

## Contested Land: Claims and Backgrounds of Clash on Bukit Duabelas National Park

Muhammad Yusuf,\* Dinda Syufradian Putra, Wahyu Rohayati

*Governmental Studies Program, Universitas Jambi, Muaro Jambi, Indonesia*

 Corresponding Author: [myusuf@unja.ac.id](mailto:myusuf@unja.ac.id)

---

### Article Info:

### Abstract

#### Keywords:

Conflict  
National Park  
Management  
Orang Rimba  
Policy

---

#### Article History:

Received on March 11, 2026  
Revised on April 01, 26  
Accepted on April 05, 2026

This research aims to analyse claims in the conflict after the joint stipulation of TNBD management policy and its background. The zoning-based forest area management policy has caused multidimensional conflict between the government and the Orang Rimba. The results showed that the conflict became multidimensional because the involvement of other actors who previously had no interest in forest resources penetrated the forest area, causing the problem to become more complex. Conflicts that continue to occur are caused by policies agreed upon that do not impact those living in the area to reaccess forest resources freely. In addition, the contradiction between formal regulations and local customary law is also a cause of conflict. The policies implemented are considered inappropriate to the existing conditions because they do not feel the existence of indigenous peoples living in the area. Therefore, in forest management with regions with specificities, such as indigenous peoples, there needs to be a comprehensive policy accompanied by a deep understanding of local values. Differences in understanding the policy context are the root cause of conflict.

---

## INTRODUCTION

This study was conducted because forests not only provide benefits for climate regulation and a stable environment, but also produce resources that drive the country's economy, making the case for exploitation. Indonesia's tropical forests, the third-largest in the world after Brazil and the Democratic Republic of Congo, are increasingly threatened by ongoing deforestation. From 2003 to 2006, Indonesia's deforestation rate was 1.17 million hectares per year. Then, from 2006 to 2009, Indonesia's deforestation rate was 0.83 million hectares per year. Indonesia is second among 10 countries worldwide in terms of the highest rate of forest destruction ([Forest Watch Indonesia, 2014](#)). Deforestation is a significant problem because of its adverse impacts on national economies, livelihoods, and biodiversity. This deforestation was caused by illegal logging, forest fires, and other activities around deforestation sites ([Wijaya et al., 2015](#)). This condition is used as an argument for the government to determine strategic steps to overcome these problems. Proper forest management, grounded in sustainable principles, is needed to prevent forests from being

increasingly exploited. In this case, forest conservation policy is one of the solutions proposed to address deforestation.

Designating forest areas as conservation areas aims to protect the diversity of species and ecosystems from extinction. However, a rigid, centralised conservation policy has led to conflicts over natural resources. The legacy of restricted, tightly controlled conservation areas that deny access remains a major part of conservation policy worldwide (Peluso, 1993; Sahide et al., 2020; Fisher & Maryudi, 2018). While exceptions have been made for other zoning categories, these are usually done only for certain uses that remain very limited, such as natural scenery for tourism purposes or limited non-timber harvesting, and thus rarely involve the role of local communities in managing their lands, which may have had claims for generations (Fisher, 2018). Increased and enforced laws to keep communities out of conservation zones occurred through widespread land closures by state forestry bureaucracies, and resistance to such practices also began to influence international policies on regulating communities in forests (Gilmour, 2016). Particularly in areas where communities have a deep historical connection to the landscape and environment, where natural resources are central to their livelihoods, and where communities play an important role in maintaining ecosystem sustainability, policies emerge to accommodate communities as partners in forest management (Ostrom, 1990).

The context of management of Bukit Duabelas National Park/*Taman Nasional Bukit Duabelas* (TNBD) in Jambi province indicates that the interaction between the government and the Orang Rimba community warrants further discussion. Differences in claims on TNBD by both parties are leading to a conflict. Initially, the TNBD area was a Limited Production Forest/*Hutan Produksi Terbatas* (HPT), Other Use Area/*Area Penggunaan Lain* (APL), and Nature Reserve and Nature Conservation Biosphere Reserve/*Kawasan Suaka Alam dan Pelestarian Alam/Cagar Biosfer* (KSAPA) area located in three districts (Batanghari, Sarolangun, and Tebo) (Sylviani, 2008). The TNBD area has been designated as a protected forest and biosphere reserve, in the form of a national park, under the Minister of Forestry Decree No. 258/Kpts-II/2000 since August 23, 2000. There are indigenous communities within the area, namely the Orang Rimba, who have inhabited the area long before the establishment of the national park (Nurfathiyah, 2021). The change in status to a conservation area with a zoning system then affects the community. The most obvious impact is to narrow Orang Rimba's access to forest resources. This happens because the TNBD management policy, combined with a zoning system, is considered biased towards local values embedded in the national park. The TNBD has conditions distinct from those of other national park areas in Indonesia, where Orang Rimba depend on forest resources for their livelihoods. Unlike villagers in the buffer zone area, they have their own way of life and values. They make the forest their home, so they are very protective of its sustainability because their lives depend heavily on forest resources (Takiddin, 2014).

