

Exploring Class Struggles in Marine Conservation: The Live Reef Fish Trade in Natuna and the Anambas Islands Indonesia

Siti Arieta¹, Rilus Kinseng², Tri Samnuzulsari³, Teguh Setiandika Igiassi⁴

^{1,3,4} Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social dan Political Sciences, Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji, Tanjungpinang

² Department of Rural Sociology. Faculty of Human Ecology, Institut Pertanian Bogor, Bogor
Email: arietasiti@umrah.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract
Received: 2024-10-1 Revised: 2024-12-21 Accepted: 2024-12-24	<i>This study discusses the important context related to class struggle in the context of Live Reef Fish Food Trade (LRFFT) in Natuna Regency and Anambas Islands. This area, known as a supplier of live reef fish, faces a dilemma between marine conservation policies and local economic sustainability. With the global backdrop of marine conservation targets, such as the '30 × 30' set by UNEP-WCMC in 2021, it is important to understand the dynamics of class struggle in achieving these goals. Although marine conservation is considered a solution to overcome overfishing and reduce endangered species, resistance from local communities indicates the complexity of implementing conservation policies. This study aims to fill the gap in knowledge related to the dimensions of class struggle in the context of marine conservation, focusing on LRFFT in Natuna and Anambas. Through a sociological theoretical framework, this study seeks to understand the dialectical relationship between agents (local communities and fishermen groups) and structures (conservation policies) and their impacts on the success or failure of policies. By detailing the geographical context, existing conservation policies, and challenges faced by local communities, this study hopes to provide further insights to help design more inclusive and sustainable marine conservation policies in the future.</i>
Keywords: MPA; Class strrruggle; Marine conservation; LRFFT; Dichotomy	

I. Introduction

While Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) are widely regarded as a crucial tool for safeguarding marine biodiversity and promoting ecosystem sustainability, they often face resistance from local communities, who perceive them as restrictive, limiting their ability to sustain livelihoods (Love, 2021). However, the accelerating

degradation of marine ecosystems driven by human activities has underscored the urgency of MPAs. These protected areas are increasingly recognized as an essential

policy measure to combat overfishing and protect endangered species, offering long-term solutions that balance ecological preservation with sustainable resource use (Rees et al., 2021).

A global long-term target for the expansion of conservation areas has been set for countries to preserve at least 10% of coastal and marine areas by 2020 (CBD, 2010), which was later integrated into the SDGs in 2015 (UN, 2015). This target was later supported to 30% by 2030, known as the '30 × 30' target (UNEP-WCMC, 2021; HAC for Nature and People, 2022). Unfortunately, marine ecosystem degradation continues (Khuu et al., 2023), indicating that the effectiveness of MPAs has not yet been fully realized (Grüss et al., 2014).

Discussions related to MPAs have been examined over the past four decades, where previous researchers have discussed various dimensions, including institutional frameworks (Jupiter et al., 2014; Kockel et al., 2019), governance (Berkes, 2004; Kawaka et al., 2017), commodity challenges (Roberson et al., 2020; Booth et al., 2023), knowledge (Charles & Wilson, 2009; Gall & Rodwell, 2016), and conditions threatening the success of MPAs (Cánovas-Molina & García-Frapolli, 2020; Failler et al., 2020; Fauzi et al., 2023).

Studies suggest that marine conservation depends not only on ecological aspects but also on social aspects, as human activities are the primary determinant of its success or failure. However, previous studies have not considered the dimension of class struggle, which serves as a strength in supporting conservation. Therefore, this research aims to fill the gap in MPA studies with a sociological perspective that examines class structure and struggle.

Conceptually, marine conservation can be seen as a class struggle where the Government, with its authority to establish conservation areas, is always confronted by communities, particularly fishing groups, who have economic interests in marine spaces (Aburto et al., 2020; Burbano & Meredith, 2020). While certain classes in the context of marine conservation have been recognized and delegated authority to manage MPAs through traditional practices (Mujiburrahman et al., 2021), not all coastal communities have traditional marine territories.

These societal and fishing groups are vulnerable to inequality or social conflict due to power differences between classes in the establishment of MPAs. In this context, class struggle in the conservation arena is based on Pierre Bourdieu's thoughts regarding the dialectical relationship between agents and structure, and vice versa (Ritzer, 2010). The arena is where various forms of capital (including economic, cultural, social, and symbolic) and habitus compete. The position of agents in society is determined by the capital they possess, which plays a role in devising strategies for carrying out social practices (Costa et al., 2019; Ravi, 2019). In this dynamic, the

interaction between structure and agents, who carry habitus and capital, can influence individuals' ability to modify social structures according to their needs.

