



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/gijlss.v4i2>  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

## **Agrarian Conflict and the Restriction of Access to Living Spaces: A Case Study of PT. Wira Karya Sakti and Bukit Bakar Village**

**Atik Winanti<sup>1\*</sup>, Alisyah Rahma Saebani<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jakarta, Indonesia, [atikwinanti@upnvj.ac.id](mailto:atikwinanti@upnvj.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jakarta, Indonesia, [alisyarahmas@upnvj.ac.id](mailto:alisyarahmas@upnvj.ac.id)

\*Corresponding Author: [atikwinanti@upnvj.ac.id](mailto:atikwinanti@upnvj.ac.id)<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** This comprehensive sociological and legal study investigates the agrarian conflict between PT Wira Karya Sakti and the Bukit Bakar community, manifesting as coercive territorial exclusion rather than mere administrative disputes. Utilizing qualitative methods through secondary data triangulation and doctrinal analysis, this research aims to critically deconstruct the formalistic implementation of Article 50 of the Indonesian Forestry Law. Findings reveal that territorial exclusion operates systematically through regulation, force, market manipulation, and legitimation, clearly constituting a textbook case of state and corporate crime. The state apparatus actively facilitates this physical dispossession, granting absolute impunity to transnational capital while explicitly criminalizing customary tenure. Consequently, the prevailing legal positivism contradicts the ecological justice mandate enshrined in the Green Constitution (Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution). Furthermore, the study demonstrates that Alternative Dispute Resolution mechanisms fundamentally fail in these asymmetrical power landscapes, transforming into sophisticated instruments of coerced subordination rather than equitable consensus. In conclusion, the structural resolution of forestry and agrarian conflicts demands a radical jurisprudential paradigm shift. Moving definitively beyond orthodox legal formalism, the state must comprehensively implement the Green Constitution, ensuring that regulatory frameworks protect communal living spaces and ecological sovereignty instead of serving as bureaucratic catalysts for oligarchical accumulation and repression.

**Keywords:** Agrarian Conflict, Territorial Exclusion, State-Corporate Crime, Green Constitution, Alternative Dispute Resolution.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Forest ecosystems represent more than mere ecological entities; they are the locus of a complex intersection between constitutional mandates and human rights. In the Indonesian legal tradition, the management of these resources is anchored in Article 33, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, which establishes the state's "right to control" (*hak menguasai negara*). However, modern constitutionalism increasingly interprets this authority through the lens of a

"Green Constitution," suggesting that state control is not an instrument for unfettered exploitation, but a fiduciary duty to ensure ecological justice and protect the fundamental rights of forest-dependent communities (Asshiddiqie, 2016:45-47). When legal instruments and licensing policies deviate from this paradigm, they do not merely cause environmental degradation; they undermine the foundational legitimacy of the state's regulatory authority.

The global significance of forest governance is underscored by the fact that over 1.6 billion people, including 60 million indigenous individuals, derive their primary livelihood from these resources (Putri et al., 2024). In the Indonesian context, the nexus between rural communities and forest zones is historical and multidimensional, spanning economic, spiritual, and cultural domains. Despite this, the transition from constitutional theory to administrative practice often results in a disconnect, where the formalization of forest zones precipitates structural inequities and socio-legal friction.

Extant scholarship has extensively documented the systemic failures in Indonesian forest governance. Recent socio-legal inquiries have highlighted the power asymmetries inherent in tenurial disputes, where state-sanctioned corporate interests frequently override communal land claims (Mustofa et al., 2025). Scholars such as Sianturi et al (2026) and Syahputra & Anggraini (2023) have elucidated how the primacy of statutory law effectively erodes indigenous legal frameworks, while Sari & Wahanisa (2025) have theorized the "powers of exclusion" utilized by conservation and concession regimes to sever community access to ancestral lands.

Despite the breadth of these studies, a critical research gap persists in the literature. While previous research has meticulously analyzed administrative boundary overlaps and permit irregularities, there is a notable absence of doctrinal and empirical scrutiny regarding the "criminalization of spatiality" specifically, the use of physical barricades and territorial isolation as a mechanism of corporate-state control. Most studies treat tenurial conflict as a procedural or administrative failure; few address these phenomena as "extreme agrarian crimes" that weaponize the physical landscape to revoke the right to life and movement. This study fills this lacuna by examining how normative ambiguities in the Forestry Law provide a legal cloak for the forced physical isolation of communities.