Forest management conflicts are always related to land tenure in the forest area. This happens because forest areas have valuable natural resources. In this case, land and natural resources are interpreted as assets and become the basis for obtaining economic, social, and political power (Buur & Nystrand, 2017). Land-based natural resource disputes arise due to a lack of concepts about 1) to whom land and natural resources belong, 2) who has the right to use land and natural resources, and 3) who has the right to make decisions on land and natural resources. The conflict over the management of Baluran National Park shows that differences in land claims between the community and the government are a source of conflict. Where in the national park area there are community settlements, this is contrary to the national park's function. The settlements in the national park area belong to people who were previously workers of PT. Gunung Gumitir has been in the national park area for many years. In addition, the community holds an HGU, namely the right to use

an area or land for economic purposes in Labuhan Merak and Gunung Masigit (within the Labuan National Park area) (Wianti, 2014).

In other cases, conflicts between communities and policymakers over national park areas can also be viewed through the lens of conflict dynamics. On the establishment of the Bukit Duabelas area into TNBD in Jambi Province, the dynamics of conflict between national park officials who regulate the zoning system in the national park and the Orang Rimba, where zoning rules in the field are interpreted as an effort to limit space and access to forest resources for the Orang Rimba, who have used it traditionally and for generations. The zoning step narrows the space for the jungle people to fulfill their needs by sustainably leveraging natural resources and being mobile. The conflict between the jungle people and management is highly dynamic due to differences of opinion over protected areas, so it does not yield a solution acceptable to all parties (Yusuf & Syafril, 2019).

Differences in perception are one source of conflict. This can occur for various reasons; for example, the incompatibility between formal and customary rules often leads to disputes that escalate into conflict. Differences between formal and customary rules have implications for divergent objectives in forest management, leading to land conflicts in forest areas. Conflicting objectives drive land disputes in Indonesia, leading to instability, insecurity, and the unfair use of land (Sunderlin et al., 2014). The forest conflicts in Remppek Village, Lombok, were caused by disagreements over forest boundaries between the Ministry of Forestry and the National Defense Agency (Riggs et al., 2016). Uncertain access to land and natural resources, especially in forest areas, can hamper the legitimacy of development activities. Irregular and uncertain land tenure threatens social conditions, income, and food security (Santos et al., 2014).

Humans make various efforts to meet their needs through the realisation of rights that are part of the communal, but not infrequently this leads to clashes that cause injustice and trigger conflicts between people (Marina & Dharmawan, 2011). Conflict over national park management is one example of conflict caused by the realisation of rights to meet needs. Conflict over natural resource management in the Gunung Gede Pangrango National Park area began with the change in the mountain area from a protected area to a national park. The disruption of people's need for resources in the national park led to conflict over access to them. The change in the area's function from a protected forest to a conservation forest, and later to a national park, raises various social and economic problems. It has legal consequences for its management (Zulfikar & Nasdian, 2018).

In contrast to previous research, the conversion of the Sungai Pulai area into a protected forest has implications for the neglect of citizens' rights to access public services. In this case, public services are a basic need for the community, so neglecting them disrupts community interests. Overlapping regulations arising from the establishment of the Sei Pulai protected forest have led to conflicts between public services for communities in the protected forest area and regulations governing protected forests (Yudhi, 2019). Based on the problems and prior studies, this research focuses on conflicts arising from the joint establishment of the TNBD management policy. Research on this topic is very important to provide a different perspective on the implementation of TNBD management policies that can accommodate local wisdom values previously missing from the TNBD management policy currently being implemented. To better align later policies with the local context, this research will also explain the causes of conflicts in TNBD management.

## METHODS

TNBD is geographically located at approximately 1°44'–2°03' south latitude and 102°31'–102°48' east longitude, with the center of the conservation zone at approximately

1°51' south latitude and 102°39' east longitude. According to data from the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the capture coordinates are around -1.85°, 102.65°. The administrative scope of TNBD covers three districts in Jambi, namely Sarolangun, Batanghari, and Tebo. With an area of approximately 60,500 hectares (605 km<sup>2</sup>), TNBD is an important example of lowland tropical rainforest in Sumatra. This area is the primary water catchment area for the Batanghari River. It is an essential habitat for unique flora and fauna.

Culturally, TNBD is home to the Orang Rimba (also known as the *Suku Anak Dalam*, *Suku Kubu*, *Komunitas Adat Terpencil*). Estimates indicate that around 1,200 people, or approximately 40% of the Orang Rimba population in the region, live within the national park. At the same time, the rest are scattered across Bukit Tigapuluh National Park and other areas in Jambi. The Orang Rimba's way of life is rooted in semi-nomadic traditions and entirely depends on the forest as a source of food, medicine, and spiritual space. However, they face enormous pressure due to forest fragmentation, the expansion of plantation concessions, and conservation policies that do not fully accommodate indigenous rights.