The management of MPAs should be perceived as a shared need, involving the community in planning, implementation, and evaluation so that sustainability values can be maximally internalized. Thus, the concept of class struggle is expected to contribute to realizing inclusive marine conservation areas, in line with the mandate of 'equitably managed, ecologically representative, and well-connected systems of protected areas' (CBD, 2010).

Rees et al. (2020) state that MPAs are a policy to address overfishing activities. In this study, the Live Reef Fish Food Trade (LRFFT) is examined as it has been researched as a category of overfishing in Asia (Sadovy de Mitcheson et al., 2013), where the catch is sent to Hong Kong as luxury food (Dirhamsyah, 2012; Sadovy de Mitcheson, 2019). Countries contributing to the catch include the Philippines (Tahiluddin & Sarri, 2022), Seychelles (Daly et al., 2020), and Indonesia (Arieta et al., 2022; Khasanah et al., 2020).

As suppliers of live reef fish in Indonesia, Natuna Regency and Anambas Islands are two regions that have exclusively received direct collection by Hong Kong shipowners since the 1960s. The high price of live reef fish has caused various species to be overfished for more than four decades, from adult fish to juvenile and larval capture, which are then raised for up to four years in cages. This has led to the formation of a network of actors involved in fisheries, from exporters to those who raise adult fish, larval fish farmers, and larval reef fish catchers (Arieta, 2019).

The declining stock of reef fish due to overfishing, along with destructive fishing methods, has caused coral ecosystem degradation (Mustika et al., 2013). This led to the designation of the Anambas Islands as a National Marine Conservation Area (KKPN) based on the Decree of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries No. 37 of 2014, named the Anambas Marine Tourism Park (TWP Anambas). Meanwhile, Natuna Regency is awaiting the approval of its Regional Marine Conservation Area (KKPD) under the authority of Riau Islands Province, although it previously had a conservation area that had to be revised due to changes in authority resulting from the amendment of the Regional Government Law No. 32 of 2004 to No. 23 of 2014.

The designation of TWP Anambas and the planned establishment of Natuna's KKPD have not stopped the live reef fishery network's activities, although the export quota for live fish, specifically the endangered Napoleon fish, has been set, and export procedures are strictly monitored. On the other hand, the Government continues to actively designate and expand MPAs, although support for conservation in both locations is low because supporting conservation means abandoning the primary livelihood (Indrawati & Suparmo, 2021).

The above description illustrates differing views from the two classes, namely the

live reef fishery network and the Government, where each class is steadfast in its beliefs. Therefore, class struggle to achieve dominance and reproduce power to influence the dominated class is the main focus of this research. Based on the above description, this study will explore the class struggle efforts to create space for marine conservation in the Live Reef Fish Food Trade in Natuna Regency and the Anambas Islands.

2. Research Method

Qualitative approach is applied to systematically, factually, and accurately describe the scope of the research related to Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), which receive minimal support from local communities in Natuna Regency and the Anambas Islands. The class struggle variable will serve as a key instrument, where this research will discuss the strategies of the government and the fishing network as a class dichotomy in the social reproduction of power within the Live Reef Fish Food Trade (LRFFT) arena.

The objective of this research is to explore the efforts to implement MPAs as a solution to marine ecosystem degradation while still providing economic access to local communities. This situation requires strategies that favor both social classes, as there are fundamentally different perspectives on how to utilize coastal and marine resources. The reasons for selecting Natuna Regency and the Anambas Islands as the research locus are as follows:

- 1) These are the only two regencies with LRFFT export permits;
- 2) The designation of the Anambas Marine Tourism Park as a National Marine Conservation Area (KKPN) based on the Decree of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries No. 37 of 2014;
- 3) The plan to designate an MPA in Natuna Regency as a Regional Marine Conservation Area (KKPD).

Data collection techniques include observation, interviews, and documentation. Data analysis is conducted interactively and continuously until saturation is reached (Miles & Huberman, 1992). For interview data, transcriptions were provided from all the informants' answers into a working document. Key topics that

emerge from the informants' responses will then be systematically organized to address the research questions outlined in the problem statement.

Data is simplified through the coding process, including open, axial, and selective coding. Observation will help the researcher select relevant observations about the phenomenon of conservation and LRFFT according to the observation guidelines, so the collected data can be categorized as needed for this study. Documentation will also contribute to the data collection process. All data were distributed into themes,

which presented according to the data needs, such as identifying and analyzing the relationships between actors in LRFFT, conflicts of interest, and structural changes in the paradox of MPA implementation versus the economic needs of the community and the overall findings are analyzed using the concept of class struggle within the dichotomy and duality of agent-structure.

