

## THE THE KUTAI NATIONAL PARK: MANAGEMENT POLICY IN ANTHROPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

**Pawennari Hijjang, Ahmad Ismail and Hardiyanti Muni**

*Hasanuddin University, Indonesia*

**Simon Abdi K. Frank and Usman Idris**

*Cendrawasih University, Indonesia*

**Henny Marya Pratiknjo**

*Sam Ratulangi University, Indonesia*

**Syahlan Mattiro and Yuli Apriati**

*Lambung Mangkurat University, Indonesia*

**Dahniar Th Musa**

*Tanjungpura University, Indonesia*

**Abd. Salam Harianto**

*Polewali Islamic Religion Institute, Indonesia*

Conflicts of interest relating to the forest sector show that forests are not physical media, but also social, cultural, economic and political media. In this case, forests can be the basis for explaining the social, cultural, economic and political phenomena that exist in the “National Park”. Referring to the reasons above, this article will explain how the Kutai National Park is discussed with a different side and how the implications of this discussion are about the appearance of conflicts of interest and the changing meaning of Kutai National Park. The type of research used is a qualitative descriptive type with an ethnographic approach design. Data collection techniques used were interviews and observations. The analysis model is carried out interactively, which includes: data reduction, data exposure, and conclusions, through description and verification. The results show that the struggle for access to forest and land resources in Kutai National Park is the main motive that triggers social conflict and interests, both political interests or economic interests framed by one policy. This conflict occurs among people living in and around Kutai National Park on one side and the Kutai National Park itself on the other. Therefore, this conflict has implications for the emergence of resources through land tenure and

management within the Kutai National Park area as a part of the battle effort which is automatically considered as a colonialism within Kutai National Park.

**Keywords:** Forest management, Kutai, National park, Anthropology.

## Introduction

In recent years, environmental issues (especially the forestry sector) have confiscated most environmentalists, forestry practitioners, mass media, and social scientists including anthropologists. This happens because the quality of forest resources experiences crises nationally and globally due to human actions and behavior. On the other hand, this issue is raised because of the increasing number of social conflicts due to conflicts of interest over access to forest resources, both ecological and economic interests, especially political interests.

The forestry sector is the focus of universal attention, besides being a source of income for the state treasury (state foreign exchange) (Wahyuni, 2014), it is also a place where most local communities depend (people often call it indigenous people) which are not only spread in Indonesia, but also in several countries in the world. In addition, it is also a breeding ground for protected species of animals and plants (Hijjang, 2014). Due to the crisis of forest resources, the ecological, economic and socio-cultural sectors are also on the verge of crisis. In addition to the country's declining cash inflows, the culture of local communities is threatened with extinction of protected species of animals and plants.

For anthropologists, these cases are common because of environmental crises and social conflicts surrounding forest resources can be found everywhere (Hijjannng, 2014). For example on Yamdena Island, Tanimbar Islands around 1992-1993, in Lampung Way Abar around 1991, in Sungapa Village, Samosir Island from 1987 and peaked in 1993 until now, a conflict between residents of Dusun Bengkulu village and local people with Hall of Lore Lindu National Park in 1997/1998 (Laban, 1999) conflict between the Moi Tribe in Irian Jaya and PT. Intipura Timber CO as a concession holder in 1992 (Soetrisno, 1995) and several other conflicts that occurred in conservation areas or protected forests, including in Kutai East Kalimantan National Park (Lych & Harwells, 2002).

The issue of Kutai National Park (TNK or *Taman Nasional Kutai*), in recent years, has increasingly been discussed and has become a separate debate (Efendi, et.al, 2018). This is not only due to the physical condition of TNK's forests that have experienced a crisis, but also due to the emergence of various social conflicts or conflicts of interest within the region. A further consequence of the symptoms of the emergence of the conflict (Pulungan, 2014), TNK is not merely a debate about forest resources, but rather a political difference.

## Research Methods

The type of research used in this study is qualitative descriptive with an ethnographic approach design. In this study, we raised the issue of managing Kutai National Park from the perspective of anthropology of policy. Informants in this study come from several categories, such as the governments, private managers and local communities so that we can obtain a deep and holistic description of the management of Kutai National Park in a sustainable manner. In addition, the data collection techniques used were interviews and observations. Model analysis is carried out interactively, which includes: data reduction, data exposure, and conclusions, through description and verification.