The urgency of this inquiry is underscored by a deteriorating empirical landscape. Data from the Consortium for Agrarian Reform (KPA) indicates a 15% increase in agrarian conflicts in 2025, with the plantation and forestry sectors remaining the primary drivers of volatility (Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria, 2026b). In Jambi Province, where extractive licensing covers approximately 44% of forest tracts, these conflicts have escalated from legal disputes to humanitarian crises. A salient example is the 2026 conflict in Bukit Bakar Village, where the excavation of deep trenches by PT Wira Karya Sakti across primary access routes resulted in the total economic and social isolation of the local population. This maneuver paralyzed agricultural distribution and deprived children of educational access, illustrating a severe breakdown in the protection of fundamental liberties (Kurniawan, 2026; Tanah Kita, 2026) (Kurniawan, 2026; Tanah Kita, 2026).

These developments suggest that agrarian conflict in Indonesia is not merely a by product of economic competition but is rooted in a formalistic legal architecture that is increasingly divorced from sociological realities. Predicated on this theoretical and empirical backdrop, this article analyzes the normative architecture of Indonesian forestry regulations, specifically Article 50 of Law Number 41 of 1999. The central objective is to determine how these regulations facilitate power asymmetries and the extent to which current legal enforcement deconstructs both the principle of legal certainty and the human rights of communities residing within contested forest zones.

## METHOD

### Research Framework and Design

This study utilizes a qualitative socio-legal framework to analyze the intersection between statutory forestry norms and the empirical manifestations of territorial exclusion. Rather than treating Law Number 41 of 1999 on Forestry as an autonomous system of rules, this research operationalizes a "law-in-action" approach to deconstruct how formal legal instruments are leveraged within asymmetrical power structures. This design is specifically applied to evaluate the dissonance between the "Green Constitution" mandates of Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution and the restrictive implementation of forestry regulations observed in the conflict between PT Wira Karya Sakti (PT WKS) and the Bukit Bakar community (Banakar & Travers, 2005:27).

### Data Acquisition and Sources

The research utilizes a systematic triangulation of secondary data, categorized into primary legal materials and socio-empirical documentation.

1. Primary Legal Materials: The statutory corpus analyzed includes Law Number 41 of 1999 on Forestry and Law Number 5 of 1960 (Basic Regulations on Agrarian Principles). These are interrogated via a statutory approach to identify *ratio legis* and normative collisions between conservation mandates and communal land rights.
2. Secondary Socio-Empirical Data: Empirical data regarding the April 2026 conflict were retrieved through rigorous documentary research. Sources include investigative reports from the Consortium for Agrarian Reform (KPA), spatial databases from WALHI Jambi, and media archives from *Ekuatorial* and *TanahKita*. These materials provide the factual basis for analyzing the physical escalation of the dispute and the severing of communal access routes.

### Analytical Techniques

The analytical phase employs a normative-empirical content analysis to synthesize statutory provisions with site-level realities. Legal analysis is executed through three specific techniques:

1. Systematic Interpretation: Examining Article 50 of the Forestry Law in the context of broader agrarian principles to isolate the legislative lacunae that facilitate corporate impunity.
2. Pattern Matching: The study utilizes the "Powers of Exclusion" framework (regulation, force, market, and legitimation) as an analytical lens to categorize and evaluate the empirical manifestations of corporate-state actions in Bukit Bakar.
3. Constitutional Teleological Analysis: Statutory implementation is evaluated against the teleological goals of the Green Constitution specifically the mandate for ecological justice and "the greatest prosperity of the people" to determine the extent of constitutional subversion.

Through this synthesis, the study evaluates whether the enforcement of formal "legal certainty" effectively deconstructs the substantive human rights of forest-dependent communities.

### Research Limitations

While this socio-legal approach provides deep insight into power dynamics, it is subject to certain limitations. Primarily, the study relies on a comprehensive triangulation of secondary reports and institutional investigations rather than direct field interviews or primary ethnographic observation. Consequently, the findings are constrained by the scope and

perspectives of the available documentary evidence. Furthermore, the analysis is focused on a specific geographic and temporal locus the 2026 conflict in Jambi which may limit the direct generalizability of the findings to broader national or international contexts without further comparative scrutiny.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Territorial Exclusion and Agrarian Crimes: The Anatomy of the Bukit Bakar Conflict

Territorial exclusion within forestry conflicts frequently manifests through physical repression over space. In the contemporary agrarian landscape, exclusionary instruments have evolved beyond administrative disputes in formal courtrooms or document-based battles within land agencies; instead, they increasingly materialize as the forced severance of mobility and the coercive reconfiguration of livelihood spaces at the site level. Employing a framework of methodological transparency, this study grounds its analysis in the triangulation of secondary data from the Consortium for Agrarian Reform (KPA) investigative reports, cross-referenced with regional media documentation. Based on these data, the escalating dispute between PT Wira Karya Sakti (PT WKS) and the community of Bukit Bakar Village in West Tanjung Jabung Regency, Jambi Province, between April 20 and 21, 2026, provides a sharp empirical illustration of this destructive phenomenon (Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria, 2026b:12).