Conclusions in qualitative research represent new findings that have not been previously explored. These conclusions will be drawn from the data collected by the researcher from the beginning of the study to the analysis, resulting in theoretical and practical contributions to the research problem.

3. Results and Discussion

History of Fishing Practices in Natuna and Anambas Islands

From the 1980s until around the 2010s, fishing practices in the Anambas and Natuna Islands were carried out in destructive ways, such as fish bombing and the use of cyanide to quickly catch fish (Milner et al., 2013). For three decades, fish bombing was widespread, while cyanide fishing continues to this day. The impact of cyanide on coral reefs is extensive, as the poison is carried by ocean currents from the spraying site (Pauwelussen, 2021). This destructive behavior persisted because there was a market willing to accept the catch.

The location of the Anambas and Natuna Islands along international shipping and trade routes led to fish trading, until the end of 2018, being conducted without regulations, known as Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing, which harmed the country (Dirhamsyah, 2012). Transactions were often conducted via transshipment, which involved the transfer of fish at sea from Anambas fishermen's boats to foreign vessels, especially for species with high economic value. During this period, the state did not monitor illegal activities in the waters of Anambas. Research shows that fish bombing ceased around 2012-2013 because the market rejected fish damaged by the bombing. However, cyanide fishing continues because the fish caught remain alive when sold.

The ongoing destructive activity is the use of cyanide. The poison is dissolved in water and squirted on coral habitats to stun fish, making them easier to catch. Cyanide fishing is now carried out secretly, often at night. Fishermen have developed ways to reduce the poison's effect on the fish by placing them in nets and moving them to locations opposite the current and far from the spraying point. If the fish no longer float, it indicates that the poison's effects have dissipated. This destructive behavior is driven by the belief that fish in the sea are inexhaustible and has become part of the social fabric of the Anambas and

Natuna Islands. The existing socialization has evolved into a learning process for destructive behavior. This has led to overfishing of reef fish species, including various grouper species and the protected Napoleon fish. These reef fish species are not consumed locally but are used to meet the demand for luxury food in mainland China (Arieta et al., 2022).

The state, which is expected to have views and practices that protect species and coral ecosystems from destructive activities, has not implemented any strategies to counter or stop these practices. The state's absence in regulating sustainable practices has created a class dualism between the dominant and the dominated classes. During the overfishing period, the state became the dominated class, while the LRFFT trade network was the dominant class. As a result, the public did not receive any socialization of sustainability values from the state. Instead, destructive values were internalized and shaped the mindset of the community. This shows that the community's cognitive structure was pre-existing through established values, knowledge, and understanding, which will be passed down to future generations, forming a structured structure.

The participation of community members in LRFFT fish farming forms a class habitus that combines actors with similar habitus. According to Bourdieu, class consists of a dualism between the dominant and the dominated, while class habitus divides actors' positions based on the quality of their habitus (Bourdieu, 1991). Commitment, knowledge, loyalty, recognition, and bargaining power determine whether an actor occupies a high or low class habitus. Thus, although actors in this fishing network share the same habitus, they occupy different positions. Class habitus is reflected in the division of labor between those who raise mature fish and the exporters, differentiated by the duration and size of the fish farming. This division of labor heavily depends on the actors' economic capital. The more capital an actor has, the longer they can farm fish and the greater their profit potential.

Thus, it can be said that destructive habitus is being passed on to more actors. LRFFT fishing hubs are located in Air Sena Village, Central Siantan District, Anambas Islands Regency, and Sedanau Village, Natuna Regency. The highest class habitus is held by the exporters, known as "export tauke." The ability to form networks within this class habitus is based on psychological reciprocity, where business capital is provided to local tauke operating at the village level, but in exchange, they become members of the live fish trade network, primarily for various species of reef fish. This exchange is not explicitly stated, but actors who receive this assistance will voluntarily join the network.

They receive significant support from exporters, including capital to acquire fishing boats or engines with a capacity of 7 to 8 gross tons (GT). In distributing the capital loans, export managers do not set a repayment deadline but ask

network members to supply live fish for export, such as Napoleon fish and groupers. The obligation to repay the capital to the export tauke is not considered a burden by local tauke because it will be used to pay off the loan. This creates loyalty and compliance.

Both local and export tauke often assist the community with urgent needs, such as medical expenses and children's education, in addition to helping with fishing-related matters. This becomes important for gaining legitimacy and broad support outside the LRFFT fishing network. In this way, all parties involved in the capture and rearing of reef fish become familiar with the knowledge, experience, and technical execution of the export tauke, ensuring that these farming practices continue today. This reciprocal relationship has led to collective action in the form of network partnerships in reef fisheries under the LRFFT.