## Literature Review

Anthropological studies of policy have been going on since the 1940s in Northern Ireland, and their development took place in the 1980s (Donnan & McFarlane, 1997). In contrast, in the United States, it

started around the 1930s and 1940s. The orientation of the study is not only aimed at industrial management and labor, but also to development policy makers, communities around the industry and environmental problems produced by industry. A few years later, anthropological research concepts and techniques were developed through education with the aim of analyzing the industrial structures, organizations, relations, processes, consequences, and policy implications (Holzberg & Giovannini, 1981). The same is stated by Hoben (1982), that anthropological involvement in public policy began in the 1940s, although it was not fully involved. Entering the 1970s the full involvement of anthropologists in policy studies has begun to appear, especially in the development sector and in the decision-making process.

The following writings show the development of the policy study in question, from appreciating the perspective of science, including anthropology. A number of names mentioned by Barlett (1980), for example the study of “*Government policy and political history*” as a component for understanding coffee production in Puerto Rico by Wolf (1956), “*The use of forced agricultural policy implementation*” in Tanzania by McHenry (1973), and “*Effects of agricultural policy by the government on the productivity of agricultural cooperation*” in Romania by Argyres (1978). Likewise Hinshaw (Annual Review of Anthropology 1980, Vol. 9) also mentions several names, including Mead (1979) looking how the anthropologists contributed in national policy in the United States during and after World War II, Wolcott, et al. (1979) saw how general education administration was approached anthropologically, Sanday (1976) analyzed the influence of educational policy formulations on values in America. Other writings try to explain how the relationship between anthropology and policy, applied or related to development by Hinshaw (1980) and Hoben (1982), both of which highlight the anthropological relationship with policy issues or how anthropologists have a considerable role in the development process. Good development in the organizational sector, political decision making, bureaucracy and administrative problems. Holzberg & Giovannini (1981) further highlights how the role of anthropology in economic sector development and by Chambers (1985) further highlights how the role of anthropology in the development of various sectors of people’s lives, whether nutrition, agriculture, human resource development, or rural community development.

## Discussion

### The Kutai National Park

Geographically, the area of Kutai National Park and its surroundings are between the equator 1160 58’48 “1170 35’29” East Longitude and 00 7’57 “- 00 33 ‘53” North Latitude with a total area of 198,604 ha or long stretches from the coast ( Makassar strait) to land (to the east) ± 65 Km and width of ± 40 Km. Distance from the capital city of East Kalimantan Province (Samarinda) 25 km south of Sangatta City (the capital of East Kutai Regency). Physiographically, the surface of the land is mild to heavy wavy and in the west and north it is hilly to mountainous with an altitude of 0-400 meters above sea level. While the average annual rainfall is 1,997 mm / year to 2,222 mm / year. The more west the rainfall the higher the height of the region follows (Arifin, 2003: 21).

The layout of Kutai National Park based on the planned development policy of the East Kalimantan region is bordered by 3 (three) integrated development areas (*Wilayah Pembangunan Terpadu* or WPT) and seven WPT of Kutai District (before the expansion in 1999), including: (1) Tenggarong integrated development area (WPT) and surrounding areas, including those bordering KNP, in the west are Muara Kaman District and Muara Bengkal District; (2) Bontang integrated development area (WPT), Muara Badak and its surroundings, where some areas of KNP Maşuk are in the Bontang Kotib area which is to the south of TNK; (3) Sangkulirang, Muara Wahau and the surrounding integrated development area (WPT), including Sanggatta District (now the capital of East Kutai District which was expanded from Kutai District in 1999) to the North of Kutai National Park (Arifin, 2003).

Based on the economic development policies of the East Kalimantan province, the Kutai National Park area is flanked by East Kutai Regency and Bontang Municipality which are incessantly conducting development in various sectors and also surrounded by eight large companies (forming Mitra TNK organizations in 1995 ) engaged in various sectors, including: (1) PT. Kaltim Prima Coal; (2) PT. Rhinoceros NGL Co; (3) PT. Indomico Mandiri; (4) HTI Surya Hutani Raya; (5) Pertamina Sangatta; (6) PT. Kiani Lestari; (7) PT. Pupuk Kaltim; (8) PT, Porodisa and several small companies.