This research specifically discusses the social conflicts that occurred after the establishment and implementation of the TNBD management policy, prepared under a joint agreement between the TNBD agency and the Orang Rimba. The method used in this research is a qualitative case study that explores a case or phenomenon in depth and involves multiple parties. To ensure the research ran systematically, it was conducted in several stages. In the first stage, we identify the concepts of national park management as defined by the TNBD and the Orang Rimba. The second stage explores the background of conflict in national park management, followed by conclusions and recommendations.

The research was conducted in TNBD, Jambi Province, covering the districts of Sarolangun, Tebo, and Batanghari. From the three districts, one village was selected as the data source for each district: Pematang Kabau Village (Sarolangun District), Tanah Garo Village (Tebo District), and Sei Ruan Ulu Village (Batanghari District). The research location was determined using a purposive sampling technique based on predetermined criteria. The criteria for the three villages used as data sources are that they have access to the national park and are places where Orang Rimba interact with the community and where the conflict between TNBD and Orang Rimba occurs. The research data were obtained from two sources: primary and secondary data. Primary data in this research is in the form of structured and unstructured interviews and through observation. Secondary data are obtained from literature, including previous research results, journals, books, regulations, the internet, and other sources.

The technique used to identify informants is snowball sampling, in which researchers ask informants for referrals to others with information relevant to the data needed. Informants in this study included the TNBD managers, Orang Rimba, KKI Warsi, Sokola Rimba, and villagers (Pematang Kabau, Tanah Garo, and Seri Ruan Ulu). The informants were determined based on predetermined criteria. First, the TNBD officers served as informants in this research because they are the party that regulates and implements the Bukit Duabelas National Park Management Plan/*Rencana Pengelolaan Taman Nasional Bukit Duabelas* (RPTNBD) policy and interacts directly with the Orang Rimba. Second, the Orang Rimba community lives within the national park and opposes the RTNBD policy, so they interact with park managers. Third, KKI Warsi and Sokola Rimba were chosen as informants in this study because they have extensive knowledge of the Orang Rimba and often conduct research, publish, serve as education facilitators, advocate for indigenous rights, and provide other assistance. Fourth, residents of Sei Ruan Ulu Village, Tanah Garo Village, and Pematang Kabau Village serve as access points for Orang Rimba with surrounding communities, such as for buying and selling, working relationships, and other interactions.

The data in this study were analysed using interactive model-based data analysis techniques. The data analysis technique consists of three stages, namely data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing and verification.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Concept of TNBD Management

RPTNBD, prepared by the Natural Resources Conservation Agency/*Balai Konservasi Sumber Daya Alam* (BKSDA), was published in December 2004 and endorsed by the Director General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation/*Perlindungan Hutan dan Konservasi Alam* (PHKA), the Regent of Sarolangun, the Regent of Batanghari, the Regent of Tebo, and the BKSDA itself. The document regulates the management of the national park. The issuance of the TNBD management document is a strategic step by the government to address threats of deforestation arising from inappropriate forest use, such as land sales and illegal logging. Therefore, specifically, the management objectives of TNBD are to maintain, protect, and preserve the lowland tropical rainforest, which has a high diversity of flora, fauna, and ecosystems and is already threatened with extinction. In addition, it aims to protect and preserve the place of life and culture of the Orang Rimba, which has long been in the TNBD area. Then another goal, namely to protect, preserve, and develop medicinal plants, which are a source of livelihood.

The issuance of the RPTNBD document indicates a change in the TNBD's functions and management. The Bukit Duabelas area, which was previously a production forest, became a conservation forest in the form of a national park. This change then raises problems because indigenous people, namely the Orang Rimba, have previously inhabited the area. Before the change in the park's function and management, both indigenous peoples and communities living in the area were highly dependent on forest resources. So, in accordance with the issued documents, the Orang Rimba in the forest area and the communities around it no longer have access to forest resources. Limited access to forest resources results in policies that are implemented, which are considered to limit the space for both the Orang Rimba and the surrounding community. Furthermore, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) Sokola consider the document plan to be a form of unilateral action that regulates the lives of people within it. This causes conflict between the government and people with interests and activities in the forest.

BKSDA has made various efforts to implement national park management policies. The efforts took the form of controlling the area, including cutting down the rubber trees of Temenggung Majid and Depati Ngerak and prohibiting them from clearing fields in several places within the TNBD area. However, the efforts by BKSDA led people who previously had access to the forest to feel that their area was being disturbed and that they had lost access to it. Therefore, in response to the actions taken by BKSDA, they carried out various actions to reject this policy. However, the actions taken have yet to receive the expected response. As time went by, the conflict finally ended on its own, especially with the change in TNBD management from BKSDA Jambi to Balai TNBD, as reflected in Permenhut No. P.29/Menhut-II/2006 dated 2 June 2006. BTNBD has effectively carried out its duties since 2007 (Sardi, 2010).