As documented in the official release by the Jambi Regional Consortium for Agrarian Reform (KPA, April 22, 2026), PT WKS unilaterally severed communal mobility by excavating isolation trenches approximately two meters deep, positioned to bisect five primary arterial routes connecting Neighborhood Units (RT) 07 and 09. This action transcends mere infrastructural vandalism; it constitutes a deliberate feat of spatial engineering designed to impose total isolation. Such confinement effectively paralyzed the community's economic and social lifelines. Consequently, hundreds of households were abruptly deprived of vital channels for agricultural distribution, staple food supplies were drastically severed, and the fulfillment of the fundamental right to education was obstructed as school transport to institutions outside the village was rendered impossible (Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria, 2026b:15).

Moving beyond mere exclusionary topographical manipulation, this spatial restriction operation was accompanied by the systematic and mass destruction of the peasantry's productive assets. Subsistence-sustaining crops specifically bananas, aromatic ginger (*kencur*), galangal (*laos*), peanuts, and various other secondary food crops (*palawija*) were forcibly uprooted. This systematic elimination of communal food reservoirs directly dismantled the foundations of household food security, precipitating a state of extreme structural vulnerability. The empirical reality observed in Bukit Bakar Village comprehensively substantiates and enriches the thesis of agrarian exclusion pioneered by Hall et al (2011:7) in the seminal work of agrarian sociology, *Powers of Exclusion: Land Dilemmas in Southeast Asia*.

Hall et al (2011:14-16) delineate a structural theoretical framework positing that exclusion or the restriction of access to land and natural resources is not an arbitrary process; rather, it is functionally propelled by four primary dimensions of power: regulation, force, market, and legitimation. The conflict in Bukit Bakar Village serves as a pivotal precedent, illustrating how these four instruments of power do not function in isolation. Instead, they operate in a simultaneous, orchestrated, and intertwined manner to systematically exclude marginalized subjects from their livelihood spaces.

The inaugural dimension of power coercive force is observed to operate with palpable excess and finds factual, empirical manifestation on the ground. Hall et al (2011:17) elucidate that "force" encompasses eviction, coercion, or the restriction of access implemented through both actual physical violence and the mere deployment of violent threats; such implementation frequently involves a hybrid delegation between state and non-state actors. In Bukit Bakar Village, coercive actions specifically the excavation of isolation trenches and the destruction

of community gardens were executed under the escort of corporate security units (PT WKS security), facilitated by the direct presence of state security apparatuses (the Indonesian National Armed Forces [TNI] and the National Police/Brimob). The deployment of armed state personnel at the frontline of a tenurial dispute instantaneously transmutes a civil matter into a militarized security operation. This dynamic exemplifies "spatial violence," wherein a concession holder leverages its capital to mobilize the state's monopoly on security in order to safeguard its circuits of accumulation (Peluso & Lund, 2011).

The second dimension of power legitimation is discursively manifest within the corporation's rationalized territorial claims. The centrality of territoriality is utilized as an affirmative mechanism, inextricably linking a particular landscape to assertions of absolute ownership or jurisdictional supremacy (Hall et al., 2011:19). PT WKS leverages its standing as the grantee of a Business License for the Utilization of Timber Forest Products in Industrial Forest Plantations (IUPHHK-HTI) as its foundational jurisprudential legitimacy. This legitimacy serves as a rationalizing tool to delegitimize the socio-historical reality that the contested area constitutes a *lebensraum* a livelihood space that sustained local communities long before concession polygons were delineated on official maps. By marginalizing these historical narratives, legal legitimacy is weaponized to criminalize the existence of residents upon their own traditionally managed landscapes.

The third dimension is the market (*market*). Market-based exclusionary forces operate through commodity dictation and interventions that obstruct local economic substitution (Hall et al., 2011:21). When the corporate security apparatus structurally destroys community food crops, it constitutes a systematic effort to extinguish the citizenry's access to the mechanisms of market autonomy. By severing the capacity to produce subsistence commodities, residents are forcibly integrated into a condition of economic subordination, stripping them of the bargaining power required for autonomous survival.

The fourth dimension regulation (*regulation*) serves as the overarching umbrella shielding the entirety of this exclusionary process, wherein the legislative framework is wielded as a sword to delineate the boundaries of legality and illegality (Hall et al., 2011:23). The strategic application of regulation enables acts of spatial repression to be judicially reframed as 'asset normalization' or 'forestry law enforcement.' To delineate the convergence of these four dimensions, Table 1 provides an analytical synthesis of exclusionary operations as they manifest at the site level.