This is because they share the same goal of maximizing profits, but they are also seen as honorable by those outside their class. However, it is unfortunate that the collective behavior of this class habitus does not align with sustainability values. The dialectical externalization-internalization or "structured structure" behavior, resulting from the socialization of destructive values, has been illustrated in the above description. There are no specific rules to prevent the capture and grow-out farming of species traded in LRFFT (Khasanah et al., 2020).

The habitus formed through the socialization of the "structured structure" is a factor that hinders the formation of coral conservation efforts in the Anambas and Natuna Islands (Acheson, 2006). The involvement of local resource users at this stage is not a factor that supports the sustainability of coral ecosystems, which are the natural habitat for fish traded in LRFFT. The assumption that habitus leads to collectivism, where a class in society shares a common understanding of structure and social life (Akrivou & Di San Giorgio, 2014), is currently not sufficient to ensure the success of coral ecosystem conservation efforts. Thus, there is a choice to either maintain or change this habitus.

According to Bourdieu, although habitus motivates community actions, it should be emphasized that habitus is not fixed (Leaney, 2019). Habitus is a stimulus that suggests what should be done, opening the opportunity for habitus to be changed.

Law on Endangered Species Protection in LRFFT

The concept of structuring structure, or internalization-externalization, emphasizes the need for changing destructive habits, a shift that should be

guided by the state through regulations and policies. In 1995, a regulation on the export size and control of Napoleon wrasse fishing was introduced in Indonesia due to high demand in the Live Reef Fish for Food Trade (LRFFT) market. However, by then, the adult fish population in Anambas and Natuna waters had already declined (Soemodinoto et al., 2013). Unfortunately, this regulation lacked legal force to be applied to the live reef fish fishery.

In 2014, Indonesia's Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries issued Regulation No. 56/2014, imposing a moratorium on fishing business permits. This led to a ban on foreign vessels entering Indonesian waters, resulting in a dramatic halt of exports to Hong Kong from 2015 to 2017. As a result of this policy change, values and commitments underlying the state's habitus were identified. However, how the state, as a dominated class, can change its position will be discussed in the context of power dynamics, as seizing the dominant position requires understanding the capital possessed by actors involved in LRFFT.

The dominant class in this fishery comprises three groups with varying degrees of power or capital. According to Bourdieu, capital refers to the specific power concentration an actor uses to maintain their existence or control others (Hayes, 2020). The majority of fishing production tools are owned by exporters, as reflected in the number of fish cages and fish contained within them. The primary activity in these cages is growing grouper and Napoleon wrasse.

Two companies dominate live reef fish export: PT. Jaya Laut Siantan (JLS) in the Anambas Islands and PT. Eka Bina Pratama (EKP) in Natuna, with PT. Cahaya Alam Lestari (CAL) as a subsidiary in Anambas. The owner of PT. JLS was previously an employee of PT. EKP in Natuna but chose to become independent and establish his own company, while PT. CAL remains affiliated with PT. EKP in Natuna. Therefore, PT. CAL has a more extensive network than PT. JLS.

Nevertheless, PT. JLS's strategy for attracting network members is considered more progressive, as the company's owner is closer to the community and cooperates well with government institutions. PT. JLS not only operates in live fish exports but also has a spice trading business, specifically cloves. In contrast, PT. CAL, as a subsidiary of PT. TDA, has no business diversification aside from live fish exports. Current regulations and technical policies related to coral reef conservation and marine spatial planning have limited export practices, particularly for Napoleon wrasse, though grouper trading remains unrestricted. Although this policy is not well-received by the two export license holders, they have no choice but to comply. Natuna's export quota, twice that of Anambas, is

attributed to more sustainable practices. In Natuna, the live reef fishery network has agreed that larvae should not be captured due to their high mortality rate. This agreement stipulates that only early-stage juveniles measuring 3 inches can be caught. As a result, destructive fishing practices are more prevalent in the Anambas live reef fishery.

In 2018, the first legal exports from Anambas and Natuna occurred based on established quotas, preventing further losses to the state due to unreported fishing from previous illegal exports. The implication of these legal exports is a transparent pricing mechanism, whereas, in the past, prices could only be verified through cross-checks with grow out farmers and exporters. The limited-quota export mechanism presents a learning experience for exporters, but not for other members of the habitus class. This knowledge will become part of the cultural capital exclusive to the highest habitus class in the dominant group. Thus, the accumulation of capital by exporters includes three classifications: economic capital through fishery asset ownership and income, social capital through trust in lending to communities, and cultural capital through exclusive knowledge in managing export quota pressures.