The felling of rubber trees and the prohibition on field clearing carried out by BTNBD as part of its management met with resistance from the Orang Rimba. For the Orang Rimba, planting rubber trees is not limited only to economic considerations; it also serves as proof of territorial authority or ownership of the area. The aim is to prevent encroachment and illegal land clearing by village residents. Thus, others cannot easily cut down rubber trees without severe sanctions. In addition, shifting cultivation was a habit carried out by the

Orang Rimba even before Dutch colonialism (Steinebach & Kunz, 2017). Therefore, if you look at BTNBD's efforts to manage TNBD, it is clear that they are in stark contrast to the Orang Rimba's habits. These things are then considered contradictory between the formal rules issued by the government and the customary laws believed in by the Orang Rimba.

The change in management from BKSDA to BTNBD did not resolve the conflict; instead, it became more complex, with various existing problems. To reduce the conflict that occurred previously, conflict resolution efforts were carried out, namely through a joint agreement based on the Decree of the Minister of Forestry number 258/kpts-II/2000, which mandates TNBD as a place for "the life and livelihood of Orang Rimba". This opens up opportunities for Orang Rimba to again access all forms of forest resources that were previously limited. Based on this joint agreement, TNBD is divided into six zones: core, jungle, utilization, rehabilitation, religious, and traditional. Based on the determined zones, the Orang Rimba, an indigenous community inhabiting the TNBD area, is placed in the conventional zone. With zoning-based TNBD management, it is hoped that there will be no further disputes over TNBD management, as TNBD areas have been divided by function, especially since the policy has been mutually agreed upon. However, more was needed to resolve the previous conflict. After the joint establishment of a zoning-based TNBD management policy, the conflict between the government and the Orang Rimba became even more multidimensional.

The conflict reflects a classic tension between state ownership of conservation areas and indigenous communities' access to the resources that sustain their livelihoods. The change in the status of the Bukit Duabelas area from a production forest to a national park triggered a displacement of access from customary-based access to a state-controlled access regime based on zoning and prohibitions, which, in theoretical terms, can be understood as a shift from a bundle of rights to a contestation over a bundle of powers to derive benefits from the forest. In Indonesia, this tension is reinforced by legal pluralism (customary law versus state forestry law), which, since the decentralization era, has frequently produced overlapping claims and authority forum shopping, a pattern also found in Sumatra. Normatively, Constitutional Court Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012 indeed affirms that customary forests are no longer classified as state forests; however, its implementation has been slow and has often clashed with sectoral governance arrangements.

#### **A. Background of the Conflict: Top-down policy and Alienation**

Conflicts over natural resources and land claims are not recent conflicts. This conflict is even a legacy of past problems. Recorded land-use conflicts in Jambi Province are rooted in land confiscations of local rural communities during the Soeharto era (1965-1998). In 1967, the forestry law designated approximately 70% of Indonesia's territory as forest areas under state jurisdiction (Contreras-Hermosilla & Fay, 2005; Indrarto et al., 2012). Under the Forestry Law, customary forests are categorized as state forests. They can only be recognized (not owned) if they remain relevant and do not conflict with national interests. The definition of "national interest" raises debate, leaving the state with almost undeniable control power (Bakker & Moniaga, 2010). Following the Constitutional Court's decision, customary forests were no longer categorized as state forests, and customary communities were recognized as rights-holding subjects (Rachman, 2013).

The shift in status and categorization of customary forests is no longer part of state forests based on the removal of the word "state" from the article of Law no. 41 of 1999 concerning Forestry, which now reads: "Customary Forest is a forest that is within the territory of a customary law community" (Steinebach & Kunz, 2017). Indigenous communities and various land rights activists certainly welcomed these changes. However, in practice, these changes take time to implement. Until now, conflicts over control of natural

resources related to indigenous communities have persisted. Where the state claims forest areas in line with changes to their function, indigenous peoples ultimately lose their claim rights to those areas, so conflicts of interest and land claims are inevitable.

Conflict plays a central role in decision-making models; it is equally relevant when distinguishing between descriptions of implementation processes. Rational and bureaucratic politics models of decision-making assume that individual actors rationally have interests. Policy conflict will occur when more than one organization views a policy as relevant to its interests, and when organizations hold inappropriate views. Disputes over policy may arise over jurisdiction or the substance of the proposed means of achieving objectives. The intensity of conflict increases with increasing concern about incompatibility and perceived stakes for each actor (Matland, 1995). The conflict between BTNBD and the Orang Rimba demonstrates the government's failure to implement its policies. Policy implementation is the most critical stage in public policy. Failure to implement policies will result in the failure to achieve program objectives and, in turn, lead to conflict.