In addition to the existence of several companies in question, there is also a shaft road Bontang-Sangatta (trans Kalimantan road) along the  $\pm$  65 Km which welds two areas of Kutai National Park. With geographical conditions like this, directly or not, contribute to the increasing flow of mobility of people and live within the Kutai National Park area, especially with the construction of the electricity network and the paving of the Bontang-Sangatta axis. It is often used as an excuse for residents living in and around the Kutai National Park area, especially residents of Teluk Pandan Village to build houses and open plantation land along the road. Moreover, it is economically more profitable. If they open up plantations and settlements along the road, they can easily sell plantation products to Bontang Market, or easily get transportation if they want to go to Samarinda, Bontang or Sangatta. Likewise, the rampant opening of land lots along the road, because the economic value of the land is higher when road and lighting facilities have been built.

### **Land Tenure Issues**

Forest fires in the TNK area since 1997/1998 have been widely feared by the BTNK and various environmentalists (environmental NGOs) from local, national and international. This is due to the fact that forest fires in the TNK area consumed a large part of the forest inside, and gave rise to various land speculators called colonization<sup>1</sup> of the area which incidentally belonged to the residents of Teluk Pandan Village, which were mostly Bugis-Makassar tribes and claimed that their villages were not TNK, on the contrary TNK is included in the village territory.

Therefore, they feel entitled to build a house, garden and farm. Even the former fire area along the Bontang-Sangatta axis road was used as plot land. Residents of Teluk Pandan village and other residents of three villages, their legal status became increasingly clear when their village was recognized as the definitive village by the central government and the East Kutai District Government. In addition, the TNK area is not regulated by customary law, so the resolution of problems within it is not based on customary law, but formal law. This is what they made an excuse to remain in their respective villages. The other reasons are: Firstly, long before it was confirmed as Kutai National Park, the people who are now living have been settled for generations in the area; Secondly, the proposal of the East Kutai Government to the Governor and the Ministry of Forestry to release around 15,000 ha of the TNK area (including four definitive villages) to be used as urban development areas and the agribusiness sector, where Teluk Pandan Village is the main village (Arifin, 2003).

Therefore, since post-forest fires within the TNK area, the existence of TNK has been discussed again and again through the mass media and in every seminar or workshop with an environmental theme. Fires and damage to forests and protected animals, looting, encroachment, land clearing within the TNK area, protests from the various NGOs on the destruction of the TNK area, destruction of TNK facilities and infrastructure by residents, law enforcement to resolve conflicts of interest in TNK are the main headlines and news in newspapers. Kaltim Post, on 19<sup>th</sup>, 28<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> of January 2000 reported news about the threat of an International NGO, namely the European Wildlife Press Conservation Coalition (EWPC) based in the Netherlands to boycott Kaltim (coal, oil and gas, fertilizer and wood) if the

---

<sup>1</sup> The term colonization that I am referring to here is not similar to Dutch colonization of Indonesia in the colonial era, but I mean that an area which is considered as no-man's land is claimed as property rights. This symptom is the issue / motive for the birth of conflicts of interest in KNP between the people (Bugis-Makassar ethnic as an actor of colonization) who live in and around this area with the BTNK and several community observers (local, national and international NGOs).

government in the regions did not immediately take steps to save TNK forests from illegal encroachment activities.

Both the NGO security and protest operations were a form of resistance to the East Kutai regional government and the people living inside the KNP, especially the Teluk Pandan Village for the colonization of parts of the area. This BTNK resistance effort was carried out as a form of justification for the claim that KNP is an area that must be protected from human activities. Therefore, they expect that activities in the KNP area that are considered illegal and threaten the sustainability of biodiversity (eg stealing, occupying, looting and capturing land) must be intercepted if necessary (Arifin, 2003).

The presence of police operations and the plan to boycott one of the foreign NGOs was a response to the existence of the community and the destruction of forests in the KNP area following the 1997/1998 forest fires. Although there were threats from various parties, including NGOs and security forces (rangers, soldiers and police), none of this affected their activities in KNP. Even the people who live in the KNP area (especially in Teluk Pandan Village) actually build semi-permanent and permanent houses, open new gardens, and plot land.