The lowest habitus class in LRFFT is the larva catchers, who lack awareness of their marginalized position. Despite villagers from Batu Belah and Sedanau—areas rich in sargassum during its season—having valuable knowledge about differentiating various grouper and Napoleon wrasse larvae, their bargaining position remains low. This is evident from their loyalty in supplying larvae and juveniles, even though their transactions provide little economic impact. Recognition within the community is more about their jobs, such as being teachers, village heads, or students.

For this group, growing larvae to young juveniles means holding a form of savings, despite the high risk of larval death. In urgent situations, members of this habitus class can sell their grown larvae to local tauke, who never refuse to assist. It is common to sell 1-2 inch larvae when in need, but not all are sold. The remaining larvae will be sold when they reach 3 inches. Even so, dead larvae are not seen as a loss since there are no monetary costs for catching them in sargassum areas.

Bureaucratic reforms aimed at improving LRFFT include requiring live fish transportation permits for farmed fish, evidenced by SIKPI-A, and the issuance of a Certificate of Origin (SKA) by relevant agencies to certify that Napoleon wrasse comes from farming efforts. Exporters must have a wildlife dealer permit from CITES Indonesia (Directorate General of Natural Resources Conservation and Ecosystem, Ministry of Environment and Forestry). Furthermore, fish transfers must be recorded and monitored by the Fish Quarantine and Quality Control Agency (BKIPM), fishery inspectors, relevant agencies, and other

authorities.

Social Reproduction and Power Struggles in LRFFT

Symbolic capital is a form of capital that grants a position capable of generating power. Before the implementation of adequate regulations, symbolic capital was represented by exporters, who held the authority to determine which actors could network under their control. However, for the people of the Anambas Islands, anyone participating in this fishery was considered prestigious because owning fish cages seen as the symbol of economic strength.

Although symbolic capital does not depend on economic capital, it is ultimately economic capital that determines power (Wacquant, 2013). This leads to legitimacy in the form of symbolic support obtained from both the dominant and subordinate classes. Procedurally, legitimacy is built because only exporters have connections to international markets and understand the steps required for licensing and technical transactions. Without this procedural legitimacy, exports would not occur. To build counter-symbolic capital against exporters, the Indonesian government has sought to restrict the freedom of exports through complex administrative processes since 2018. The government requires exporters to pay Non-Tax State Revenues (PNBP) upon submitting a quota request based on the proposed export volume. This mechanism is seen as burdensome because the actual number of fish exported is often less than the quota granted.

Unmet export quotas for the Napoleon fish species indicate a lack of stock in cages, as these fish are sourced from the wild. This means that wild stocks are becoming increasingly scarce. In response, the government has initiated awareness programs and conservation efforts involving members of the live reef food fish trade (LRFFT) network. While these efforts have not yet resulted in significant replenishment of wild stocks, the government aims to educate network members about the importance of species conservation.

The government's authority as symbolic capital, imposing new mandatory policies, aims to reduce exporters' preference for this fishery, while gradually fostering sustainability awareness among the dominant class. The dominant class, based on their capital ownership, reaffirms the hierarchy within the social structure (Krisdinanto, 2016). This class includes the dominant class capable of imposing their views on others, the petite bourgeoisie, who imitate the dominant class but do not impose their views on lower classes, and the subordinate class, which accepts the dominance of the upper class without the power to resist (Wacquant, 2001). Thus, capital ownership also influences an actor's ability to reproduce their position within the social structure.

However, symbolic capital, according to Bourdieu, can shift class and capital ownership, allowing actors to remain in the same arena (Fatmawati & Sholihin, 2020). Therefore, an increase in capital signifies a change in social position, which is not solely determined by economic capital. An increase in cultural and social capital by a particular class can surpass the strength of economic capital, as society is not solely viewed through competitive relations. The arena, according to Bourdieu, is a space where social actors compete to gain sources of power (Ritzer, 2010). The reciprocal relationship is that habitus shapes the arena, and the arena is a battleground between the dominant and subordinate classes vying for social positions. Even though a group may dominate based on habitus and capital, that position must be maintained through social reproduction, as the subordinate class continuously seeks to change their position (Costa et al., 2019). Social reproduction also serves as a strategy for fulfilling the interests of the dominant class.

Social reproduction within the LRFFT involves meeting export demands. Knowledge of the high mortality rate of larvae is not considered significant. Although the Anambas Islands have been designated as a National Marine Conservation Area (KKPN) with zoned management, such as no-take zones and utilization zones, the no-take zones do not specifically cover nursery grounds for reef fish, thus not hindering ecologically unsustainable social reproduction. A further challenge for Natuna Regency is the delay in designating marine conservation areas due to the amendment of Law No. 32 of 2004 into Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Governance, which removed the authority of regencies/cities to manage marine areas within 0-3 nautical miles, transferring this authority to provincial governments.

