since the Tzen plantation is situated in the remote Pomio district, for which no road connected it to the provincial capital until 2015, the mill was located on the plantation. In many ways, the mill serves as the heart of the plantation. All oil palm fields are surrounded and traversed by roads that link to the mill like arteries, such that fresh fruit bunches can be transported to the mill via trucks. After the fruit is pressed into oil, the oil must be transported to buyers. Given that the Wide Bay area lacked roads linking it to major centres, palm oil is transported via ship. In fact, one reason local politicians wanted Tzen Niugini to establish the oil palm plantation in Wide Bay was the hope that the company would build the as-yet missing roads linking Pomio and the capital (Tammisto 2010, 2024: 157–58).

The Tzen plantation mill is, however, located inland, such that an approximately 2.5 km pipeline links the mill to the shore. The pipeline was built to reach the shore via the shortest possible distance: it crosses the large Mevlou River, which is also the southern border of the plantation, makes a slight angle, and runs straight to the shore. On a sandy beach on the shore lies the end of the pipeline and a pumping station, consisting of a shipping crate which serves as a shed to store tools and some hand-operated valves. Beyond this, no other infrastructure exists. The bay is deep enough for large tanker ships to call to port; when they arrive, workers connect a large floating hose to the pipeline and pull the other end to the ship using tug boats. Then, palm oil can be pumped into the tanker. The pipeline, and the seemingly unimpressive pumping station on the beach, is a materialization of the plantation's relation to markets. There, by opening the valves, workers literally regulate the flow of palm oil into global markets. The oil is

pumped onto ships that sail under the flags of China, Indonesia, Hong Kong or South Korea,[1] and it is transported to buyers, and later to producers, as raw material for food stuffs, cosmetics and biofuel. At one point, the mill on the Tzen plantation supplied palm oil to the Finnish fuel company Neste (Global Witness 2021: 32), which operates three refineries in Porvoo (south-eastern Finland), Rotterdam and Singapore, respectively.

The pipeline represents more than a simple material conduit, making the flow of palm oil from Pomio possible and serving as the connection between the plantation and global markets. The requirement to transport palm oil via the pipeline to the shore for shipping made it necessary for the palm oil company to establish relations with the neighbouring community. By crossing the Mevlou River, the pipeline crosses multiple territorial and administrative boundaries. On the northern side of Mevlou lies the plantation, which is located on land leased for 99 years from its customary owners, the Simbali. On the southern side lies the Lamarein ward, a community of several villages inhabited by Sulka and Mengen speakers. This is interpreted by the inhabitants of Lamarein to mean specifically them, since the majority of Sulka and Mengen live further south, where various Sulka and Mengen clans hold land under a customary title. In order to build the pipeline along the shortest possible route to the shore, the plantation company was forced to secure permission from the inhabitants of Lamarein, paying rent for the land needed for the pipeline and the pumping station. Notably, the customary ownership has *not* been suspended (unlike the land leased from the Simbali). Thus, half of the pipeline and the pumping station lie on land controlled by the inhabitants of Lamarein. The people of Lamarein have not interfered with the flow of palm oil. On the contrary, when a tanker ship arrives, the company hires people from the community to help the tug boats, employing the ubiquitous speedboats used for travel in the coastal area. As noted above, the pipeline is the literal point of contact between the plantation and the global market, and the piece of infrastructure upon which the profitability of the plantation hinges. That pipeline has been placed under the control of the neighbouring community; the company needs to remain on good terms with that community. The pipeline is then also a material relation which connects the different social orders with one another.

This pipeline is a tangible piece of infrastructure that materializes and makes possible relations with the global market—that is, with other places which in part shape the plantation as a place. The plantation is also connected to places near and far through much less tangible relations via the company that owns it. The company that owns and operates the plantation is often referred to as 'Tzen Niugini', a Malaysian company. As Caroline Hambloch (2022: 6) noted, Tzen Niugini was connected to Cakara Alam, a Malaysian logging company operating in PNG, and the lease for the nearly 25,000 hectare lease area with the Simbali was signed by Tzen Plantation. Tzen Plantation is connected to a larger network of companies (Hambloch 2022: 6). Tzen Niugini and Tzen Plantation are part of a larger network of companies connected to a resource economy in PNG.[2] For example, two of the companies in the network own and operate palm oil mills. These companies are connected to one another via Malaysian businessmen, who are or have been in various configurations owners and directors of the companies. Some of the companies, like Tzen Plantation and one of the palm oil mill companies, are owned by holding companies registered in the British Virgin Islands. The plantation in Wide Bay, like the plantations in Kalimantan discussed earlier, is also formed and defined by its relative location in this web of companies with connections to Malaysia and beyond. To anyone standing on the beach in Lamarein, these connections are less tangible than the palm oil pipeline connecting the mill to the large tanker ships. Yet they are no less important. These connections materialize in the flows of money, in company records available through the Investment Promotion Authority of PNG and via the shareholders and directors.