The conflict between the government and the Orang Rimba shows that the policies used to manage forest areas need to be more accurate. Conservation policy frameworks tend to be non-aspirational, ignoring local community livelihood systems and the historical dimensions of community property claims. The regional context in question is community culture and socio-economic conditions. Resistance influences policy implementation because local communities can access forest resources (Peluso, 2023). Therefore, the approach must comprehensively understand forest management with indigenous communities. There is a need for a comprehensive strategy and a deeper study of the local context. Policies must not be understood solely as efforts to achieve forest management goals, namely, the preservation of forest areas. Still, they must also consider the impact of these policies on indigenous communities residing in forest areas.

Conflicts over natural resource control and land claims in Jambi, including those involving the Orang Rimba, are structural conflicts rooted in the legacy of New Order-era forestry policies that unilaterally designated approximately 70% of Indonesia as state forest areas, thereby marginalizing indigenous peoples' tenure claims and practices. Although Constitutional Court Decision No. 35/PUU X/2012 normatively marked an important shift by removing customary forests from the category of state forests and recognizing indigenous peoples as legal subjects, implementation of the policy has been slow and remains constrained by strong sectoral governance in the forestry sector, resulting in continued tenure conflicts. From a policy implementation perspective, these conflicts reflect a high conflict–high ambiguity condition, in which conservation policy objectives are not aligned with local communities' livelihood interests, leading to implementation failure and resistance at the ground level. A study of agrarian conflict in Jambi shows that state-mandated changes in forest area functions systematically shift local access and authority, reinforce power imbalances, and create a multidimensional conflict arena between the state, indigenous communities, and external actors. Therefore, conservation policies that fail to integrate the history of land claims, livelihood systems, and the socio-cultural context of indigenous communities have the potential to perpetuate conflict, rather than achieving the goal of sustainable and equitable forest management.

## 2. Cause of Conflict: Debates Between the State and Indigenous People

Conflicts over forests between communities and the government have become fierce because access to forest resources has decreased. Access is the ability or opportunity to benefit from forest/land resources (McDermott, 2009). At the same time, the struggle for rights over resources between indigenous communities and other actors always refers to

customary rules (Hauser-Schäublin, 2013). Access refers to the right to enter a particular area. Limited access to forest resources leads to economic and power issues. Where further limited access will impact reducing economic resources obtained from forest products; however, limited access indicates changes in control over forest area ownership. Economy and power are closely related to access to forest resources. Forest resources in national parks are of high value and have become the basis of life for local communities, serving as a primary source of income or as alternative economic sources (Nepal & Weber, 1995).

In TNBD conflicts, conservation areas, such as centrally managed national parks, are affected. As a conservation area designated as a national park, commercial resource exploitation activities are not permitted under the regulations in this area, including the TNBD area. The change in status to a national park then made both indigenous peoples and communities around the TNBD uneasy and ultimately led to conflict. During the conflict between BTNBD and Orang Rimba, efforts at conflict resolution failed. This happens because conflict resolution has used a legal approach, so new conflicts arise after resolution using various models (Sembiring et al., 2010). The legal approach to conflict resolution makes the position of the Orang Rimba weaker because, although their status as indigenous peoples is recognized, they have a weak legal position regarding land ownership.

The conflict between the government and the Orang Rimba over TNBD management continues to rage. Implemented policies continue to cause disputes. The policy does not account for on-the-ground conditions and should accommodate local values. Apart from that, the approach in the policy being implemented does not involve participation from parties who are also affected by it; ultimately, for parties who are disadvantaged, the policy will, of course, be opposed, and vice versa. In this case, the conflict between the Orang Rimba and BTNBD persists because the national park management policy based on zoning has little impact on the Orang Rimba's access to forest resources. The zoning system limits the Orang Rimba's access to forest resources. Also, the rights of the Orang Rimba as an indigenous community are taken away, ultimately resulting in the loss of the national park's leading economic resource.

The conflict resurfaced in 2009 amid increasingly complex problems. BTNBD's efforts to manage the park remained a problem. In 2011, the curbing of illegal fields was again destroyed. Unlike before, the fields that BTNBD destroyed did not belong to Orang Rimba but to the surrounding community, which received guarantees from Orang Rimba. As a result of reduced access to forest resources for the Orang Rimba, which also affects their economic rights, illegal activities occur. The Orang Rimba continue to clear land and cut down trees to plant crops such as rubber and rice and sell *serpehan* (the sale of timber trees to villagers on a consensual basis, costing up to millions of rupiah) which is usually carried out simultaneously with the opening of new land for gardens involving villagers such as Toha, Wawan and the Lubuk Bumbun people as timber buyers, and sell land that has been cultivated. These things are done by the Orang Rimba not only as a form of resistance but also to fulfill their daily lives.