### Ecological Issues

In general, the debate about biodiversity protection is inseparable from the growing concern of the world community about the increasing environmental crisis that began to bloom around the 1960s-1970s due to over-exploitation. Concerns then become a momentum over certain public and political interests (environmental politics) so that the birth of environmental love movements, global warning of the loss of biodiversity, until the emergence of the warning "Earth Day" in 1970 (Boulding, 1966 Barry wrote 1999: 27). The same thing was the holding of an international conference on human environment held in Stockholm Sweden in 1982, and the holding of a high-level conference on environment and development (Earth-Summit) in the Rio de Janeiro Brazil in 1992 (see Warren, 1992; Rompas, 31 October 2002, p. 4-5) and 1992 in Nairobi Kenya held an international biodiversity conservation conference (Warren, 1992). On this basis also, Bappenas as one of the highly competent institutions that make national development policies also made a kind of action plan related to biodiversity protection in Indonesia in 1993, namely the Biodiversity Action Plan Indonesia.

Protection of various animals and plants from extinction is one of the main objectives of the establishment of national parks throughout the world, including Kutai National Park (TNK) which was formed based on ratification with the United Nations Biodiversity Convention on biodiversity protection<sup>2</sup>, in addition to agreements with Ramsar Convention and CITES. That is why all national parks, including Kutai National Park, are protected from various human activities that allow disruption of protected ecosystems. The intended ecosystem is the original ecosystem, especially the protected flora and fauna.

This area is a restricted area, especially in certain eras (National Park Core Zone). As stipulated in the Basic Forestry Law (UUPK) No. 5 of 1967 Article 33, namely: 1) Every person is prohibited from carrying out activities which can result in changes to the integrity of the National Park Core Zone; 2) Changes to the National Zone of the National Park as referred to in paragraph 1, covering reducing the function and extent of the National Zone of the National Park, and adding other types of plants and animals that are not original; 3) Everyone is prohibited from carrying out activities that are not in accordance with the functions of the utilization zone and other zones of the national park (*Taman Nasional* or TN), the forest park (*Taman Hutan Raya* or THR) and the natural tourism park (*Taman Wisata Alam* or THA). We can also see this rule in the UPPK No. 41 of 1999.

---

<sup>2</sup> This agreement was made on October 12, 1982 during the III National Park Congress in Bali. Alsan is specifically made into a National Park because this area is the habitat of several protected species, namely the Orang Utan (*Pongo pygmaeus*) Banteng (*Bos Javanicus*), and Rhinoceros (*Diccerorhinus* SP.) And other animals, including hornbills. The result of this agreement was poured into Decree of the Minister of Agriculture No. 736 / Minister of Agriculture / X / 1982

Kutai National Park is one of nature conservation areas<sup>3</sup>. It has certain characteristics that are considered to have native ecosystems<sup>4</sup>. Specific features intended are this area has more than 500 species of trees, both a type of Ulin wood (*Eusideroxylon*), and a species of Dipterocarp tree (Keruing wood family tree species -*diptericarpus cornutus*- and meranti (*shorea sp.*).

Whereas according to Arifin (2003: 54) there are 73 types of Borneo mammals, some of which are found in this region. Primate species, for example, can be found in eleven species in KNP from 13 species in the Borneo archipelago. Another peculiarity is that 3% of poultry species can be found in TNK from all poultry species in the world and 80% from all poultry in Borneo. In particular, hornbills (*Buceros rhinoceros*), which are proud symbols and symbols of the Dayak ethnic group, especially Dayak Ethnic in East Kalimantan, seven of these eight species in Borneo can be found in TNK. Of the number of mammal and poultry species, there are 12 mammals and 17 birds which are protected because they are almost extinct, for example the Utan (*Pongo pygmaeus*). The protection of these endangered species is strengthened by the issuance of Minister of Forestry Decree No. 301 / Kpts-11/1991.

Related to the condition of TNK since the 1997/1998 forest fires have been getting worse, mainly due to fires and encroachment<sup>5</sup> (to be used as gardens, settlements and land lots), it is reasonable if various parties, from the NGO environment observer, the BTNK and from the local government through various means, concerned about the situation are trying to voice the issue of protecting the TNK area from destroyers and encroachers..