Conclusions

This chapter demonstrates, through a manifold anthropology, how resource regimes such as the palm oil and timber industries and related commodity chains constitute a locating logic, for example, in the creation of new social orders, principles and territorial boundaries, and in plant–human relations. Such resource regimes need to be located in specific contexts. We have been interested in how these resource regimes create connections and disconnections between places, and between multiple and sometimes overlapping social orders, the boundaries of which people in these particular contexts must constantly negotiate.

These locating resource regimes are made up of circulating commodities and the social organizations that travel with them, shaping and producing those multiple social orders—resource-based commodity production, various social organizations, cosmological spirit and ancestral relations, and modern corporations—with somewhat porous boundaries. Porous boundaries here indicate the movement of people and things between different social organizations and social orders or inhabiting several simultaneously. Crossing these boundaries creates connections as well as disputes and tensions regarding where people belong. In Central Kalimantan, residents form forest peasant groups that grow timber plantations, while they also belong to river groups which mainly manage rubber gardens to combine subsistence and cash-based livelihoods (Dove 2012). These circulating models connect and disconnect regions we know of as 'Southeast Asia' or 'Oceania', and they also extend across locations when people participate in multiple social orders. This can include when inhabitants of Wide Bay move to plantations to perform alienated labour and funnel the wages back to social reproduction in villages.

In Indonesia, according to the national and regional expectations, the Ngaju should become modern citizens by participating in market-based commodity production (e.g. timber or palm oil). But becoming wage labourers poses a potential threat, disconnecting them from both the land and the spiritual landscape. In other words, by cutting off the Ngaju from subsistence livelihood systems and relations with spirits and ancestors, the land is reconfigured through the formation of a new social order produced by the market economy. Indeed, various resource regimes in Indonesia are violent because of the loss of these connections and the loss of the means of production (land and resources) given that the state controls most of the land and, thus, can allocate the rights to those lands to others (Li and Semedi 2021: 11–12). This, in turn, impacts how multiple social orders take shape.

We argue that, while natural resource regimes are similar and produce connections and disconnections across places, they can also differ significantly. However, it is important to point out that in these locations residents have to negotiate their belonging and the boundaries of various and overlapping social orders. This is of interest to contemporary anthropology. In the Pomio District of New Britain Island, large areas of land are in practice and under Papua New Guinean law held by various kinds of local communities under the customary land title.

This stands in stark contrast to the authoritarian state land regime in Indonesia. This property regime also grants local communities much more leverage in shaping relations and results in a more varied social and physical landscape. While the northern side of Mevlou is planted with oil palm, inhabitants of the southern side have refused to lease their land to the plantation company. People also make use of the different places and different regimes materialized within them. However, in both Pomio and Central Kalimantan, people may leave their home villages to pursue commodity relations on a plantation, in the timber industry and in mines. But they also leave abruptly when they become fed up with the highly controlled labour relations characteristic of plantations, the low wages paid or for other reasons—that is, they maintain and cross over the boundaries of multiple social orders.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Ilana Gershon and Sarah Green for their insightful comments and suggestions on our chapter. We also thank two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments. We would also like to thank the Kone Foundation for funding the project New Regimes of Commodification and State Formation on the Resource Frontier of Southeast Asia, without which our research and this chapter would not have been possible.

Notes

1 During his fieldwork in 2019, Tammisto noticed that workers had written the names and call-in dates of four ships to the pipeline and had himself witnessed two of the ships being loaded with palm oil.

2 The analysis of company networks is based on research conducted by Hambloch (2022) as well as Tammisto's examination of company records obtained through the Investment Promotion Authority of Papua New Guinea.

References

Appel, Hannah C. 2012. 'Walls and White Elephants: Oil Extraction, Responsibility, and Infrastructural Violence in Equatorial Guinea'. *Ethnography* 13 (4): 439–65. https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138111435741.

