

The Politics of Recognition and Differentiated Citizenship Among in the *O'hongana Manyawa* Indigenous Community in East Halmahera

Abd. Firman Bunta * ^{1, a}, Wahyudin Noe ^{2 b}

¹ Gorontalo State University, Gorontalo, Indonesia

² Khairun University, Ternate, Indonesia

^a abdfirmanbunta@ung.ac.id *; ^b wahyudinnoe@unkhair.ac.id

* Corresponding Author

Abstract: *This study examines the formation of Indigenous citizenship among the Tobelo Dalam community in East Halmahera amid the dominance of extractivism that threatens their living spaces. Drawing on the perspectives of the politics of recognition and differentiated citizenship, recognition is positioned as a corrective prerequisite for addressing the structural disadvantages experienced by minority groups, particularly through the protection of collective territorial rights and the recognition of cultural heritage as the foundation of Indigenous citizenship. This study employs a qualitative case study approach, utilizing participatory observation, in-depth interviews, and documentary analysis. The collected data were analyzed through the processes of data reduction, data presentation, and verification. The findings demonstrate that the formal inclusion of the Tobelo Dalam Indigenous community has taken place through resettlement programs, civil registration, electoral participation, and limited involvement in local public offices. However, such recognition remains partial, as increased administrative visibility has not been accompanied by secure access to basic rights, including clean water and infrastructure, while the shrinking of forest-based living spaces continues without adequate protection mechanisms. These conditions reveal a paradox of citizenship, characterized by a tension between formal registration and substantive exclusion, in which the state is present administratively but remains ineffective in fulfilling its protective function. This selectivity is reflected in the asymmetry of legal certainty, where the recognition of Indigenous territories remains limited to the registration stage, whereas the designation of mining concession areas is established definitively—a condition conceptualized in this study as pseudo-integration. The study recommends a reorientation of development policies and the strengthening of citizenship education to ensure that administrative inclusion is meaningfully connected to the restoration of territorial rights.*

Keywords: *Politics of Recognition; Differentiated Citizenship; Citizenship Paradox; Indigenous Peoples; Extractivism*

INTRODUCTION

Extractivism driven by land-use conversion and mining expansion poses a direct threat to the living spaces of Indigenous communities in Indonesia. This threat operates through governance arrangements over land and natural resource control that position Indigenous territories as spaces for investment (Fahmi et al., 2024). Such conditions require a conceptualization of citizenship that extends beyond formal legal status, namely a form of citizenship grounded in cultural heritage as well as in relations of access rights and protection, which determines whether vulnerable groups can achieve substantive justice (Isin, 2012; Roy & Neveu, 2023). In this article, citizenship is examined through three dimensions: formal registration, the fulfillment of substantive rights, and differentiated recognition of cultural heritage as the basis of collective rights.

Studies on Indigenous communities demonstrate that recognition processes often proceed through administrative and local political channels. These processes may increase formal visibility without automatically restoring territorial rights, thereby revealing an unstable dialectic between land restitution agendas and the state's tendency to retain control over natural resources (Tamma & Duile, 2020). The governance of natural resources is characterized by uncertainty over Indigenous territories, resulting in protection deficits and complicating processes of recovery when violations occur (Karso, 2025).

The case of the *O'hongana Manyawa* or Tobelo Dalam Indigenous community in East Halmahera illustrates a pattern of recognition unfolding under the dominance of extractivism (Alting et al., 2025). For this community, forests function as ancestral heritage that sustains identity, livelihoods, and collective knowledge; therefore, cultural heritage constitutes the foundation of their citizenship rather

than merely an additional cultural attribute (Asteria et al., 2021). Development policies have promoted permanent settlement and the standardization of indicators of a decent standard of living (Noe et al., 2025). At the same time, mining expansion and land-use changes continue to exert pressure on forest-based living spaces through concession allocations and licensing arrangements that remain beyond community control (Sinay et al., 2024). The customary territory of the O'Hongana Manyawa in Dodaga, covering 27,711 hectares, is recorded only as registered territory without formal designation, while the proposed customary forest area of 19,305.63 hectares has remained at the proposal stage since 2020 (Tanah Kita, 2020; BRWA, 2024). Monitoring reports on Indigenous peoples' rights further emphasize that investment pressures on Indigenous territories in Indonesia are frequently accompanied by criminalization and violence. These reports also highlight that the recognition of Indigenous land rights remains an urgent agenda that is often stalled at the implementation level (Survival International, 2024).

The politics of recognition requires recognition that generates meaningful consequences for the redistribution of protection (Taylor, 2021). The concept of differentiated citizenship explains why uniform treatment does not necessarily produce equality. Young emphasizes the need for institutional mechanisms that enable oppressed groups to ensure that their collective interests are considered in public decisions affecting their lives (Young, 2020). The citizenship paradox examined in this article refers to a condition in which formal registration increases while substantive protection of territory and cultural heritage remains delayed, resulting in partial recognition that prioritizes administrative categorization while leaving territorial issues unresolved (Tamma & Duile, 2020; International IDEA, 2024). This tension also extends to the domain of citizenship education, as state-sanctioned conceptions of citizenship influence whether Indigenous peoples' collective rights are recognized as integral components of citizenship or reduced merely to administrative compliance. Within the sphere of social policy, protection mechanisms do not always reach vulnerable groups equally, particularly when communities face environmental pressures and vulnerabilities in accessing basic services such as clean water (Surtiari et al., 2024).