However, each region faces unique challenges in marine conservation regarding reef fish exploitation. In the Anambas Islands, where the central government manages the TWP, there is overfishing of reef fish larvae, while in Natuna, despite the absence of formal marine conservation areas, LRFFT network members have practiced more sustainable fishing by refraining from catching reef fish larvae.

Therefore, the intervention needed is not a complete ban on farming activities, which have become a livelihood, but rather changing the ongoing social reproduction by reducing the dominant party's power. However, the dominant class will not readily diminish their power, as they have goals to fulfill. This does not mean that social reproduction indicates that network members' lives will always remain static or that members of the dominant class share uniform preferences. This aspect has not received enough attention in habitus theory, as Bourdieu emphasizes only the social reproduction of power (Corciolani et al., 2020).

The state's strategy in creating new capital within the LRFFT fishery involves three stages: building the human dimension (embodied), the objectified dimension, and the institutionalized dimension. Generally, the challenge faced by the state is the lack of rules and sanctions accompanying larval fishing due to the failure of the larval fishing moratorium. Thus, the approach cannot be one of prohibition, as the community views banning the capture of Napoleon fish as cutting off their livelihood.

Marine Conservation and Collective Action

Conservation efforts involve establishing Core Zone points as part of the zoning system set out in the National Marine Conservation Area (KKPN). The zoning system in the Anambas Marine Tourism Park (TWP) consists of no-take zones, utilization zones, sustainable fisheries zones,. Theno-take zone serves as a protection area for biodiversity where any fishing activity is prohibited. The area of the no-take zone constitutes only 2.40% of the total area of TWP Anambas, distributed across 26 points. The hope for the future is that every village in the Anambas Islands Regency will have a no-take zone that is independently maintained by the community. Meanwhile, in Natuna, the established regulations include the Governor's Decree No. 1598/KPTS-21/VIII/2023 regarding the Community Group Supervisors for Marine and Fisheries Resources of the Riau Islands Province, although no marine conservation area has been established in this district.

The presence of no-take zones accelerates the organizational capacity of the Community Surveillance Groups (Pokmaswas) in Anambas and Natuna. The socialization of the importance of the zone to village communities, accompanied by monitoring or patrol activities against fishing activities, represents a capacity that has not existed before. They are no longer hesitant to directly reprimand or appeal to individuals from outside the village who operate within these zones.

Capacity building efforts by the government and non-profit organizations can also be viewed as a process of delegating power and authority to local organizations (Pomeroy & Berkes 1997) in managing fishery resources to community monitoring organizations, currently implemented by LKKPN Pekanbaru in Anambas and DKP Natuna Branch Office, as well as USAID Kolektif and Berikan. The government's strategy to build cultural capital for communities in Anambas and Natuna in the context of marine area conservation, based on Bourdieu's concept, includes educational strategies accompanied by symbolic investment strategies (Bourdieu, 1999). Educational strategies are the main approach conducted through the indoctrination of sustainable values over a considerable time, with the hope that communities can pass on ecological knowledge systems to future generations. Meanwhile,

symbolic investment strategies are carried out through social recognition, legitimacy, and the reproduction of perceptions grounded in ecological values.

Therefore, the government's commitment to supporting MPAs deserves appreciation. The time and financial investments made by the government to build community capacity, alongside the risks of uncertainty, reflect political commitment to changing the destructive behaviors practiced thus far. The goodwill to make communities reliable partners in sustainable resource management will provide a stimulus for other villages in the Anambas Islands and Natuna Districts. All Pokmaswas groups have engaged in collective action regarding the sustainable management of fishery resources and coastal ecosystems. In the context of the Live Reef Fish Food Trade (LRFFT), the uncertainty surrounding resource availability, particularly the scarcity and decline in the number of larval catches, serves as momentum for collective action that stands in opposition to destructive practices.

4. Conclusion

In order to understand the class struggle within the paradox of establishing Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) versus the interests of the Live Reef Fish Food Trade (LRFFT) network in Natuna and the Anambas Islands, this research illustrates the complexity of the actor's power dynamics that either provide opportunities or reject ideas of improvement and sustainability through marine conservation.

Although the implementation of Marine Conservation Areas (MPAs) is seen as a positive step, local community resistance indicates a mismatch between conservation policies and daily living needs. Therefore, a deeper understanding of class struggle in this context is expected to provide additional insights to enhance the effectiveness of marine conservation policies.