The actions taken by the Orang Rimba illustrate how they do not care about the existing rules. The activities carried out by the Orang Rimba are certainly not justifiable. However, in this case, the Orang Rimba are in a forced situation due to their reduced access to forest resources that were previously freely accessible. Furthermore, the actions taken by the Orang Rimba drew criticism from the BTNBD, the TNBD's manager, because the activities contradicted regulations limiting them to a maximum of 2 ha, especially since the impact could damage the forest. At this stage, the conflict escalated, as shown by demonstrations by the Orang Rimba to BTNBD, blocking BTNBD from entering the TNBD area, and by collective violence that attacked the office. The Orang Rimba's apathy

towards existing regulations further led to conflicts arising from different perceptions of the implemented policies.

The increase in conflict has made finding consensus and conflict resolution increasingly tricky. Moreover, the conflict between the Orang Rimba and the government is increasingly multidimensional, with additional actors widening the conflicts of interest. Villagers who transformed into financiers/*toke* and even landowners in the area then penetrated the region to benefit from forest resource wealth by using Orang Rimba to access resources outside the park, prompting more parties to demand their rights to forest resources. The emergence of outsiders, such as unscrupulous officials who initially had no interest in forest resources, also led to the clearing of  $\pm$  30 ha of land in 2013, but the problem could have been resolved immediately. However, the involvement of external parties underscores the conflict's complexity.

In addition to the involvement of villagers and outsiders in the conflict, Orang Rimba, as a leading actor, is not entirely *opposed* to the policy. In this case, the involvement of Orang Rimba in the conflict is divided into two groups: those who oppose the zoning-based TNBD management policy and those who oppose the policy that has been implemented. Policies often cannot accommodate all the interests of the parties affected by them. Therefore, those who are not harmed will accept the policy that has been implemented. However, those who are hurt will, of course, reject the implemented policy. The Orang Rimba, who oppose the policy, consider it a violation of their customary rights; they want the national park status changed to a customary forest specifically for the Orang Rimba. Meanwhile, the pro-Jungle People consider the policy to protect forest areas from encroachment by outsiders, which, if left unchecked, can disrupt their existence.

The existence of NGOs such as KKI *Warsi* and Sokola, which were involved in the conflict between BTNBD and the Orang Rimba, is equally important. NGOs that have been carrying out education and health missions in this conflict since 1996 provide assistance and raise awareness of the Orang Rimba's position. Moreover, the role of NGOs such as PBHI West Sumatra, Walhi Jambi, PPJ, and KoperHam that accommodate, mobilize, and provide movement networks and assistance, strengthens the position of the Orang Rimba and at the same time positions all NGOs that have been involved as part of the conflict (Rokhdian, 2012). The assistance provided made the Orang Rimba aware of their position and their rights to access forest resources. Even the resistance carried out by the Orang Rimba in the conflict after the joint determination of the zoning-based TNBD management policy was initiated by the Orang Rimba themselves without any assistance from NGOs, as happened in the previous conflict.

Conflicting land claims between the zoning system stipulated in formal law and the concept of customary land, and different perceptions of the resources being accessed, are the root causes of conflict in many *rainforest* areas. The collaborative approach the government has tried to use to manage TNBD in practice has failed because the involvement of Orang Rimba, as a party with a direct interest in accessing forest resources, is shallow. This can be seen from the formation of Forest Police Partner Community/*Masyarakat Mitra Polhut* (MMP) in 2014 through Decree No. 15/BTNBD-1/2014 in the letter, only 3 Orang Rimba were involved, namely Ngalembo, Celitai, and Selambai, out of 40 partners; villagers dominated the rest. Therefore, the resulting policy does not take into account the local context or is biased by it, as the involvement of the Orang Rimba is minimal; as a result, the government only understands the problem from its perspective.

The conflict between the Orang Rimba and the government over TNBD management is rooted in restrictions on access to *forest* resources that are highly valuable economically and culturally, where such access is closely linked to power relations, rights, and territorial control. The designation of TNBD as a national park with a zoning system transformed forest

management and use from one based on customary practices to one governed by formal state law, thereby weakening the position of the Orang Rimba, who, although recognized as an indigenous people, lack legal authority over land ownership. The dominant conflict resolution approach, which is legal-formal in nature and involves minimal local participation, has proven ineffective at reducing conflict; instead, it has triggered resistance and escalated violence because the policies are not contextualized to on-the-ground social conditions and disregard the values and economic needs of the Orang Rimba.

Limited access has led to the loss of livelihoods, which in turn has driven illegal practices such as land *clearing*, logging, and land sales not only as a form of resistance but also as a survival strategy while simultaneously opening space for external actors such as villagers, financiers, and unscrupulous officials to enter, thereby complicating conflicts of interest. On the other hand, the Orang Rimba themselves are not homogeneous in their responses to the policy: some oppose it because it is considered to violate customary rights and therefore demand a change in the area's status to an indigenous forest, while others accept the policy as an effort to protect forest areas from encroachment by outside parties. The involvement of NGOs has strengthened the Orang Rimba's awareness and bargaining position, but has also positioned them within the conflict dynamics. Overall, the TNBD conflict demonstrates that competing claims between formal law and customary law, combined with the weak substantive involvement of indigenous communities in decision-making, such as seen in the formation of the MMP with minimal Orang Rimba representation, are the main factors behind the failure of collaborative management and the persistence of multidimensional conflicts in conservation areas.