Studies on extractivism in Indonesia further reinforce the argument that mining dominance within legal and policy preferences generates unequal access to land and undermines sustainability. Such inequalities prolong land conflicts and narrow the living spaces available to communities (Halomoan et al., 2025). Mining investment policies repeatedly generate conflicts when Indigenous land rights remain legally weak (Arizona & Illiyina, 2024), making it difficult for Indigenous communities to claim losses over territories designated as mining areas (Rumadan & Salamah, 2023). The selective character of state action can be observed through contrasting levels of legal certainty across policy instruments. East Halmahera is burdened by 29 mining business permits covering a total concession area of 186,693.21 hectares, all of which have received definitive legal designation (Satu Data Maluku Utara, 2025; Sawal, 2025). In contrast, the 27,710.98-hectare customary territory of the O'Hongana Manyawa remains at the registration stage without designation through a regional regulation or a regent's decree, while its proposed customary forest area of 19,305.63 hectares has not progressed beyond the proposal stage since 2020 (BRWA, 2024; TanahKita, 2020).

This asymmetry of procedural progress demonstrates that the state is capable of completing licensing procedures while allowing customary territory recognition procedures to remain unresolved, causing recognition processes to move more slowly than concession allocations. Information submitted to the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination through its early warning procedure on 19 January 2026 stated that an adequate legislative and procedural framework for Indigenous peoples' recognition had not yet been established in North Maluku Province (Forest Peoples Programme, 2026). Similar selectivity is evident in spatial governance instruments, where the spatial conformity recommendation issued in 2018, which facilitated the entry of new mining companies, was revoked only after public pressure, while the revision of the regency spatial planning framework remained unfinished (JATAM, 2023). The formal evidentiary regime in mining-related land conflicts places corporations in a more advantageous position because Indigenous communities often lack legal evidence that conforms to the standards of positive law (Peterson et al., 2025). Consequently, the protection of collective rights remains structurally unequal (Berenschot & Saraswati, 2024).

The research gap addressed by this article lies in the tendency of studies on Indigenous social transformation to employ modernization indicators as measures of progress, such as permanent

settlement, population documentation, and electoral participation. These indicators often reproduce colonial-sedentary logics and do not necessarily correspond with Indigenous empowerment (Fahmi et al., 2024b; Nurjaya & Navisa, 2025; Riyanto, 2025; Reyes-García et al., 2026). Meanwhile, cultural heritage, territorial rights protection, and the restoration of living spaces are frequently excluded from the core assessment of citizenship. This article offers a conceptual contribution by integrating the politics of recognition and differentiated citizenship to understand recognition as a corrective agenda—an effort to connect administrative inclusion with territorial rights restoration and protection from extractivism.

This article conceptualizes pseudo-integration as a condition in which the state incorporates Indigenous communities into systems of registration and indicators of modernity without restoring territorial rights and without recognizing cultural heritage as the foundation of citizenship, thereby producing inclusion alongside substantive exclusion. This finding also has implications for citizenship education, which should position Indigenous peoples' collective rights and cultural heritage as substantive components of citizenship education. The objective of this study is to analyze the formation of Indigenous citizenship among the Tobelo Dalam community in East Halmahera amid the dominance of extractivism. The study focuses on identifying forms of formal inclusion experienced by the community, explaining why recognition remains partial and generates a citizenship paradox, and formulating policy reorientation and implications for citizenship education to ensure that administrative recognition is connected with the protection of living spaces and the restoration of territorial rights.

METHODS

This study employs a qualitative approach using a case study design (Dunk-West & Saxton, 2024). The research was conducted in Tukur-Tukur Hamlet, Dodaga Village, East Wasile District, East Halmahera Regency. The research site was selected based on three considerations. First, the area represents the location of a permanent settlement program that has generated measurable social changes within the Tobelo Dalam community. Second, the community's living space directly borders forest areas experiencing pressure from land-use conversion and extractive activities. Third, the customary territory of the Tobelo Dalam or O'Hongana Manyawa community, covering 27,710.98 hectares, has been registered in the customary territory registry but has not yet received formal designation. Therefore, this location provides an empirical setting for examining the relationship between administrative recognition and territorial protection (BRWA, 2024).

Field research was conducted from May to August 2024. The unit of analysis was defined as the citizenship practices of the Tobelo Dalam Indigenous community, encompassing administrative registration, local political participation, access to basic services and settlement arrangements, experiences of territorial rights uncertainty, as well as the community's relationship with cultural heritage as the foundation of citizenship. The cultural heritage dimension was operationalized through the customary spatial organization of the community, including customary forests (O Adata ma Hongana), agricultural land (Dumule), settlements (Berera), ancestral settlements (Berera Mahira), and sago forests (Raki Lamo), as well as through the customary institution of Madukuroka with its leadership structure consisting of the Tribal Chief, Kapita, Customary Leader, and Baru-baru (BRWA, 2024). This dimension enables an assessment of whether state recognition reaches the cultural and territorial foundations of citizenship or remains confined to administrative categories.

The study involved 20 informants selected purposively based on their direct knowledge of permanent settlement processes, population administration, and living space-related issues. The informant composition consisted of 10 Tobelo Dalam community members who participated in the settlement program, 3 customary leaders representing the Tribal Chief, Kapita, and Customary Leader, 2 hamlet officials, 3 Dodaga Village officials, and 2 representatives from Indigenous community support organizations. The informants ranged in age from 27 to 68 years, consisting of 13 men and 7 women. The number of informants was determined based on thematic saturation, whereby additional interviews no longer generated new analytical categories. Each informant was assigned an identification code to ensure confidentiality: TD-01 to TD-10 for community members, PA-01 to PA-03 for customary leaders, AP-01 to AP-05 for hamlet and village officials, and OP-01 to OP-02 for supporting organizations.