For instance, Kompas (April 13, 1998, p. 12), lowered the news with the title *Orang Utan Victims of East Kalimantan Forest Fires*. The title implies that the existence of “*Utan people*” attracted special attention compared to the others, because “orang utans” became one of the protected animals. This phenomenon can be interpreted that the existence of orangutans in forest areas, especially the TNK area is very important. It may even be more important than humans who live in the area. So important is its existence that the treatment is the same as humans who are treated when sick. Termi, Trie and Billy, are three of the many orangutans who have been personified as human beings who have the right to live together with their colleagues in the TNK area with an area of 198,604 ha. Therefore, in order to preserve the TNK area, especially the preservation of protected animals, rehabilitation and prevention of various human activities must be carried out which are considered threatening their existence. The intended rehabilitation action is besides planting plant tree species which are staple food for orangutans, also carried out the transfer of orangutans to areas that are free from fires within the TNK area.

## Conclusion

The debate about the management of TNK is a negotiation process on the meaning and conception of TNK. More accurately referred to as a process of negotiating power over the access of forest resources in the TNK area. This debate arose and took place through areas of conflict originating from various conflict motives. From the analysis of the TNK debate, there are two main issues discussed, namely the issue of land tenure and the issue of ecology (protection of biodiversity). These two big issues are packaged in the TNK management policy.

A further implication of the debate, gave birth to two patterns of social relations related to efforts to access forest resources in TNK. The two patterns of social relations intended are the emergence of conflicts of interest and coalitions. The ongoing conflict of interest and coalition as a debate is a process leading to the changing meaning of TNK. On the one hand, the community and the East Kutai Regional Government are trying to establish power over TNK and on the other hand it is a process of silencing

<sup>3</sup> This classification is clearly stated in UU No. 5 of 1990 concerning Conservation of Natural Resources and Ecosystems article 1 point 13 and 14, things: 5 and Chapter VII article 29 things: 16.

<sup>4</sup> Original in the definition of *dişini* is that the area is still intact (has not been burned), and there has been no human intervention or animal plants in it are local animals and plants, not from other areas / forests.

<sup>5</sup> Fires in KNP damaged forests around 71,099 ha (37%), looting damaged 5,858 ha of forests. With wood cut about 84,000 cubic meters. This means that the state loses as much as Rp. 94 billion. Kompas July 19, 1999.

(delegitimizing deconstruction) on the function and existence of TNK which has been established by the BTNK.

If formerly TNK was an area claimed to be an area free of activities or protected areas for protected animals and plants, it now became a residential, plantation, agricultural and plot area, and became an “enclave” area. This means that TNK is used as a tool by certain groups to maintain and establish power, namely economic and political power.

## References

1. Arifin, Muhammad. 2003. *Wacana Politik di Taman Nasional Kutai (Perspektif Antropologi Kebijakan)*. Dissertation, Postgraduate Program Gajah Mada University, Yogyakarta.
2. Astiti, N. K. A. (2018). Sumber Daya Arkeologi Kutai Kartanegara: Keragaman Budaya sebagai Identitas Budaya dan Daya Tarik Wisata (Archaeological Resources Of Kutai Kartanegara: Cultural Diversity as Cultural Identity and a Tourist Attraction). *Naditira Widya*, 12(1), 71. doi:10.24832/nw.v12i1.254
3. Barlett, Peggy M. 1980. Adaptive Strategies in Peasant Agricultural Production. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 9 : 545-573.
4. Barber, Victor et. al. 1. 1999. *Menyelamatkan Sisa Hutan di Indonesia dan Amerika Serikat*. Jakarta:YOI.
5. Barry, John 1999. *Environment and Social Theory. Routledge Introduction to Environment*. London & New York. Routledge.
6. Chambers, Erve. 1985. *Applied Anthropology. A Practical Guide*. USA : Waveland Press.
7. Efendi, H., Sardjono, M. A., & Matius, P. (2018). Strategi Adaptasi Masyarakat Kutai Menghadapi Perkembangan Pembangunan Ekonomi Berbasis SDA (Studi Kasus: Wilayah Kedang Ipil, Kutai Kartanegara, Kalimantan Timur). *Jurnal Penelitian Ekosistem Dipterokarpa*, 4(2), 95–108. doi:10.20886/jped.2018.4.2.95-108
8. Ministry of Forestry. 1990 . *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No. 5 Tahun 1990 tentang Konservasi Sumberdaya Alam Hayati dan Ekosistemnya*. Jakarta :Dephut.
9. Ministry of Forestry. 1999. *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No. 41 Tahun 1999 tentang Kehutanan*. Jakarta : Departemen Kehutanan.
10. Donnan, Hasting & Graham McFarlane. 1997. Anthropology & Policy Research. The View from Nothern Ireland dalam Cris Shore & Susan Wright (ed). *Anthropology of Policy, Critical Perspectives on Governance & Power*. London : Routledge. hal. 261-281.
11. Hijang, P. (2014). Pasang dan Kepemimpinan Ammatoa: Memahami Kembali Sistem Kepemimpinan Tradisional Masyarakat Adat dalam Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Hutan di Kajang Sulawesi Selatan. *Antropologi Indonesia*, 29(3). doi:10.7454/ai.v29i3.3545
12. Hinshaw, Robert L. 1980. Anthropology. Administration & Public Policy. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 9:497-522.
13. Hoben, Allan. 1982. *Anthropologists & Development*. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 11:349-375.
14. Holzberg, Carol S & Maureen J. Giovannini. 1981. Anthropology & Industry : Reappraisal & New Directions. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 10:317-360.
15. Ismail, A., Munsu, H., & Hans, A. (2019). Online Social Movement: Adopsi Teknologi Informasi dalam Melakukan Gerakan Sosial di Indonesia. *ETNOSIA : Jurnal Etnografi Indonesia*, 4(1), 91. doi:10.31947/etnosia.v4i1.5039
16. Jhamtani, Hira (Penerjemah). 1993. *Menuju Kepunahan Keragaman Dunia dan Umat Manusia*. Jakarta: Konhalindo.
17. J. Linch, Owen & Emily Harwell. 2002. *Whose Natural Resources ? Whose Common Good ? Toward a New Paradigm of Environmental Justice and the National Interest in Indonesia*. Jakarta : ELSAM in Collaboration by CIEL, HuMa, ICEL and ICRAF.
18. Kompas, 13 April 1998 : *Orang Utan Korban Kebakaran Hutan di Kaltim*
19. Kompas, 19 Juli 1999 : *Taman Nasional Kutai Memprihatinkan*
20. Kaltim Post, 19 Januari 2000 : *LSM Internasional Ancam Boikot Hasil Bumi Kaltim*