**Table 1: Analysis of Power Dimensions in the PT WKS vs. Bukit Bakar Village Spatial Conflict**

Power Dimension (Hall, Hirsch, & Li, 2011)	Empirical Manifestation: PT WKS & Bukit Bakar Case (April 2026)	Socio-Spatial Impact on Affected Communities
<b>Regulation</b>	Utilization of HTI concession permits as a proxy for absolute legal truth, effectively delegitimizing the community's historical-cultural claims.	Triggers the criminalization of residents, the marginalization of living law, and the systematic erosion of local tenurial recognition ( <i>de jure</i> and <i>de facto</i> ).
<b>Force</b>	Operational deployment of corporate security forces bolstered by state combatants (TNI/Brimob) to excavate two-meter isolation trenches.	Generation of profound psychological trauma, physical repression of spatial mobility, and the degradation of civilian resistance through structural intimidation.
<b>Market</b>	Structured destruction of local agricultural commodities (bananas, galangal, aromatic ginger) aimed at collapsing peasant economic self-sufficiency.	Catalyzes absolute food insecurity, engineered structural impoverishment, and the systematic elimination of residents from local economic supply chains.
<b>Legitimation</b>	Monopolistic assertion of concession boundaries framed as "securing national	Institutionalizes an exclusive territorial "truth" favoring capital interests while

assets" and the repudiation of the April 9, 2026, amicable settlement.

nullifying social justice discourse and prior bilateral agreements.

A salient finding within the anatomy of this dispute is that the sequence of coercive actions was executed in explicit contravention of a formal Minutes of Agreement (*Berita Acara*) signed on April 9, 2026. This unilateral repudiation underscores a stark reality: for entities wielding the instruments of 'powers of exclusion,' social pacts lack binding legal significance. This disregard persists because coercive apparatuses can be mobilized with greater capitalistic efficiency than the comparative costs of social compromise or genuine conciliation.

In a broader analytical context, these actions must be situated within the theoretical framework of state-corporate crime instances where corporate transgressions are systematically facilitated by institutional state structures. Ciocchini & Greener (2023) conceptualize sites of agribusiness exploitation within the Global South as 'regimes of extreme permission.' They posit that the imperatives of transnational corporations to maximize profit serve as the primary drivers catalyzing ecological degradation and human rights violations processes that are systematically legalized through the state apparatus (Ciocchini & Greener, 2023). Within this regime, the phenomenon of land grabbing persists because the armed apparatus proactively engenders a permissive environment to preserve investment stability, effectively transmuting the state's social protection mandate into a vanguard for corporate malfeasance (Fahmi, 2026).

This empirical reality exposes a profound structural paradox. At the level of global discourse, agribusiness conglomerates prolifically disseminate narratives of sustainable development and green governance. However, such campaigns stand in stark contradiction to the site-level realities at 'ground zero.' International governance standards, such as the RSPO or ISPO, frequently function as mere bureaucratic facades or *greenwashing* that fail to penetrate the protective layers of corporate impunity prevalent in states characterized by regimes of extreme permission (Astari et al., 2025).

This structural criminological construction of state-corporate crime, in turn, stands in diametric opposition to the doctrinal foundations of Indonesian constitutional law and agrarian constitutionalism. The failure to intervene against spatial repression in forest zones constitutes a profound anomaly within the philosophy of the State's Right to Control (HMN) as mandated by Article 33, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution. Under the Green Constitution paradigm, the state's sovereign authority cannot be delegated as an instrument of corporate impunity to exclude local communities; rather, it must be stringently regulated to guarantee ecological justice (Asshiddiqie, 2016:112). The state's failure to equilibrate these asymmetric power relations marks a critical transition: the crisis has shifted from a mere administrative law dispute into a direct threat against national ecocratic sovereignty.

### **The Illusion of Legal Certainty: Deconstructing Article 50 of the Forestry Law**

The audacity of corporate entities to enforce coercive territorial exclusion manifested in actions such as the excavation of trenches to sever communal access does not occur within a legal vacuum. Rather, these repressive interventions consistently shield themselves behind the instruments of national legal positivism. In practice, state law no longer functions as an impartial institution of 'blind justice'; instead, it is instrumentalized into a bureaucratic apparatus that legitimizes spatial dispossession. The root of this structural impunity lies in the excessively formalistic architecture of Indonesian forestry law, the epicenter of which is the construction of Article 50 of Law No. 41 of 1999 (The Forestry Law).