Data were collected through three techniques. Participatory observation focused on settlement conditions, access to clean water and basic infrastructure, daily economic practices, and interactions between residents and local actors within development programs. In-depth interviews were conducted with community members, customary leaders, hamlet officials, and village authorities who possessed direct knowledge of the permanent settlement process and changing citizenship relations. Each interview lasted between 45 and 90 minutes and was conducted in Indonesian using the Halmahera Malay dialect commonly used in daily communication, as well as in the Tobelo language with assistance from a local interpreter when informants felt more comfortable expressing themselves in their mother tongue. All interviews were recorded with informants' consent and transcribed verbatim to enable direct quotations. Documentary analysis included village archives, population administration records, development program documents, and institutional reports, as well as district and provincial spatial planning documents (Government of North Maluku Province, 2025; BRWA, 2024; TanahKita, 2020). This document review compared the legal certainty of licensing instruments with the procedural stages of customary territory recognition, ensuring that claims regarding selective state action were grounded in documentary evidence.

Data analysis was conducted through the processes of data reduction, data presentation, and verification. Thematic coding was applied using four analytical focuses (Ahmed et al., 2025): forms of formal inclusion, partial recognition, the citizenship paradox whereby increased registration is not accompanied by territorial rights protection and basic service provision, and pseudo-integration as a condition in which administrative inclusion occurs simultaneously with substantive exclusion from territory and cultural heritage. Coding was conducted through three cycles, reducing 38 initial codes into four thematic categories. Data validity was ensured through technical and source triangulation by integrating informants' statements, observational findings, and policy documents.

Ethical procedures were implemented through oral informed consent obtained prior to each interview, along with careful consideration in presenting information that could potentially increase risks for the community, in accordance with the principles of Indigenous peoples' protection established in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) (Assembly, 2007).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the 2024 field findings from Tukur-Tukur Hamlet, Dodaga Village, East Wasile District, East Halmahera. The findings are organized according to the three research questions. The analysis draws on the perspectives of the politics of recognition (Taylor, 2021) and differentiated citizenship (Young, 2020), while positioning citizenship ambivalence (Mhurchú, 2019; Sy, 2024) as a manifestation of the paradox that emerges when administrative recognition is not accompanied by the restoration of territorial rights and the protection of living spaces. This analytical framework is particularly relevant because the dynamics of Indigenous recognition in Indonesia often proceed through local and procedural pathways characterized by increasing formal visibility while continuing to produce protection deficits. The analysis positions cultural heritage as the foundation for evaluating citizenship, as the citizenship of the Tobelo Dalam community is rooted in customary spatial arrangements and the Madukuroka institution, which governs communal control over customary forests (BRWA, 2024). Therefore, recognition that does not reach these cultural and territorial foundations operates only at the surface level of citizenship.

The findings reveal an unstable dialectic of recognition, similar to patterns observed in several Indigenous recognition cases in Indonesia. This supports arguments regarding the uncertainty of customary territory recognition resulting from institutional fragmentation and weak mechanisms for remedying rights violations (Karso, 2025). Under an extractivist regime, field findings demonstrate that administrative recognition may occur simultaneously with the shrinking of living spaces and increasing investment pressures. The study indicates that legal and policy preferences favoring the mining sector have the potential to compromise ecological sustainability while extending uncertainty over land access for Indigenous communities (Muhdar et al., 2023). Such uncertainty becomes more pronounced when customary land rights occupy a subordinate position within investment policy frameworks, thereby intensifying existing patterns of land conflict (Rumadan & Salamah, 2023).

Table 1. Dimensions of Formal Inclusion and Substantive Exclusion in the Citizenship of the Tobelo Dalam Indigenous Community

Aspect	Indicators of Formal Inclusion	Evidence of Substantive Exclusion	Impact on citizenship	Consequences for Rights Protection
Permanent settlements	Settlement program and housing provision	Vulnerability of basic services	Citizenship becomes administratively visible	Protection of living spaces is not automatically guaranteed
Civil registration	Increased access to identity cards and family registration documents	Unequal access to services	Formal visibility increases	Substantive rights remain unfulfilled
Elections and local offices	Election participation	Representation does not alter territorial protection	Procedural Inclusion	Collective rights remain fragile
Basic services	Welfare programs	Vulnerable access to clean water and infrastructure	Citizenship remains unsubstantive	The state is present but not protective
Forest living spaces	Restricted on mobility	Shrinking living space	Forest-based livelihoods and rights are weakened	Territorial protection remains
Mining and land-use conversion	Development legitimacy	Continuing threats from expansion	Citizenship paradox becomes stronger	Restoration of territorial rights becomes urgent
Customary territory and cultural heritage	Registration of customary territory covering 27,710.98 hectares	Status remains at the registration stage without formal designation; proposed customary forest area of 19,305.63 hectares has not progressed since 2020	Cultural heritage is not recognized as the basis of rights	Pseudo-integration is reinforced

The table demonstrates that forms of inclusion observable at the administrative level do not automatically correspond with rights restoration and protection. This framework illustrates the causal pathway in the Tobelo Dalam case, showing that the paradox emerges because the state operates selectively: the state is strong in registration but weak in protection. This selectivity is measurable through contrasting policy documents, where 29 mining business permits covering 186,693.21 hectares in East Halmahera were established through legally binding decisions with definitive validity periods, while the community's customary territory remained at the registration stage (BRWA, 2024; Satu Data Maluku Utara, 2025; Sawal, 2025). This pattern is consistent with findings regarding protection deficits in natural resource governance, as reflected in monitoring reports on Indigenous peoples' rights that highlight criminalization and violence associated with investment activities in customary territories (Sinay et al., 2024; IWGIA, 2025).

