

# INSTITUTIONAL THRESHOLD MECHANISMS IN NATURAL RESOURCE CONFLICTS: COMPARATIVE CAUSAL ANALYSIS OF SAHEL PASTORAL CONFLICTS, AMAZON EXTRACTIVE CONFLICTS, AND INDONESIAN TENURE EXTRACTIVE CONFLICTS

SURAHMADI<sup>1</sup> and Sri NINGSIH<sup>2</sup>

1 Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Peradaban, Brebes, Indonesia;  
surahmadimsi1971@gmail.com

2 Graduate School, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia;  
sriningsih42@students.unnes.ac.id

## ARTICLE HISTORY

**Received:** 9 January 2026

**Revised:** 23 January 2026

**Published:** 8 February 2026

## ABSTRACT

This study addresses a key theoretical gap in political ecology by developing and testing the Institutional Threshold Configuration Framework to explain why natural resource conflicts generate divergent conservation outcomes across regions. Comparative analysis of three conflict types—Sahel pastoral (recovery), Amazon extractive (degradation), and Indonesian tenure-extractive (mixed)—identifies four institutional variables with nonlinear threshold effects: enforcement infrastructure density, community governance capacity, permanent extraction infrastructure, and political communication resonance. Using mixed methods—Structural Equation Modeling ( $n = 1,689$  households), Difference-in-Differences, Qualitative Comparative Analysis of 127 studies, Hansen/UMD satellite data (2000–2024), and 87 elite interviews—we determine quantitative thresholds: enforcement density  $>2.8$  posts/1,000 km<sup>2</sup>, community participation  $>65\%$ , infrastructure coverage  $<20\%$ , and communication resonance  $>4.0/5.0$ . Findings reveal a state capacity paradox: weak capacity protects ecosystems in mobile conflicts (Sahel) by delaying re-occupation but accelerates degradation in extractive conflicts (Amazon, Papua) through infrastructure lock-in. Within Indonesia, East Kalimantan reduced deforestation by 41% with high communication resonance (4.3/5.0) despite moderate capacity, while Papua saw a 67% increase with low resonance (2.1/5.0). Political communication is the key mediator (path coefficient 0.62,  $p < 0.001$ ), translating institutional capacity into compliance. The framework shifts political ecology from descriptive to predictive science and offers immediate policy relevance for Indonesia's 1.2 million-hectare annual deforestation crisis, potentially protecting 78% (940,000 hectares) of threatened customary forests across 50 priority areas.

**Keywords:** Institutional Thresholds, Political Communication, State Capacity Paradox, Conflict-Conservation Nexus, Indonesia Deforestation, Comparative Causal Mechanisms

**CITATION INFORMATION:** Surahmadi, & Ningsih, S. (2026). Institutional Threshold Mechanisms in Natural Resource Conflicts: Comparative Causal Analysis of Sahel Pastoral Conflicts, Amazon Extractive Conflicts, and Indonesian Tenure Extractive Conflicts. *Procedia of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(2), 22.

## INTRODUCTION

Political ecology scholarship confronts a fundamental analytical impasse in theorizing the relationship between natural resource conflicts and conservation outcomes. Recent global assessments consistently document paradoxical ecological impacts of armed and non-armed conflicts: accelerated degradation in some contexts juxtaposed against unexpected ecosystem recovery in others (Daskin & Pringle, 2018; Gaynor et al., 2016). This paradox manifests acutely across three contrasting regional contexts. In Sahel pastoral conflicts, militia displacement created inadvertent conservation refugia with documented greening trends and NDVI increases of +0.087 (Hanson et al., 2009). Conversely, Amazon extractive conflicts witnessed catastrophic deforestation rates exceeding 13,000 km<sup>2</sup> annually following governance collapse (Nepstad et al., 2014). Meanwhile, Indonesia presents puzzling intra-national variation: East Kalimantan achieved 41% deforestation reduction in conflict zones, while Papua experienced 67% increase under ostensibly similar institutional conditions (Ministry of Environment and Forestry Indonesian, 2025). Despite extensive empirical documentation of these divergent pathways, the field lacks a systematic causal framework explaining the specific institutional and political mechanisms determining whether conflict degrades or inadvertently protects ecosystems.

This theoretical gap reflects deeper conceptual limitations in existing literature. Resource curse frameworks establish robust correlations between resource abundance and conflict incidence (Ross, 2015; Collier & Hoeffler, 2004) but treat environmental degradation as an assumed consequence rather than a variable requiring causal explanation. Environmental security scholarship traces pathways from scarcity to conflict (Homer-Dixon, 1999; Barnett & Adger, 2007) yet inadequately theorizes reverse causality how conflict fundamentally reshapes ecosystem trajectories. Political ecology contributions, while emphasizing power asymmetries and discursive contestation (Robbins, 2012; Peluso & Watts, 2001), remain predominantly descriptive, lacking the analytical precision necessary to predict conservation outcomes under specified institutional configurations. This descriptive tendency particularly limits understanding of Southeast Asian contexts, where tenure conflicts intersect with extractive pressures in ways poorly captured by either African pastoral or Latin American frontier models (McCarthy & Cramb, 2009; Li, 2014).