## CONCLUSION

The conflict between state and customary law, which occurred in the BTNBD-Orang Rimba case after the re-establishment of the TNBD management policy, has intensified. The differing interests of the actors involved in the conflict make it difficult to reach a resolution. The Orang Rimba's resistance to the applied policy stems from the TNBD management policy potentially threatening their livelihood. The misalignment between the goal of the implemented policy, which is to preserve the forest, and the forest's role as a source of life for the Orang Rimba is part of the dynamics of the national park management conflict. In this case, efforts can be made to resolve disputes over TNBD management by reviewing the TNBD management policy and formulating new, appropriate policy instruments that address the root causes of past conflicts and local wisdom embedded in the area. In addition, TNBD management must involve all stakeholders to ensure that all interests are accommodated.

## Acknowledgement

This research was fully funded by Universitas Jambi.

## REFERENCES

- Bakker, Laurens; Moniaga, S. (2010). The Space between: Land Claims and the Law in Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 38(2), 187–203.  
<https://doi.org/10.1163/156853110X490890>
- Burton, J. W. (1990). *Conflict: Human Needs Theory*. Springer.
- Contreras-Hermosilla, Arnoldo; Fay, C. (2005). Strengthening forest management in Indonesia through land tenure reform: Issues and framework for action.
- Forest Watch Indonesia. (2014). *Potret Keadaan Hutan Indonesia Periode Tahun 2009–2013*.

- Gilmour, D. (2016). Forty Years of Community-Based Forestry: A Review of Its Extent and Effectiveness.
- Hauser-Schäublin, B. (2013). Adat and Indigeneity in Indonesia: Culture and Entitlements between Heteronomy and Self-Ascription. Göttingen University Press.
- Indrarto, Giorgio Budi; Moeliono, Moira; Resosudarmo, Ida Aju Pradnja; Prasetyo, Lilik Budi; Thuy, Pham Thu; Arwida, E. A. ; T. G. M. P. (2012). The context of REDD+ in Indonesia: Drivers, agents and institutions. <https://doi.org/10.17528/cifor/003745>
- Kristiani Fajar Wianti. (2014). Land Tenure Conflict in the Middle of Africa van Java (Baluran National Park). *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, 20, 459–467. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proenv.2014.03.058>
- Lars Buur, Malin Nystrand, & R. H. P. (2017). The Political Economy of Land and Natural Resources in Africa: An Analytical Framework. Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS)-tersedia di JSTOR (bukan penerbit utama, JSTOR hanya platform akses).
- M. Yusuf & Syafrial. (2019). A Big Battle: The State vs. Indigenous People (Case Study in Jambi Province). *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 23(1), 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.22146/JSP.37568>
- Marina, Ina; Dharmawan, A. H. (2011). Analisis konflik sumberdaya hutan di kawasan konservasi. *Sodality: Jurnal Sosiologi Pedesaan*, 5(1), 35–52. <https://doi.org/10.22500/sodality.v5i1.5876>
- Matland, R. E. (1995). Synthesizing the implementation literature: The ambiguity-conflict model of policy implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*, 5(2), 145–174. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a037242>
- McDermott, M. H. (2009). Locating Benefits: Decision-Spaces, Resource Access and Equity in US Community-Based Forestry. *Geoforum*, 40(2), 249–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2008.10.004>
- Micah R. Fisher. (2018). Assessing the New Social Forestry Project in Indonesia: Recognition, Livelihood and Conservation? *International Forestry Review*, 20(3), 346–361. <https://doi.org/10.1505/146554818824063014>
- Micah R. Fisher, Ahmad Maryudi, Muhammad Alif K. Sahide. (2018). Assessing the New Social Forestry Project in Indonesia: Recognition, Livelihood and Conservation? *International Forestry Review*, 20(3), 346–361. <https://doi.org/10.1505/146554818824063014>
- Muhammad Alif K. Sahide, Ahmad Maryudi, Lukas Giessen, Christian A. M. G. Schusser, Rini Hidayat, Murniati, Satyawan Sunito, Gede Arya Wirawan, Greg Acciaioli, dan rekan lainnya. (2020). Anticipating a New Conservation Bureaucracy? Land and Power in Indonesia's Essential Ecosystem Area Policy. *Land Use Policy*, 97, 104789. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104789>
- Nepal, Sanjay Kumar; Weber, K. W. (1995). Managing Resources and Resolving Conflicts: National Parks and Local People. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 2(1), 11–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509509469884>
- Nurfathiyah, P. (2021). Ruang publik dan komunikasi dialogis Orang Rimba di Taman Nasional Bukit Dua Belas Provinsi Jambi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sosio-Ekonomika Bisnis*, (1), 1–11.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press.