Formal Inclusion and Forms of Administrative Recognition

The findings demonstrate that formal inclusion among the Tobelo Dalam Indigenous community can be identified through four main channels: the permanent settlement program, population administrative registration, electoral participation, and limited involvement in local public positions. These four channels constitute what can be referred to as administrative recognition. Administrative recognition enhances the visibility of the community within state-defined categories. Such recognition places the community

within standards of decent living conditions framed as indicators of progress and development (Riyanto, 2025).

The settlement program emerged as an integration instrument that directly transformed the community's living conditions, which had previously depended on mobility and close relationships with forest environments. The program introduced standardized housing conditions as a measure of modernity. One resident described the initial process as follows:

"We began adapting and settling in Tukur-Tukur Hamlet because the government paid attention to our situation by opening land for residential purposes and providing housing assistance. At that time, our community still lived in houses made from woka leaves." (TD-01)

This statement illustrates that state presence was recognized through two administratively measurable forms: land opening and housing assistance for permanent settlement, while houses made from woka leaves were positioned as markers of a condition that needed to be transformed. However, another finding indicates that the community's movement away from forest areas did not entirely originate from government intervention. As explained by a senior informant:

"Before 1997, we were no longer living in the forest because we had already moved around Tukur-Tukur Hamlet. More specifically, we lived around the river coastal area until the government opened and provided land and housing, allowing us to settle permanently in Tukur-Tukur Hamlet." (PA-02)

This account is significant because it demonstrates that community mobility had already shifted prior to state intervention. Therefore, the settlement program is more appropriately understood as a formalization of an ongoing process rather than as the beginning of a civilizing transformation introduced by the state.

The settlement process occurred gradually and was not simultaneous for all community members, given the interaction between government settlement policies and internal community dynamics. The settlement program functioned as an entry point for welfare policies introduced by the state through administratively measurable indicators. This transformation directly affected cultural heritage, as permanent settlement shifted the center of social life away from customary spatial arrangements that organized customary forests, agricultural areas, ancestral settlements, and sago forests toward residential units evaluated through administrative criteria (BRWA, 2024). This pattern corresponds with broader recognition dynamics that operate through local procedures and development programs, whereby recognition often progresses unevenly across communities and depends on local configurations and legal fragmentation (Hidayat et al., 2026).

Population administrative registration became an important marker of expanded citizen visibility. Population documents such as Family Cards (KK) and Identity Cards (KTP) facilitated access to specific services and programs while providing formal recognition as registered citizens. Symbolically, these documents transformed the community's position from being perceived as socially peripheral to becoming administratively countable. However, this study demonstrates that registration does not necessarily guarantee protection. Registration may represent a minimal form of recognition: administrative visibility can increase procedurally while remaining weak in terms of rights remediation and protection. Protection deficits in natural resource governance help explain why administrative visibility does not resolve uncertainties surrounding customary territories. Recognition based solely on administrative standards may therefore produce only partial recognition (Tamma & Duile, 2020).

Electoral participation represents a minimal indicator of political inclusion as evidence of formal recognition. The Tobelo Dalam community has participated in several electoral cycles, and the findings indicate involvement in certain local public positions. This inclusion is important as evidence that the community is not entirely excluded from democratic procedures. However, citizens' electoral orientation was primarily directed toward improving living conditions rather than obtaining direct material benefits, as expressed by one informant:

"We chose them not because of money, but because we wanted to see how they could develop our region and our village. We also wanted to prove whether the promises they made could actually be implemented or not, because our hope for developing this village is simply to have a proper bridge and roads that we can use." (AP-04)

This statement demonstrates that electoral participation functions as an instrument for demanding basic infrastructure, meaning that citizens' demands are directed toward service provision rather than the restoration of territorial rights. This shift in focus clarifies why procedural inclusion may occur without addressing customary territorial issues. Nevertheless, electoral participation does not automatically generate substantive protection. This constitutes an electoral paradox, in which procedural dimensions operate without strengthening Indigenous communities' substantive rights. An excessive emphasis on electoral procedures may divert attention from territorial protection, which forms the basis of collective rights (International IDEA, 2024).

The theoretical interpretation of these findings positions administrative recognition as an important initial form of recognition that enables access to service structures, but it remains insufficient for minority groups experiencing structural disadvantages. The conception of citizenship employed in this article understands inclusion through three dimensions: formal registration, fulfillment of substantive rights, and differentiated recognition of cultural heritage as the foundation of collective rights. Therefore, the findings from the four channels of inclusion described above only fulfill the first dimension.

Differentiated citizenship challenges the assumption that equal treatment necessarily produces equality. According to Young, oppressed groups require institutional mechanisms that allow their collective interests to be considered in public decision-making processes (Young, 2020). In the case of the Tobelo Dalam community, such mechanisms are closely related to guarantees of collective rights over customary territories. Administrative recognition, therefore, operates only at the surface level of citizenship without addressing its material foundations, particularly those related to living spaces.