A doctrinal analysis of the text and praxis of Article 50 reveals that this norm operates purely on a foundation of formal-administrative legality, which systematically delegitimizes the 'living law' of local communities. Specifically, Article 50, paragraph (3), letters (a) and (e),

imperatively prohibits any individual from occupying or using forest areas 'illegally' or harvesting forest products without formal authorization. While a literal grammatical interpretation suggests these regulations are protective instruments designed to mitigate deforestation, the 'law in action' reveals a profound epistemological bias. This construction reductively bisects the forestry landscape into an asymmetric binary: (1) the corporate permit-holder, defined as an absolute 'legal' subject, and (2) the local community lacking formal title, who are automatically categorized as 'illegal' encroachers and potential subjects of criminalization (Bedner, 2001:17).

When this formalistic lens is projected onto the socio-cultural realities of Bukit Bakar, the resulting distortion of justice becomes strikingly apparent. The majority of these forest-dwelling communities inherited spatial relations, cultural exchanges, and subsistence dependencies long before the state apparatus demarcated concessions for Logging (HPH) or Industrial Forest Plantations (HTI). Yet, the instruments of Article 50 reduce this pre-independence existence and communal tenurial system to the mere criminal offense of 'unauthorized occupation.' Conversely, entities such as PT WKS, fortified by state-issued concession documents, automatically attain a form of juridical immunity. Consequently, the law fails to function as a facilitator of spatial equity; instead, it transforms into an apparatus of agrarian exclusion that secures the cycles of plantation oligarchy under the guise of formal 'legal certainty.'

A socio-legal critique of the orthodox character of Article 50 necessitates an elevation of the discourse into the realms of constitutional law and ecological constitutionalism. The deployment of Article 50 to isolate and repress rural populations for the sake of concession expansion constitutes, in essence, a defiance of the nation's supreme ecological mandate: the Green Constitution. Asshiddiqie (2016:45–47) posits a fundamental argument that the post-amendment 1945 Constitution has undergone a paradigm shift toward 'ecocracy' the synthesis of ecological sovereignty and environmental sustainability. This paradigm is explicitly codified in Article 33, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, which mandates that the earth, water, and natural resources are controlled by the state for the *greatest prosperity of the people*. A contemporary 'Green Constitution' interpretation dictates that 'prosperity' cannot be measured solely through macroeconomic ratios or corporate tax revenues. Rather, it must be interpreted as the guaranteed right to a healthy environment, the preservation of communal food sovereignty, and the assurance of intergenerational spatial security (Asshiddiqie, 2016:112).

Concession-securing practices that tolerate the eradication of community subsistence crops and the severance of public access represent an absolute negation of the Green Constitution's core tenets. Article 50 of the Forestry Law is characterized by an ontological failure; it is incapable of translating the constitutional imperatives of social justice into enforceable protections. Consequently, the State's Power of Control (HMN) is perverted into a tool for monopolistic corporate delegation, amputating the foundational requirement that natural resources be managed for the 'greatest prosperity of the people.'

When state instruments are harmonized to accommodate the destruction of vital communal landscapes, the situation demands an inquiry into structural criminology. Under the lens of the 'criminology of the powerful,' this dysfunctional symbiosis is characterized as state-corporate criminality. Ciochini & Greener (2023) conceptualize capital accumulation regimes within Southeast Asia as 'regimes of extreme permission.' Their thesis posits that the relentless profit-making objectives of corporations imported into Global South nations act as the primary engine dictating macroeconomic policy strategies. This pattern of intensive investment is inherently responsible for both ecological degradation and the repression of human rights (Ciochini & Greener, 2023).

A fundamental aspect of this state-corporate crime phenomenon is the reality that the accumulation of oligarchic wealth persists not because of state absence, but rather through

active state presence. This involves the engineering of legal spaces, the design of repressive regulations such as Article 50 of the Forestry Law, and the deployment of security forces to create conditions of 'extreme permission' that tolerate accumulation by dispossession. The state's acquiescence toward the blockade of communal connectivity and the instrumentalization of criminalization threats in Bukit Bakar Village represent the constituent elements forming a complete anatomy of state-corporate crime. To underscore these contradictions, Table 2 elaborates on the paradigmatic deconstruction between the conventional forestry law perspective and the ideal constitutional paradigm.