Aspinall, Edward and Ward Berenschot. 2019. *Democracy for Sale: Elections, Clientelism, and the State in Indonesia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Astuti, Rini, Michelle Ann Miller, Andrew McGregor, M. Dedy Pratama Sukmara, Wiko Saputra, Sulistyanto, and David Taylor. 2022. 'Making Illegality Visible: The Governance Dilemmas Created by Visualising Illegal Palm Oil Plantations in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia'. *Land Use Policy* 114: 105942. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105942.

Autio, Petra. 2021. 'Crossing Borders: Changing Contexts of This Book'. In *Culture and History in the Pacific*, 2nd edition, edited by Jukka Siikala, vii–xxii. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. https://doi.org/10.33134/HUP-12-2.

Barney, Keith. 2009. 'Laos and the Making of a "Relational" Resource Frontier'. *Geographical Journal* 175 (2): 146–59. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4959.2009.00323.x.

Beng-Huat, Chua. 2001. 'Notes on the Cold War in Southeast Asia'. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 2 (3): 481–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649370120111028.

Berenschot, Ward. 2018. 'The Political Economy of Clientelism: A Comparative Study of Indonesia's Patronage Democracy'. *Comparative Political Studies* 51 (12): 1563–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414018758756.

Berenschot, Ward and Ahmad Dhiaulhaq. 2023. 'The Production of Rightlessness: Palm Oil Companies and Land Dispossession in Indonesia'. *Globalizations*: 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2023.2253657.

Bernstein, Henry and Michael Pitt. 1974. 'Plantations and Modes of Exploitation'. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 1 (4): 514–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066157408437911.

Biersack, Aletta. 2006. 'Reimagining Political Ecology: Culture/Power/History/Nature'. In *Reimagining Political Ecology*, edited by Aletta Biersack and James Greenberg, 3–40. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822388142.

Bourke, Richard Michael. 2009. 'History of Agriculture in Papua New Guinea'. In *Food and Agriculture in Papua New Guinea*, edited by R. Michael Bourke and Tracy Harwood, 10–26. Canberra: ANU Press. http://doi.org/10.22459/FAPNG.08.2009.

Chao, Sophie. 2022. *In the Shadow of the Palms: More-than-Human Becomings in West Papua*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9781478022855.

Dennis, Maxine. 1980. 'Plantations'. In *A Time to Plant and a Time to Uproot: A History of Agriculture in Papua New Guinea*, edited by Donald Denoon and Catherine Snowden, 219–48. Port Moresby: Institute for Papua New Guinea Studies.

Dove, Michael R. 2012. *The Banana Tree at the Gate: A History of Marginal Peoples and Global Markets in Borneo*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gershon, Ilana. 2019. 'Porous Social Orders'. *American Ethnologist* 46 (4): 404–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.12829.

Global Witness. 2021. *The True Price of Palm Oil: How Global Finance Funds Deforestation, Violence and Human Rights Abuses in Papua New Guinea*. https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/forests/true-price-palm-oil/.

Golub, Alex and Mooweon Rhee. 2013. 'Traction: The Role of Executives in Localising Global Mining and Petroleum Industries in Papua New Guinea'. *Paideuma: Mitteilungen zur Kulturkunde* 59: 215–36.

Graeber, David. 2001. *Toward an Anthropological Theory of Value: The False Coin of Our Own Dreams*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Green, Sarah. 2013. 'Money Frontiers: The Relative Location of Euros, Turkish Lira and Gold Sovereigns in the Aegean'. In *Objects and Materials: A Routledge Companion*, edited by Penny Harvey, Eleanor Conlin Casella, Gillian Evans, Hannah Knox, Christine McLean, Elizabeth B. Silva, Nicolas Thoburn, and Kath Woodward, 302–11. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203093610.

Green, Sarah. 2022. 'The Hedgehog from Jordan: Or, How to Locate the Movement of Wild Animals in a Partially Mediterranean Context'. In *Locating the Mediterranean: Connections and Separations across Space and Time*, edited by Carl Rommel and Joseph John Viscomi, 209–32. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. https://doi.org/10.33134/HUP-18-9.

Green, Sarah, Samuli Lähteenaho, Phaedra Douzina-Bakalaki, Carl Rommel, Joseph Viscomi, Laia Soto Bermant, and Patricia Scalco. 2024. *An Anthropology of Crosslocations*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. https://doi.org/10.33134/HUP-23.