These findings suggest that standards of modernity operate as classificatory mechanisms through which permanent settlement and population administration produce criteria of legitimate citizenship, thereby shaping the community's bargaining position in accessing public services. However, these criteria simultaneously function as normalizing instruments that measure progress through quantifiable indicators without automatically restoring territorial rights that are difficult to administratively capture. This condition demonstrates the need for a corrective politics of recognition—one that does not stop at formal visibility but requires structural transformation in the protection and restoration of rights underlying the community's historical disadvantages.

Partial Recognition and the Citizenship Paradox

Recognition of the Tobelo Dalam community remains partial, as demonstrated by the increase in administrative visibility while basic rights related to clean water and settlement infrastructure remain vulnerable. This vulnerability reflects not only service deficits but also the limitations of administrative recognition, which produces registered citizens without automatically producing protected citizens. This is where the citizenship paradox operates (Mhurchú, 2019). In this study, the citizenship paradox refers to a condition in which formal registration increases while substantive protection of territory and cultural heritage remains delayed.

Partial recognition emerges from a policy implementation logic that positions registration as the primary indicator of success. The permanent settlement program demonstrates state presence in terms of housing provision; however, the findings indicate that settlement does not necessarily correspond with adequate infrastructure quality and service provision. As a result, access to clean water remains vulnerable, and settlement conditions continue to require sustained support (Noe et al., 2025).

This vulnerability was explicitly expressed by a community member:

“Apart from the bridge, we also hope that a water supply system can be built because we experience difficulties in obtaining clean drinking water to fulfill our daily needs.” (TD-03)

This statement demonstrates that, after more than two decades of the settlement program, the most basic need for clean water continues to be expressed as an expectation rather than as a fulfilled right. Consequently, residents who have been administratively registered continue to experience service deficits. This vulnerability confirms that programmatic inclusion does not necessarily equal the fulfillment of basic rights. Social protection policies in Indonesia indicate that existing protection systems still require strengthening to address increasing risks and unequal access to services (Surtiari et al., 2024). The field findings reinforce this argument by demonstrating that, for Indigenous communities, basic

services function as an important indicator of substantive citizenship and determine whether settlement programs genuinely become secure living spaces.

The root of the citizenship paradox identified in this study lies in the tension between formal registration and substantive protection. Formal registration enables the state to recognize, identify, and distribute programs; however, substantive protection requires different institutional commitments, including territorial rights certainty, mechanisms for protection against extractive expansion, and remedies for rights violations. Within Indonesia's natural resource governance, these mechanisms remain weak due to fragmented institutional authority, uneven recognition procedures, and limited remediation mechanisms, thereby sustaining systemic protection deficits (Karso, 2025; St Laksanto Utomo, 2025). Therefore, the citizenship paradox is not merely a procedural anomaly but rather the outcome of a governance structure that systematically separates administration from protection.

Analytically, these findings position the state as a selective actor: strong in administrative practices but weak in protective functions. This selectivity can be traced through asymmetries in policy implementation stages. Mining licensing instruments have proceeded to the stage of issuing legally binding decisions, whereas the 27,710.98-hectare customary territory of the Tobelo Dalam community remains at the registration stage without formal designation through a regional regulation or a regent's decree, while the proposed customary forest area of 19,305.63 hectares has remained at the proposal stage since 2020 (BRWA, 2024; Tanah Kita, 2020). Information submitted to the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination through its early warning procedure on 19 January 2026 also stated that an adequate legislative and procedural framework for Indigenous peoples' recognition had not yet been established in North Maluku Province (Forest Peoples Programme, 2026).

Similar selectivity is evident in spatial planning instruments, where the 2018 spatial conformity recommendation that facilitated the entry of new mining companies was revoked only after community pressure, while the revision of the regency spatial planning framework remained incomplete (JATAM, 2023). This series of documentary evidence demonstrates that state selectivity is not merely a normative assessment but a pattern reflected in differences in the speed and binding authority of various policy instruments.

These findings are consistent with analyses showing that Indigenous recognition in Indonesia often proceeds through local politics and procedural mechanisms that do not necessarily transform state control over land and resources, thereby producing administrative recognition without substantive protection (Kurniawan & Rye, 2025). In the mining legal regime, land conflicts are frequently addressed through formal evidentiary logic that advantages corporations because Indigenous communities often lack legal evidence that conforms to the standards of positive law. Consequently, the protection of collective rights becomes structurally unequal. Population documents do not constitute evidence of territorial ownership and do not automatically restore collective rights (Berenschot & Saraswati, 2024; Peterson et al., 2025).

The theoretical discussion connects these findings with the politics of recognition and differentiated citizenship. The politics of recognition requires recognition that produces corrective action against injustice through protection and restoration, while differentiated citizenship emphasizes that minority groups experiencing structural disadvantages require specific institutional protection mechanisms. Such mechanisms are necessary to ensure that the interests of marginalized groups are considered in public decisions affecting their lives (Taylor, 2021; Young, 2020). In the case of the Tobelo Dalam community, these mechanisms operate across two dimensions: settlement-based basic services and territorial rights. If the second dimension remains unresolved, the first may become an administrative integration project that positions the community as registered citizens while leaving them structurally vulnerable.

The citizenship paradox is also evident within the discourse of procedural democracy, where electoral participation may occur while functioning merely as a procedure without producing territorial protection. International IDEA (2024) demonstrates that electoral designs and practices may emphasize procedural norms while delaying the fulfillment of Indigenous peoples' substantive rights, thereby weakening meaningful political participation. The field findings confirm that procedural participation does not automatically disrupt extractive power relations operating through concessions and licensing arrangements that remain beyond community control.