**Table 2: Jurisprudential-Philosophical Analysis of the PT WKS vs. Bukit Bakar Village Spatial Conflict**

Analytical Dimensions	Formalistic-Positivist Paradigm (Implementation of Art. 50, Forestry Law)	Green Constitution & Constitutional Ecocracy Paradigm (Art. 33, 1945 Constitution)
<b>Locus of Tenure Legitimacy</b>	<b>Administrative Legality:</b> Based on concession permits generated through centralized bureaucratic structures and formal state recognition.	<b>Substantive Legitimacy:</b> Grounded in fundamental human rights, genealogical-communal tenure evidence, and ecosystem-carrying capacity.
<b>Status of Local Communities</b>	<b>Derogatory Classification:</b> Residents are categorized as encroachers, impediments to investment stability, and potential subjects of criminalization.	<b>Primary Rights-Holders:</b> Positioned as the principal stakeholders and the primary stewards of communal ecological spaces.
<b>Functional Essence of Legal Instruments</b>	<b>Apparatus of Repression:</b> Functions as a mechanism to protect capital ownership, facilitate spatial exclusion, and normalize state-corporate criminality.	<b>Mechanism of Protection:</b> Operates as a safeguard for vulnerable populations, ensuring socio-ecological welfare and preventing exploitative monopolies.
<b>Threshold for Violations/Offenses</b>	<b>Linear-Geometric Infringement:</b> Focused strictly on transgressions against the administrative boundaries claimed by the HTI corporation.	<b>Socio-Ecological Disruption:</b> Evaluated based on the destruction of local food chains, the collapse of subsistence economies, and the degradation of bio-ecological balance.

A comprehensive synthesis of this doctrinal analysis leads to the inescapable conclusion that the application of Article 50 of the Forestry Law shackled by an orthodox formalist logic produces nothing more than a delusion of 'legal certainty.' In its substantive execution, this norm functions as jurisprudential weaponry that paralyzes the fundamental mandate of constitutional ecocracy. It is through this legislative architecture that the state's criminal law is hijacked and commodified, serving as a facilitator for the persistent agrarian dehumanization orchestrated by the maneuvers of global corporate oligarchies.

**The Privatization of Public Space and Negotiating Asymmetries in Conflict Resolution**

When public pressure or site-level resistance escalates to a point that threatens to trigger a social crisis, both local government apparatuses and corporate entities frequently introduce discourses of 'peaceful conflict resolution' or 'participatory mediation.' On the surface, these non-litigious resolution frameworks appear to represent a democratic compromise. However, a critical socio-legal perspective necessitates the deconstruction of neutrality claims within mediation mechanisms conducted under the shadow of structural disparities and profound power asymmetries. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) cannot yield an equivalent consensus when one party maintains control over coercive instruments and the threat of structural impoverishment.

This asymmetric resolution dynamic is vividly captured in the local authorities' response to the severance of communal mobility facilities in Bukit Bakar Village. Investigative

documentation confirms that, following the isolation trench incident, the sub-district government initiated mediation between community representatives and PT WKS management on April 28, 2026. Within this chronological framing, public officials' statements indirectly unveil the underlying power relations: it was stipulated that the corporation would only consent to restoring road access on the condition that the community signs a written agreement (Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria, 2026a).

The sociological reality wherein the restoration of vital public infrastructure (the commons) is utilized as an instrument of spatial hijacking commodified through the conditional surrender of legal claims serves as a precise indicator of spatial privatization. In this context, the corporation de facto usurps state sovereignty regarding the guarantee of free movement for civilians. By arrogating to itself a quasi-state authority, the corporate entity wields a hegemonic privilege to determine which subjects may traverse or extract a livelihood from the territorial landscape.

The corporate demand for a new 'agreement' amidst a logistics crisis cannot be viewed as a standard civil contract. By exploiting food vulnerability and spatial isolation, the community is forced into a state of coerced submission to ratify documents that validate the jurisdiction of the concession. This scheme provides an empirical affirmation of the 'legitimation' element within the Powers of Exclusion framework. Consent is systematically manufactured under the pressure of deliberate economic vulnerability, serving as a legal justification to legitimize unilateral exclusion (Hall et al., 2019).

When scrutinized through the procedural lens of non-litigious mediation, this deliberative assembly demonstrates the systemic dysfunction of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) arising from acute disparities in negotiating capacity. A mediation forum loses its legitimacy as a vehicle for equitable consensus when the equilibrium of power is fundamentally compromised. The corporation dominates the proceedings through its mastery of spatial control, the protective canopy of security apparatuses, and a shield of formal legality; meanwhile, the agrarian community remains in a state of logistical isolation and systemic intimidation. This asymmetrically orchestrated reconciliation produces an 'agreement' that is essentially an instrument of absolute capitulation, cloaked in the hollow rhetoric of dispute mitigation.