Greenomics Indonesia. 2014. *Wilmar Continues to Engage with Third Party Suppliers That Clear Orangutan Habitat, Forested Deep Peatlands and High Carbon Stock Forests*. Jakarta: Greenomics Indonesia. https://web.archive.org/web/20220126074814/https://www.greenomics.org/docs/Wilmar's-suppliers_deforestation_(LowRes).pdf.

Gregory, Chris. 1982. *Gifts and Commodities*. London: Academic Press.

Gregory, Chris. 1997. *Savage Money: The Anthropology and Politics of Commodity Exchange*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203986639.

Groves, Colin P. 1983. 'Pigs East of the Wallace Line'. *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* 39 (77): 105–19. https://doi.org/10.3406/jso.1983.2792.

Hambloch, Caroline. 2022. 'Land Formalization Turned Land Rush: The Case of Oil Palm in Papua New Guinea'. *Land Use Policy* 112: 105818. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105818.

Haraway, Donna. 2015. 'Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: Making Kin'. *Environmental Humanities* 6 (1): 159–65. https://doi.org/10.1215/22011919-3615934.

Hau'ofa, Epeli. 1994. 'Our Sea of Islands'. *The Contemporary Pacific* 6 (1): 148–61.

Hau'ofa, Epeli. 2008. *We Are the Ocean: Selected Works*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hempenstall, Peter. 1989. 'The Neglected Empire: The Superstructure of the Colonial State in German Melanesia'. In *Papua New Guinea: A Century of Colonial Impact 1884–1984*, edited by Sione Lātūkefu, 133–51. Boroko: National Research Institute.

Kabupaten Pulang Pisau. 2017. 'Kunjungan Kerja Presiden Jokowi ke Kabupaten Pulang Pisau'. https://web.archive.org/web/20201204153522/https://www.pulangpisaukab.go.id/kunjungan-kerja-presiden-jokowi-ke-kabupaten-pulang-pisau/.

Kahin, George McT. 1997. 'The Making of Southeast Asian Studies: Cornell's Experience'. *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 29 (1): 38–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.1997.10409699.

Käkönen, Mira. 2023. 'Entangled Enclaves: Dams, Volatile Rivers, and Chinese Infrastructural Engagement in Cambodia'. *Advances in Southeast Asian Studies* 16 (2): 269–96. https://doi.org/10.14764/10.ASEAS-0100.

Kelly, Alice and Nancy Lee Peluso. 2015. 'Frontiers of Commodification: State Lands and Their Formalization'. *Society & Natural Resources* 28 (5): 473–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2015.1014602.

Kementerian Pertanian Republik Indonesia. 2019. 'Oil Palm Cover in Indonesia: An Analysis of Satellite Imagery from 2014–2016'. https://auriga.or.id/related/getFilePdf/en/related/29/10_oil_palm_cover_in_indonesia_en_lowres_en.pdf.

Li, Tania. 2014. *Land's End : Capitalist Relations on an Indigenous Frontier*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822376460.

Li, Tania Murray and Pujo Semedi. 2021. *Plantation Life: Corporate Occupation in Indonesia's Oil Palm Zone*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9781478022237.

Lounela, Anu. 2019a. 'Morality, Sharing and Change among the Ngaju People in Central Kalimantan'. *Hunter Gatherers Research* 3 (3): 515–36. https://doi.org/10.3828/hgr.2017.25.

Lounela, Anu. 2019b. 'Erasing Memories and Commodifying Futures within the Central Kalimantan Landscape'. In *Dwelling in Political Landscapes: Contemporary Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by Anu Lounela, Eeva Berglund, and Timo Kallinen, 53–73. Studia Fennica Anthropologica. https://doi.org/10.21435/sfa.4.

Lounela, Anu. 2020. 'Contested Values and Climate Change Mitigation in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia'. *Social Anthropology* 28 (4): 862–80. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12790.

Lounela, Anu. 2021a. 'Making and Unmaking Territories with Plants in the Riverine Peat Landscape of Central Kalimantan'. *Suomen antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* 46 (1): 15–37. https://doi.org/10.30676/jfas.v46i1.99890.

Lounela, Anu. 2021b. 'Shifting Valuations of Sociality and the Riverine Environment in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia'. *Anthropological Forum* 31 (1): 34–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/00664677.2021.1875197.