Shrinking Living Spaces and the Need for Territorial Rights Restoration

The shrinking of forest-based living spaces represents the core of substantive exclusion occurring through land-use conversion and the continued threat of mining expansion. In the context of the Tobelo Dalam community, forests are not merely natural resources but constitute the foundation of identity, livelihoods, and ancestral heritage that shape the community's way of life as a whole (Asteria et al., 2021). This cultural heritage has territorial and institutional dimensions that are empirically documented, including customary spatial divisions comprising customary forests, agricultural areas, settlements, ancestral settlements, and sago forests, as well as the customary institution of Madukuroka that governs communal control over customary forests and establishes sanctions for violations of territorial boundaries (BRWA, 2024). Therefore, the shrinking of living spaces does not merely represent the loss of livelihood resources but also the weakening of customary institutions that constitute the foundation of the community's collective rights. The reduction of living spaces consequently weakens substantive citizenship because forest-based ways of life do not receive adequate protection.

The absence of adequate protection mechanisms emerges as a decisive structural factor. Adequate protection requires certainty over customary territories, binding decision-making mechanisms that ensure community consent becomes a prerequisite for projects affecting their territories, and effective remedies when harm occurs. Studies demonstrate that mining investment policies in Indonesia frequently generate conflicts because customary land rights remain legally weak, making it difficult for communities to claim losses over territories designated as mining areas (Rumadan & Salamah, 2023). The legal and policy preference for the mining sector also has the potential to place other forms of land use under conditions of uncertainty, undermine sustainability, and prolong existing inequalities (Muhdar et al., 2023). Under these circumstances, the shrinking of the Tobelo Dalam community's living spaces should not be understood merely as an ecological event but rather as a direct consequence of prevailing policy and licensing structures.

The implication of this phenomenon is that administrative recognition may become a form of pseudo-integration when territorial rights restoration does not occur. In this article, pseudo-integration is defined as a condition in which the state incorporates Indigenous communities into systems of registration and indicators of modernity without restoring territorial rights and without recognizing cultural heritage as the foundation of citizenship, thereby producing inclusion simultaneously with substantive exclusion. Pseudo-integration places communities within systems of registration and modernity indicators without transforming their vulnerable position regarding the loss of living spaces, while simultaneously shifting policy attention away from collective rights issues. The Dodaga case demonstrates all three elements of this definition simultaneously: population registration has progressed, customary territory remains at the registration stage, and customary institutions have not obtained legal status as holders of collective rights (BRWA, 2024; Tanah Kita, 2020).

These findings are consistent with arguments that Indigenous recognition in Indonesia remains uneven and frequently depends on fragmented legal configurations, whereby formal recognition at the national level remains limited in local implementation and procedural practices that do not necessarily restore rights (Hidayat et al., 2026). Socio-legal studies further demonstrate that courts in mining-related land conflicts tend to rely on formal evidence, thereby maintaining inequality and marginalizing collective rights claims (Arizona & Illiyina, 2024). This condition strengthens the argument that protection mechanisms must be designed to address structural injustice rather than merely expand administrative registration.

The conceptual recommendations derived from these findings require a reorientation of development that integrates administration and protection through three core agendas.

First, the restoration of territorial rights requires the recognition of customary territories and resources through legally binding certainty, conflict resolution mechanisms that do not rely solely on formal evidentiary standards, and institutional bridges between collective rights frameworks and positive law. In the context of the Tobelo Dalam community in Tukur-Tukur, this agenda requires advancing the registered status of customary territory toward formal designation through a regional regulation or regent's decree as a prerequisite for customary forest recognition (BRWA, 2024). Karso (2025) emphasizes the need for stronger integration of legal pluralism so that customary territory recognition

does not become fragmented across sectoral procedures that operate inconsistently. This also requires limiting forms of state control that perpetuate uncertainty over land restitution. Local processes that produce administrative recognition without substantive protection must be corrected through binding policy designs (Tamma & Duile, 2020).

Second, protection mechanisms against extractive expansion require impact assessments based on the safety of living spaces, state obligations to prevent the dispossession of customary territories through concessions, and transparency and accountability in licensing governance. Studies of extractive politics demonstrate that policies broadly opening investment opportunities may compromise Indigenous peoples' rights and environmental sustainability (Khurun'in, 2026). Furthermore, policy preferences favoring mining directly threaten sustainability when mining activities are prioritized over alternative land uses (Muhdar et al., 2023). These findings provide a basis for limiting concessions in territories that function as essential living spaces for Indigenous communities.

Third, the fulfillment of settlement-based basic services must be understood as an integral component of substantive citizenship. Permanent settlement, which is often used as an indicator of integration, must be accompanied by guarantees of clean water and basic infrastructure; otherwise, settlement merely transfers vulnerability to a new location. Residents' expectations regarding bridges, roads, and adequate drinking water demonstrate that these demands are not additional requests but rather prerequisites for substantive citizenship. Social protection policies in Indonesia indicate the need to strengthen systems capable of adapting to increasing risks and persistent inequalities in access (Surtiari et al., 2024). In the case of the Tobelo Dalam community, this means that basic service policies must neither disconnect communities from their ecological foundations nor function as compensation for territorial loss.