Simultaneously, local government institutions which are constitutionally mandated under the 'Green Constitution' to obstruct structural criminality have suffered a profound functional erosion. The role of local authorities has been reduced to that of mere administrative catalysts or procedural facilitators who perpetuate the operational ecosystem of state-corporate crime. Rather than initiating a restoration of fundamental rights, the bureaucratic machinery thickens the veil of camouflage, presenting a facade of voluntary consensus where, in reality, only coerced submission exists.

Furthermore, the inherent pathologies of these hyper-local negotiations unveil the functional impotence of transnational governance regimes. Global certification mechanisms exemplified by the RSPO and ISPO are perennially marketed as the vanguards of sustainability and the definitive antithesis to state-corporate criminality (Astari et al., 2025). Nevertheless, the mediation reality in Bukit Bakar provides a compelling empirical deconstruction, demonstrating that global safeguarding architectures frequently collapse into functional impotence when confronted by the visceral alliance between capitalist profit accumulation and localized coercive apparatuses within the milieu of 'regimes of extreme permission' (Ciocchini & Greener, 2023). As a synthesis of these negotiation asymmetries, Table 3 presents a deconstructive comparison that interrogates the illusion of reconciliation within the hegemonic grip of the 'powers of exclusion.'

**Table 3. Evaluative Deconstruction of Dispute Resolution Mechanisms (ADR) in Bukit Bakar**

Dimensions of ADR Evaluation	Normative Ideal: Equitable and Proportional Resolution	Distortive Reality: Negotiated Asymmetries in Bukit Bakar (April 28, 2026)
<b>Pre-Negotiation Spatial Conditions</b>	The establishment of procedural neutrality, unfettered mobility, and the total absence of existential threats to all participating parties.	Presence of spatial hostage-taking via communal isolation trenches and the severance of food security corridors, precipitating acute structural vulnerability.
<b>Bargaining Power Dynamics</b>	An equilibrium in negotiating capacity, where legal and moral discourse is safeguarded by the rigorous impartiality of the state.	Absolute disparity; the dominance of formal administrative permits and state-sanctioned protection versus intimidated and unrepresented civilian subjects.
<b>Outcome Expectations</b>	The generation of spontaneous consensus ( <i>voluntary consent</i> ) wherein the restoration of social cohesion is achieved without latent coercion.	The production of coerced outputs manifested as "written compacts" engineered to extract communal recognition of corporate territorial hegemony.
<b>Function of Local Governance</b>	Acting as a progressive ombudsman; an active enforcer of the "Green Constitution" mandate to safeguard civilian authority and rights.	Functional reduction to administrative intermediaries (rubber-stampers) that provide procedural legitimation for state-corporate criminality.

The preceding sociological evaluation corroborates the hypothesis that mediation proceedings within agrarian conflict zones when divorced from a fundamental deconstruction of power asymmetries and the substantive restoration of autonomous communal rights—constitute an ontological continuation of territorial exclusion. In this context, conflict resolution does not seek to reinstate ecological justice. Instead, it is transfigured into a methodological instrument designed to neutralize grassroots resistance, enforce the formal legalization of structural subordination, and institutionalize the dominance of state-corporate criminality under a protective administrative aegis.

**CONCLUSION**

This study concludes that the tenure dispute between PT Wira Karya Sakti and the Bukit Bakar community transcends mere administrative boundary demarcations; rather, it constitutes a visceral manifestation of institutionalized coercive territorial exclusion framed as state-corporate criminality. The legitimation of this communal dispossession is paradoxically facilitated by the instruments of legal positivism specifically the formalistic orthodoxy of Article 50 of the Forestry Law which deconstructs informal tenure systems while fundamentally subverting the ecocratic tenets of the Green Constitution. Furthermore, site-level mediation mechanisms are revealed to be performative and illusory; within the grip of absolute power asymmetries, these non-litigious interventions yield only coerced subordination for the citizenry rather than an equitable, democratic consensus. Consequently, the resolution of such agrarian conflicts necessitates a radical paradigmatic shift, moving away from reductive legal-formalism toward the substantive implementation of the Green Constitution to ensure that the state apparatus resumes its fiduciary role as a guardian of communal living spaces rather than a mere facilitator of oligarchic accumulation.

**REFERENCES**

Asshiddiqie, J. (2016). *Green Constitution : Nuansa Hijau Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945*. Rajawali Pers.