21. Kaltim Post, 28 Januari 2000 : *Kekayaan Kaltim Dijarah Perompak Berdasi*
22. Kaltim Post, 30 Januari 2000 : *Taman Nasional Kutai : Pupusnya Cita-Cita Sultan*
23. Kaltim Post, 3 Maret 2000 : *Dulu Kawasan Konservasi, Sekarang “Kebun Pisang”*
24. Mulyadi, Adief. 1999. *Menggali Keinginan, Merangkai Kesepakatan*. Makalah disampaikan pada Lokakarya Taman Nasional Kutai di Samarinda Kalimantan Timur, 28-29 April 1999.
25. Pulungan, M. (2014). Permasalahan Tanah Ulayat di Wilayah Kabupaten Kutai Kartanegara Provinsi Kalimantan Timur. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, 06(03), 227–239. doi:10.21787/jbp.06.2014.227-239
26. Palsson, Gisli. 1996. *Human Environmental Relations : Orientalism, Paternalism and Communalism dalam Nature and Society*. Anthropological Perspectives. Philippe Descole and Gisli Palsson (Edited). London & New York Routledge, 1996 hal:63-81.
27. The Government of Kutai Timur. 2001. *Rancangan Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Kutai Timur No. 2001. Tentang Enclave Desa Sangatta Selatan, Desa Singageweh, Desa Sangkimah dan Desa Teluk Pandan sebagai Desa Defenitif yang Dilepas dari TNK*. Pemkab KUTIM.
28. Sutrisno, Lukman. 1995. *Menuju Masyarakat Partisipatif*. Yogyakarta : Kanisius.
29. Warren, D. Michael. 1992. *Indigenous Knowledge, Bioersity Conservation and Development*. Paper Presented of International Conference on Conservation of Biodiversity in Africa : Local Initiatives and Institutional Roles. USA : Center for Indigenous Knowledge for Agricultural and Rural Development. Iowa State University.
30. Wahyuni, Y., Kumala Putri, E. I., & Simanjuntak, S. M. (2014). Valuasi Total Ekonomi Hutan Mangrove Di Kawasan Delta Mahakam Kabupaten Kutai Kartanegara Kalimantan Timur. *Jurnal Penelitian Kehutanan Wallacea*, 3(1), 1. doi:10.18330/jwallacea.2014.vol3iss1pp1-12