Implications for Citizenship Education

These findings have direct implications for citizenship education, as state-sanctioned conceptions of citizenship influence whether Indigenous peoples' collective rights are recognized as integral components of citizenship or reduced to administrative compliance. As long as citizenship education positions population documents and electoral participation as the primary indicators of a good citizen, curricula risk reproducing the logic of pseudo-integration identified in the Tobelo Dalam case. The informant's statement that electoral choices were directed toward evaluating development promises (TD-03) demonstrates an active form of civic awareness; however, this awareness has not yet been connected to the language of collective rights over customary territories. Differentiated citizenship requires citizenship education materials that incorporate cultural heritage, customary territories, and collective rights as substantive components rather than merely complementary cultural content (Young, 2020; Taylor, 2021).

Citizenship education should therefore function as a corrective space by developing an understanding that equality among citizens is not always achieved through uniform treatment and that groups experiencing structural disadvantages require specific protection mechanisms. This orientation connects empirical findings with educational practice, ensuring that corrective recognition receives support not only at the policy level but also through the formation of civic consciousness (Isin, 2012; Roy & Neveu, 2023).

This discussion reinforces that a corrective politics of recognition and differentiated citizenship provide an analytical foundation for comprehensively assessing substantive citizenship. Administrative recognition must evolve into protective recognition, meaning the simultaneous restoration of collective rights and protection of living spaces. From the perspective of differentiated citizenship (Taylor, 2021; Young, 2020), specific mechanisms are required for marginalized groups so that public decision-making does not eliminate their collective interests. In the case of the Tobelo Dalam community, this need is clearly demonstrated through issues concerning customary territories, natural resources, and protection from extractivism, which directly threaten the community's living spaces.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study lead to three main conclusions. First, the formal inclusion of the Tobelo Dalam Indigenous community is manifested through the permanent settlement program, population

administrative registration, electoral participation, and limited involvement in local public positions. Second, such recognition remains partial because vulnerabilities in settlement-based basic services, including access to clean water and infrastructure, persist without adequate resolution. Third, the shrinking of forest-based living spaces resulting from land-use conversion and the continued threat of mining expansion have proceeded without sufficient protection mechanisms. This condition generates a citizenship paradox, characterized by a contradiction between formal registration and substantive exclusion, in which the state functions administratively but remains ineffective in its protective role. These three conclusions converge in a condition conceptualized as pseudo-integration, namely administrative inclusion that occurs without the restoration of territorial rights and without recognition of cultural heritage as the foundation of citizenship, as demonstrated by the customary territory covering 27,710.98 hectares that remains at the registration stage (BRWA, 2024).

Based on these findings, a reorientation of development policies is required to ensure that administrative recognition is integrated with the restoration of Indigenous peoples' territorial rights, mechanisms of protection against extractive expansion, and the fulfillment of basic services as components of substantive citizenship. This reorientation should be accompanied by the strengthening of citizenship education that positions Indigenous cultural heritage and collective rights as substantive elements of citizenship education, thereby enabling policy correction to gain support through the formation of civic awareness. The theoretical foundations of the politics of recognition and differentiated citizenship emphasize that corrective recognition must address structural injustice and restore the material foundations of living spaces rather than merely extending administrative registration. This study is limited to a single community in Tukur-Tukur Hamlet. Therefore, further research involving other Tobelo Dalam communities across Halmahera is necessary to examine the extent to which the pattern of pseudo-integration applies across different locations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Acknowledgements are extended to the Tobelo Dalam Indigenous community in Tukur-Tukur Hamlet for their willingness to share experiences and knowledge; to hamlet officials and Dodaga Village authorities for their assistance in facilitating access to data and documentation; and to all parties who provided academic input during the preparation of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. K., Mohammed, R. A., Nashwan, A. J., Ibrahim, R. H., Abdalla, A. Q., Ameen, B. M. M., & Khahir, R. M. (2025). Using thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health*, 6, 100198.
- Alting, H., Sinay, S. B., Alwan, S., & Rumkel, N. (2025). *Protecting of the O'hongawa Manyawa Remote Indigenous*. 214.
- Arizona, Y., & Illiyina, U. (2024). The Constitutional Court and forest tenure conflicts in Indonesia. *Constitutional Review*, 10(1), 103–135.
- Assembly, U. G. (2007). United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. *Un Wash*, 12, 1–18.
- Asteria, D., Brotosusilo, A., Soedrajad, M., & Nugraha, F. (2021). *Reinventarization of living procedures, local knowledge, and wisdom to environment (Study case on Tobelo Tribe-Halmahera)*. 716(1), 012050.
- Berenschot, W., & Saraswati, N. (2024). Discourses of land conflicts in Indonesia. *Development and Change*, 55(6), 1182–1205.
- BRWA. (2024). *O Hongana Manyawa O Dodaga [Profil wilayah adat]*. Badan Registrasi Wilayah Adat. <https://brwa.or.id/wa/view/c0NJbGRSVGJDSXM>
- Dunk-West, P., & Saxton, K. (2024). *Qualitative Social Research: Critical Methods for Social Change*. Routledge.