Astari, A. J., Lovett, J. C., & Wasesa, M. (2025). Sustainable pathways in Indonesia’s palm oil industry through historical institutionalism. *World Development Sustainability*, 6, 100200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wds.2024.100200>

- Bahari, R., & Faizin, M. (2026). Deforestasi dan Krisis Ekologis Kalimantan: Dampak Regulasi Pembukaan Lahan terhadap Kesejahteraan dan Konflik Sosial Masyarakat. *Journal of Legal, Political, and Humanistic Inquiry*, 1(3), 318–330. <https://doi.org/10.65310/8wv3fd08>
- Bakker, L., & 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>
- Banakar, R., & Travers, M. (2005). *Theory and Method in Socio-Legal Research*. Hart Publishing.
- Bedner, A. (2001). *Administrative Courts in Indonesia: A Socio-Legal Study*. Brill | Nijhoff. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004481992>
- Ciocchini, P., & Greener, J. (2023). Regimes of Extreme Permission in Southeast Asia: Theorizing State-Corporate Crime in the Global South. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 63(5), 1309–1326. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azac091>
- Fahmi, A. R. Al. (2026). Urgency of the Criminal Asset Forfeiture Bill: A Comparative Analysis with the Asset Recovery Approach. *Smart: Journal of Criminal Law Review and Analysis*, 1(1), 58–70. <https://ejournal.smartpedia.co.id/index.php/SCrim/article/view/30>
- Hall, D., Hirsch, P., & Li, T. M. (2011). *Powers of Exclusion: Land Dilemmas in Southeast Asia*. Singapore and Honolulu: National University of Singapore Press/University of Hawaii Press.
- Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria. (2026a). *PT. WKS Khianati Kesepakatan: Isolasi Warga Bukit Bakar Dan Rusak Tanaman Petani Adalah Kejahatan Agraria*. Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria. <https://www.kpa.or.id/2026/04/pt-wks-gusur-tanah-rakyat-lagi/>
- Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria. (2026b). *Tancap Gas di Jalur yang Salah, Paradoks Kebijakan Agraria Prabowo-Gibran 2025*. Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria. <https://www.kpa.or.id/2026/01/tancap-gas-di-jalur-yang-salah-paradoks-kebijakan-agraria-prabowo-gibran-2025/>
- Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria. (2026c). *Tancap Gas di Jalur yang Salah; Paradoks Kebijakan Agraria Prabowo Gibran 2025: Menolak Koreksi, Mereproduksi Krisis*. Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1xteWcLfL7tXhivfm-BJ2WCx7lfAH1pSc/view>
- Kurniawan, F. (2026). *Pengepungan Bukit Bakar, Kejahatan Agraria yang Mengisolasi Rakyat Jambi*. Ekuatorial. <https://www.ekuatorial.com/2026/04/pengepungan-bukit-bakar-kejahatan-agraria-yang-mengisolasi-rakyat-jambi/>
- Mustofa, R., Syahza, A., Manurung, G. M. E., Nasrul, B., Afrino, R., & Siallagan, E. J. (2025). Land tenure conflicts in forest areas: obstacles to rejuvenation of small-scale oil palm plantations in Indonesia. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 67(3), 341–362. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-09-2023-0216>
- Peluso, N. L., & Lund, C. (2011). New frontiers of land control: Introduction. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38(4), 667–681. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.607692>
- Putri, R. T., Yuningsih, L., & Harbi, J. (2024). Conflict Resolution of Community Land Use in PT. Musi Hutan Persada (MHP) Industrial Plantation Forest. *Journal of Global Sustainable Agriculture*, 5(1), 100–106. <https://doi.org/10.32502/jgsa.v5i1.365>
- Sianturi, C. M. J., Muliono, M., & Anshori, M. W. (2026). Model Penyelesaian Konflik Hutan Adat Kemenyan melalui Skema Perhutanan Sosial antara Masyarakat Pandumaan Sipituhuta dengan PT Toba Pulp Lestari. *JURNAL HUKUM, POLITIK DAN ILMU SOSIAL*, 5(1), 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jhpis.v5i1.5891>
- Syahputra, O. H., & Anggraini, N. (2023). Tenurial Conflict Resolution Analysis of Indigenous People of Pandumaan - Sipituhuta in Humbang Hasundutan District, North Sumatera

- Province. *Journal of Sylva Indonesiana*, 6(01), 19–28.  
<https://doi.org/10.32734/jsi.v6i01.8287>
- Tamanaha, B. Z. (1999). *Realistic Socio-Legal Theory: Pragmatism and a Social Theory of Law*. Oxford University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198298250.001.0001>
- Tanah Kita. (2026). *Konflik Kelompok Tani Sakato Jaya, Desa Lubuk Mandarsyah Kecamatan Tengah Ilir Kabupaten Tebo Dengan PT. WKS. Tanah Kita*.  
<https://tanahkita.id/data/konflik/detil/ZDBSU2ZRc1cwV2M>