- Peluso, N. L. (1993). Coercing Conservation?: The Politics of State Resource Control. *Global Environmental Change*, 3(2), 199–217. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-3780\(93\)90006-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-3780(93)90006-7)
- Peluso, N. L. (2023). *Rich forests, poor people: Resource control and resistance in Java*. University of California Press.
- Rachman, N. F. (2013). Rantai penjelas konflik-konflik agraria yang kronis, sistemik, dan meluas di Indonesia. *BHUMI: Jurnal Agraria Dan Pertanahan*, (37), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v0i37.36>
- Riggs, Rebecca Anne; Ravikumar, Ashwin; Kijazi, Martin A.; Krisnawati, Haruni; Sunderlin, W. D.; et al. (2016). Forest tenure and conflict in Indonesia: Contested rights in Rempek Village, Lombok. *Land Use Policy*, 57, 241–249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.06.002>
- Rokhdian, D. (2012). : Alim Rajo Disembah, Piado Alim Rajo Disanggah: Ragam Bentuk Perlawanan Orang Rimba Makekal Hulu Terhadap Kebijakan Zonasi Taman Nasional Bukit Dua Belas, Jambi. Universitas Indonesia.
- Roseland, M. (2000). Sustainable community development: Integrating environmental, economic, and social objectives. *Progress in Planning*, 54(2), 72–132. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-9006\(00\)00003-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-9006(00)00003-9)
- Santos, Florence; Quisumbing, Agnes R.; McNiven, Scott L.; Otsuka, Keiji; Rondot, J. M. C.; et al. (2014). Can Government-Allocated Land Contribute to Food Security? Intra-household Analysis of West Bengal's Microplot Allocation Program. *World Development*, 64, 860–872. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.07.017>
- Sardi, I. (2010). *Konflik sosial dalam pemanfaatan sumberdaya hutan (Study kasus di taman Nasional Bukit DuaBelas Provinsi Jambi)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Institut Pertanian Bogor
- Sembiring, Edward; Basuni, Sambas; Soekmadi, R. (2010). Resolusi Konflik Pengelolaan Taman Nasional Teluk Cenderawasih di Kabupaten Teluk Wondama. *Jurnal Manajemen Hutan Tropika*, 16(2), 84–91. <https://repository.ipb.ac.id/bitstream/123456789/42753/1/Edward%20Sembiring.pdf>
- Steinebach, Stefanie; Kunz, Y. (2017). Separating sisters from brothers: Ethnic relations and identity politics in the context of indigenous land titling in Indonesia. *Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies*, 10(1), 47–64. <https://doi.org/10.14764/10.ASEAS-2017.1-4>
- Sunderlin, William D.; Larson, Anne M.; Duchelle, Amy E.; Resosudarmo, Ida A. P.; Huynh, Thu-Ba; Cahyat, Ade; Pratama, Grace M.; Komarudin, Michael; Muharrom, Efrin; Satriastanti, M. et al. (2014). How are REDD+ proponents addressing tenure problems? Evidence from Brazil, Cameroon, Tanzania, Indonesia, and Vietnam. *World Development*, 55, 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.013>
- Sylviani. (2008). *Kajian Dampak Perubahan Fungsi Kawasan Hutan Terhadap Masyarakat Sekitar (Study on The Impact of Changes in The Forest Function to The Community Around The Forest)*. *Penelitian Sosial Dan Ekonomi Kehutanan*, 5(3), 155–178. <https://doi.org/10.20886/jpsek.2008.5.3.155-178>
- Takiddin, A. (2014). Nilai-Nilai Kearifan Budaya Lokal Orang Rimba (Studi pada Suku Minoritas Rimba di Kecamatan Air Hitam Provinsi Jambi). *SOSIO DIDAKTIKA: Social Science Education Journal*, 1(2), 181–194. <https://doi.org/10.15408/sd.v1i2.1258>
- Wijaya, P. A., Saleh, M. B., & Tiryana, T. (2015). Spatial Model of Deforestation in Jambi Province for the Period 1990–2011. *Jurnal Manajemen Hutan Tropika*, 21(3), 128–137. <https://doi.org/10.7226/jtftm.21.3.128>

- Yudhi, I. (2019). Konflik dalam pengelolaan hutan lindung. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik*, 10(2), 111–118.  
<https://jkp.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JKP/article/viewFile/7871/6782>
- Zulfikar, Anugerah Muhammad; Nasdian, F. T. (2018). Analisis konflik pengelolaan sumberdaya alam di kawasan Taman Nasional Gunung Gede Pangrango. *Jurnal Sains Komunikasi Dan Pengembangan Masyarakat (JSKPM)*, 2(5), 639–652.  
<https://doi.org/10.29244/jskpm.2.5.639-652>