- Fahmi, C., Stoll, P.-T., Shabarullah, S., Rahman, M., & Syukri, S. (2024). The State's Business Upon Indigenous Land in Indonesia: A Legacy from Dutch Colonial Regime to Modern Indonesian State. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, 8(3), 1566–1596.
- Forest Peoples Programme. (2026). *UN Committee on Racial Discrimination (CERD) Raises Concerns Over Nickel Mining Threats to the O'Hongana Manyawa in Voluntary Isolation*. <https://www.forestpeoples.org/publications-resources/news/article/un-committee-on-racial-discrimination-cerd-raises-concerns-over-nickel-mining-threats-to-the-ohongana-manyawa-in-voluntary-isolation-1-1/>
- Halomoan, M. R., Dharmawan, A. H., & Sunito, S. (2025). Social Forestry as Solution to Agrarian Conflicts? A Case Study between Oil Palm Smallholders and Industrial Plantations in Jambi, Indonesia. *Forest and Society*, 9(2), 449–470.
- Hidayat, A. R., Hospes, O., & Termeer, C. (2026). Uneven recognition: A comparative study of indigenous communities' struggle for securing customary land rights in Indonesia. *Land Use Policy*, 167, 108061.
- International IDEA. (2024). *Electoral paradoxes: Balancing procedural norms and Indigenous rights in Indonesia*. <https://www.idea.int/news/electoral-paradoxes-balancing-procedural-norms-and-indigenous-rights-indonesia>
- Isin, E. F. (2012). Citizenship after orientalism: An unfinished project. *Citizenship Studies*, 16(5–6), 563–572.
- IWGIA. (2025). *Indigenous peoples in Indonesia*. <https://iwgia.org/en/indonesia/5660-iw-2025-indonesia.html>
- JATAM. (2023). *Utak-atik RTRW demi Investasi Tambang: Nasib Orang Halmahera Timur Terancam*. <https://jatam.org/id/lengkap/utak-atik-rtrw-demi-investasi-tambang-nasib-orang-halmahera-timur-terancam>
- Karso, A. J. (2025). Natural resources governance and the vulnerability of indigenous communities in Indonesia. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 7, 1601480.
- Kurniawan, N. I., & Rye, S. A. (2025). The relational state and local struggles in the mapping of land in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 52(2), 343–365.
- Muhdar, M., Simarmata, R., & Nasir, M. (2023). Legal policy preference for coal mining over other land use alternatives jeopardizes sustainability in Indonesia. *Journal of Land Use Science*, 18(1), 395–408.
- Noe, W., Bunta, A. F., Abbas, I., Zahra, A. F., Yunus, R., & Madiang, D. A. R. A. (2025). Social transformation of indigenous communities in forming citizenship identity: Case study of the Tobelo Dalam tribe in Tukur-Tukur hamlet, Dodaga village, East Halmahera. *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, 22(2), 373–384.
- Peterson, D., Bedner, A., & Berenschot, W. (2025). The perils of legal formalism: Litigating land conflicts in Indonesia. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 55(3), 430–451.
- Riyanto, G. (2025). Indigeneity as a sphere of differences: State enclosure and counter-enclosure of rural spaces in Indonesia. *Anthropological Theory*, 25(4), 440–464.
- Roy, M., & Neveu, C. (2023). A philosophy of the theory of “acts of citizenship” woven into the fabric of a political anthropology of citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 27(3), 385–405.
- Rumadan, I., & Salamah, U. (2023). *Legal Status of Indigenous Land Rights in Indonesia's Mining Investment Policy*. 900–911.
- Satu Data Maluku Utara. (2025). *Daftar IUP logam dan batuan di Kabupaten Halmahera Timur [Dataset]*. Satu Data Maluku Utara. <https://satudata.malutprov.go.id/dataset/document/71/print>
- Sawal, R. (2025). *Jejak Perebutan Nikel dan Kriminalisasi Warga di Halmahera Timur*. <https://mongabay.co.id/2025/11/28/jejak-perebutan-nikel-dan-kriminalisasi-warga-di-halmahera-timur/>

- Sinay, S. B., Alting, H., & Alwan, S. (2024). Co-Existence Aand Protection Of The O'Hongana Manyawa Indigenises People In The Nickel Mining Area. *Pena Justisia: Media Komunikasi Dan Kajian Hukum*, 23(3), 1770–1777.
- St Laksanto Utomo, L. N. (2025). *Reconciling Indigenous Rights and Investment Agendas: Land Governance Challenges Under Indonesia's Cipta Kerja Omnibus Law in Natural Resource Exploitation*.
- Surtiari, G. A. K., Wannewitz, M., Prasetyoputra, P., Hadumaon Siagian, T., & Garschagen, M. (2024). Indonesia's social protection system: The relevance of informal social protection to strengthen adaptation to climate change. *Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences*, 21(1), 2375995.
- Survival International. (2024). *Driven to the edge: Nickel mining and the threat to the uncontacted Hongana Manyawa*. <https://assets.survivalinternational.org/documents/2684/original-3c8dda9a3227299a6d33458706fe76e6.pdf>
- Sy, L. A. (2024). Ambivalent Citizenship in Winnemucca and Twain: Exclusion after the Fourteenth Amendment. *Arizona Quarterly: A Journal of American Literature, Culture, and Theory*, 80(4), 31–53.
- Tamma, S., & Duile, T. (2020). Indigeneity and the state in Indonesia: The local turn in the dialectic of recognition. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 39(2), 270–289.
- Tanah Kita. (2020). *Wilayah kelola hutan adat O Hongana Manyawa O Dodaga, Kabupaten Halmahera Timur*. https://www.tanahkita.id/data/wilayah_kelola/detil/NEk1VmxVFZJM0k
- Taylor, C. (2021). The politics of recognition. In *Campus wars* (pp. 249–263). Routledge.
- Young, I. M. (2020). Justice and the Politics of Difference. In *The new social theory reader* (pp. 261–269). Routledge.