To conduct LRFFT practices in line with efforts to conserve marine fishery resources in the Anambas Islands District and Natuna District, it would be advisable to establish no-take zones that specifically provide protection for coral fish larvae as the most significant nursery grounds and to promote the strength of Civil Society Organizations as grassroots forces in the conservation of marine and fishery resources.

References

- Aburto, J. A., Gaymer, C. F., & Govan, H. (2020). A large-scale marine protected area for the sea of Rapa Nui: From ocean grabbing to legitimacy. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 198(August), 105327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2020.105327>
- Arieta, S. (2019). Relasi Habitus dalam Perikanan Napoleon wrasse di Kabupaten Kepulauan

- Anambas Kepulauan Riau. Simulacra, 165–179. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21107/sml.v2i2.6037>
- Arieta, S., Gunawan, B., Widya Setiabudi Sumadinata, R., & Ihsan, Y. N. (2022). Calling for institutional arrangements in Napoleon Wrasse conservation and management in Indonesia: The Anambas Islands case. *Marine Policy*, 145(September), 105258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2022.105258>
- Berkes, F. (2004). Rethinking community-based conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 18(3), 621–630. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2004.00077.x>
- Booth, H., Ramdhan, M. S., Hafizh, A., Wongsopatty, K., Mourato, S., Pienkowski, T., Adrinato, L., & Milner-Gulland, E. J. (2023). Designing locally-appropriate conservation incentives for small-scale fishers. *Biological Conservation*, 277(November 2022), 109821. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2022.109821>
- Bourdieu, P. (1999). Scattered remarks. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2(3), 334–340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431992224563>
- Bouzanis, C., & Kemp, S. (2020). The two stories of the habitus/structure relation and the riddle of reflexivity: A meta-theoretical reappraisal. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 50(1), 64–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsb.12225>
- Burbano, D. V., & Meredith, T. C. (2020). Conservation Strategies Through the Lens of Small-Scale Fishers in the Galapagos Islands, Ecuador: Perceptions Underlying Local Resistance to Marine Planning. *Society and Natural Resources*, 33(10), 1194–1212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2020.1765058>
- Charles, A., & Wilson, L. (2009). Human dimensions of marine protected areas. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 66(1), 6–15. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsn182>
- Corciolani, M., Grayson, K., & Humphreys, A. (2020). Do more experienced critics review differently? : How field-specific cultural capital influences the judgments of cultural intermediaries. *European Journal of Marketing*, 54(3), 478–510. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-01-2019-0095>
- Costa, C., Burke, C., Murphy, M., & et al. (2019). Capturing habitus: theory, method and reflexivity. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 42(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2017.1420771>
- Daly, R., Daly, C. A. K., Gray, A. E., Peel, L. R., Gordon, L., Lea, J. S. E., Clarke, C. R., & Weng, K. C. (2020). Investigating the efficacy of a proposed marine protected area for the Endangered humphead wrasse *Cheilinus undulatus* at a remote island group in Seychelles. *Endangered Species Research*, 42, 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.3354/ESR01035>
- Dirhamsyah. (2012). IUU fishing in Indonesia's live reef fisheries. *Australian Journal of Maritime & Ocean Affairs*, 4(2), 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18366503.2012.10815700>
- Failler, P., Tournon-Gardic, G., Drakeford, B., Sadio, O., & Traoré, M. S. (2020). Perception of threats and related management measures: The case of 32 marine protected areas in West Africa. *Marine Policy*, 117(June 2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.103936>
- Fatmawati, N. I., & Sholihin, A. (2020). Pierre Bourdieu Dan Konsep Dasar Kekerasan Simbolik. *Madani Jurnal Politik Dan Sosial Kemasyarakatan*, 12(1), 41–60. <https://doi.org/10.52166/madani.v12i1.1899>
- Fauzi, A. I., Azizah, N., Yati, E., Atmojo, A. T., Rohman, A., Putra, R., Rahadiano, M. A. E., Ramadhanti, D., Ardani, N. H., Robbani, B. F., Nuha, M. U., Perdana, A. M. P., Sakti, A. D., Aufaristama, M., & Wikantika, K. (2023). Potential Loss of Ecosystem Service Value Due to Vessel Activity Expansion in Indonesian Marine Protected Areas. *ISPRS*