Lounela, Anu and Tuomas Tammisto. 2021. 'Introduction: Frontier Making through Territorial Processes: Qualities and Possibilities of Life'. *Suomen antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* 46 (1): 5–14. https://doi.org/10.30676/jfas.v46i1.112425.

Lounela, Anu and Heikki Wilenius. 2023. 'Haunting the Factory: Indonesian Modernity and the Spiritual Landscape of Central Kalimantan'. *Ethnos* 90 (1): 128–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/00141844.2023.2227773.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. 2005. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific : An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315014463.

Mauss, Marcel. 2002 [1925]. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Translated by W. D. Halls. London & New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203407448.

McCarthy, John. 2013. 'Tenure and Transformation in Central Kalimantan: After the "Million Hectare" Project'. In *Land for the People: The State and Agrarian Conflict in Indonesia*, edited by Anton Lucas and Carol Warren, 183–214. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

McKittrick, Katherine. 2013. 'Plantation Futures'. *Small Axe* 17 (3): 1–15.

Miettinen, Jukka, David L. A. Gaveau, and Soo Chin Liew. 2019. 'Comparison of Visual and Automated Oil Palm Mapping in Borneo'. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 40 (21): 8174–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2018.1479799.

Mintz, Sidney. 1986. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. London: Penguin Books.

Nelson, Paul N., Jennifer Gabriel, Colin Filer, Murom Banabas, Jeffrey A. Sayer, George N. Curry, Gina Koczberski, and Oscar Venter. 2014. 'Oil Palm and Deforestation in Papua New Guinea'. *Conservation Letters* 7 (3): 188–95. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12058.

Peluso, Nancy. 2012. 'What's Nature Got to Do with It? A Situated Historical Perspective on Socio-Natural Commodities'. *Development and Change* 43 (1): 79–104. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2012.01755.x.

Rappaport, Roy. 1967. *Pigs for the Ancestors : Ritual in the Ecology of a New Guinea People*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Resosudarmo, Ida Aju Pradnja, Luca Tacconi, Sean Sloan, Faridh Almuhayat Uhib Hamdani, Subarudi, Iis Alviya, and Muhammad Zahrul Muttaqin. 2019. 'Indonesia's Land Reform: Implications for Local Livelihoods and Climate Change'. *Forest Policy and Economics* 108: 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.04.007.

Rodman, Margaret. 1992. 'Empowering Place: Multilocality and Multivocality'. *American Anthropologist* 94 (3): 640–56. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1992.94.3.02a00060.

Sahlins, Marshall. 1972. *Stone Age Economics*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003058762.

Sysling, Fenneke. 2019. 'The Human Wallace Line: Racial Science and Political Afterlife'. *Medical History* 63 (3): 314–29. https://doi.org/10.1017/mdh.2019.29.

Tammisto, Tuomas. 2010. 'Strengthening the State: Logging and Neoliberal Politics in East New Britain, Papua New Guinea'. *Suomen antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* 35 (1): 43–59. https://doi.org/10.30676/jfas.116657.

Tammisto, Tuomas. 2019. 'Life in the Village Is Free: Socially Reproductive Work and Alienated Labour on an Oil Palm Plantation in Pomio, Papua New Guinea'. *Suomen antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* 43 (4): 19–35. https://doi.org/10.30676/jfas.v43i4.79476.

Tammisto, Tuomas. 2020. 'Reprises: Chris Gregory's *Gifts and Commodities* and the Frontier'. *Suomen antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* 44 (3–4): 26–34. https://doi.org/10.30676/jfas.v44i3-4.91424.

Tammisto, Tuomas. 2024. *Hard Work: Producing Places, Relations and Value on a Papua New Guinea Resource Frontier*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. https://doi.org/10.33134/HUP-29.

Timmer, Jaap. 2010. 'Being Seen like the State: Emulations of Legal Culture in Customary Labor and Land Tenure Arrangements in East Kalimantan, Indonesia'. *American Ethnologist* 37 (4): 703–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1425.2010.01279.x.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. 2005. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Weiner, Annette. 1992. *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving*. Berkeley: University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/california/9780520076037.001.0001.

Wolf, Eric. 1972. 'Ownership and Political Ecology'. *Anthropological Quarterly* 45 (3): 201–5.

Wolters, Oliver W. 1994. 'Southeast Asia as a Southeast Asian Field of Study'. *Indonesia* 58: 1–17. https://doi.org/10.2307/3351100.