- International Journal of Geo-Information, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi12020075>
- Gall, S. C., & Rodwell, L. D. (2016). Evaluating the social acceptability of Marine Protected Areas. *Marine Policy*, 65, 30–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2015.12.004>
- Grüss, A., Robbins, P., Heppel, S. S., Heppel, S. A., & Semmens, B. X. (2014). Conservation and fisheries effects of spawning aggregation marine protected areas: What we know, where we should go, and what we need to get there. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 71(7), 1515–1534. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412953924.n678>
- Hayes, A. S. (2020). The Behavioral Economics of Pierre Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory*, 38(1), 16–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275120902170>
- Indrawati, A., & Suparmo, S. (2021). IKAN NAPOLEON (*Cheilinus undulatus*), SPESIES TERANCAM PUNAH DI KEPULAUAN NATUNA DAN ANAMBAS. *Oseana*, 46, 16–24. <http://oseana.lipi.go.id/oseana/article/view/112%0Ahttps://oseana.lipi.go.id/oseana/article/download/112/93>
- Jupiter, S. D., Cohen, P. J., Weeks, R., Tawake, A., & Govan, H. (2014). Locally- managed marine areas: Multiple objectives and diverse strategies. *Pacific Conservation Biology*, 20(2), 165–179. <https://doi.org/10.1071/PC140165>
- Kawaka, J. A., Samoilys, M. A., Murunga, M., Church, J., Abunge, C., & Maina, G. W. (2017). Developing locally managed marine areas: Lessons learnt from Kenya. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 135, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2016.10.013>
- Khasanah, M., Nurdin, N., Sadovy de Mitcheson, Y., & Jompa, J. (2020). Management of the Grouper Export Trade in Indonesia. *Reviews in Fisheries Science and Aquaculture*, 28(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23308249.2018.1542420>
- Kockel, A., Ban, N. C., Costa, M., & Dearden, P. (2019). Evaluating approaches for scaling-up community-based marine-protected areas into socially equitable and ecologically representative networks. *Conservation Biology*, 34(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13368>
- Love, M. (2021). Tabu, MPA and community: nomenclature and the political ecology of marine conservation in Vanuatu. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 28(1), 91–110. <https://doi.org/10.2458/JPE.2301>
- Mujiburrahman, Rochwulaningsih, Y., Sulistiyono, S. T., & Utama, M. P. (2021). Panglima Laot: Maritime Cultural Heritage and Sustainability of the Coastal Environment in Aceh. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 317. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202131701096>
- Mustika, P. L. K., Gunawan, T., & Erdmann, M. V. (2013). A Marine Rapid Assessment (MRAP) of the Anambas Islands Marine Tourism Park, 3–31 May 2012 (Issue May 2012). <http://kkji.kp3k.kkp.go.id/index.php/dokumen/publikasi/kajian-ilmiah/finish/30-kajian-ilmiah/533-anambas-mrap-2013-english>
- Ravi, R. (2019). A Deeper Look in Reflexivity. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.25215/0701.043>
- Rees, S. E., Ashley, M., Evans, L., Mangi, S., Sheehan, E. V., Mullier, T., Rees, A., & Attrill, M. J. (2021). An evaluation of the social and economic impact of a Marine Protected Area on commercial fisheries. *Fisheries Research*, 235(August 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2020.105819>
- Ritzer, G. (2010). *Sociological Theory*. In McGraw-Hill (8th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1t892z5.19>
- Roberson, L. A., Watson, R. A., Klein, C. J., & et al. (2020). Over 90 endangered fish and invertebrates are caught in industrial fisheries. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18505-6>

- Sadovy de Mitcheson, Y. (2019). Live Reef Food Fish Trade : Undervalued , Overfished and Opportunities. [https://www.icriforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/ICRI Live Reef Food Fish Report-44p- double_0.pdf](https://www.icriforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/ICRI-Live-Reef-Food-Fish-Report-44p-double_0.pdf)
- Sadovy de Mitcheson, Y., Craig, M. T., Bertoncini, A. A., Carpenter, K. E., Cheung, W. W. L., Choat, J. H., Cornish, A. S., Fennessy, S. T., Ferreira, B. P., Heemstra, P. C., Liu, M., Myers, R. F., Pollard, D. A., Rhodes, K. L., Rocha, L. A., Russell, B. C., Samoilys, M. A., & Sanciangco, J. (2013). Fishing groupers towards extinction: A global assessment of threats and extinction risks in a billion dollar fishery. *Fish and Fisheries*, 14(2), 119–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-2979.2011.00455.x>
- Tahiluddin, A., & Sarri, J. (2022). An Overview of Destructive Fishing in the Philippines. *Acta Natura et Scientia*, 3(2), 116–125. <https://doi.org/10.29329/actanatsci.2022.352.04>
- Wacquant, L. (2013). Symbolic capital and social classes. *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 13(2), 292–302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468795X12468736>