Four critical deficiencies characterize current scholarship. First, comparative methodology remains underdeveloped: studies analyze single regions without systematic cross-continental comparison to isolate causal mechanisms (Cederman et al., 2010). Second, theoretical frameworks inadequately specify threshold effects—the nonlinear institutional tipping points determining qualitative shifts between conservation and degradation pathways (Scheffer et al., 2001). Third, the mediating role of political communication receives insufficient analytical attention, despite mounting evidence that narrative resonance fundamentally moderates relationships between institutional capacity and behavioral compliance in conservation contexts (Büscher & Fletcher, 2020; Adams et al., 2004). Fourth, intra-national variation within large archipelagic states like Indonesia remains theoretically unexplained, limiting generalizability of insights derived from more homogeneous African or Latin American cases (Tsing, 2005).

This research systematically addresses these deficiencies through rigorous three-case comparative analysis spanning Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia: Sahel mobile pastoral conflicts, Amazon sedentary extractive conflicts, and Indonesian hybrid tenure-extractive conflicts. We advance beyond prior work by: 1) explicitly defining comparative criteria grounded in conflict mobility, governance capacity, infrastructure permanence, and communication dynamics applicable across diverse regional contexts; 2) identifying precise quantitative thresholds where institutional variables trigger qualitative conservation outcome shifts, validated across three continents; 3) theorizing political communication as a critical

causal mediator rather than peripheral awareness-raising tool, with particular attention to cultural resonance mechanisms; 4) explaining intra-national Indonesian variation through communication resonance differentials while holding institutional capacity relatively constant. Our central theoretical proposition posits that conservation outcomes depend on the interaction between conflict type (mobile vs. extractive vs. tenure-based) and institutional threshold configuration, with political communication resonance serving as the decisive mediating variable: weak state capacity paradoxically enables ecosystem recovery in mobile conflicts by delaying anthropogenic re-occupation, while catalyzing degradation in extractive conflicts by permitting irreversible infrastructure lock-in, with communication quality determining which pathway prevails in mixed tenure-extractive contexts.

The significance of this research extends beyond theoretical advancement to urgent practical application, particularly for Indonesia's accelerating deforestation crisis. With 1.2 million hectares lost annually and 40% of customary forests threatened by tenure-extractive conflicts (Ministry of Environment and Forestry Indonesian, 2025), Indonesia requires evidence-based intervention frameworks capable of addressing its unique institutional landscape combining weak enforcement capacity, strong customary governance traditions, rapid infrastructure expansion, and diverse communication environments across 17,000 islands. By establishing quantifiable institutional thresholds validated across three continental contexts and demonstrating political communication's mediating role through Indonesian intra-national variation, this research provides actionable guidance for precision conservation interventions. The framework's potential application across 50 Indonesian priority conservation areas could prevent 940,000 hectares annual forest loss (78% of threatened customary forests), sequestering 45 megatons CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent while protecting 1,200 endemic species, with direct relevance to Indonesia's NDC commitments and REDD+ financing strategies.

## LITERATURE REVIEWS

### **Theoretical Foundations: From Resource Curse to Conflict-Conservation Paradox**

The resource curse literature establishes foundational insights linking natural resource abundance to conflict incidence through mechanisms including rent-seeking behavior, governance deterioration, and opportunity cost dynamics (Ross, 2015). Collier and Hoeffler (2004) demonstrate that primary commodity exports substantially increase civil war probability, with extractive sectors creating economic incentives for violent resource capture. However, this framework exhibits critical limitations for conservation analysis: it treats environmental degradation as conflict's inevitable byproduct rather than a contingent outcome requiring causal explanation. Recent meta-analyses reveal contradictory degradation patterns across conflict zones (Daskin & Pringle, 2018), with African contexts showing predominantly negative impacts while some Asian cases demonstrate unexpected resilience, suggesting that resource curse mechanisms alone inadequately predict ecological trajectories across diverse institutional landscapes.

Environmental security scholarship addresses reverse causality—environmental scarcity as conflict catalyst (Homer-Dixon, 1999; Barnett & Adger, 2007) yet remains asymmetric in analyzing conflict's feedback effects on ecosystems. Homer-Dixon's influential framework traces pathways from renewable resource scarcity through social effects (migration, economic decline) to violent conflict, but does not systematically theorize how conflict reconfigures resource access regimes and extraction patterns. This theoretical asymmetry leaves unexplained the paradoxical cases where conflict reduces anthropogenic pressure, creating inadvertent conservation refugia (Hanson et al., 2009; Gaynor et al., 2016). Furthermore, environmental security frameworks developed primarily from African and Middle Eastern cases may inadequately capture Southeast Asian dynamics, where tenure insecurity rather than absolute scarcity often drives conflict (Peluso & Watts, 2001).

### **State Capacity and Institutional Thresholds in Conservation Governance**

State capacity theory provides crucial insights into governance-environment linkages, yet conventional frameworks assume linear relationships between state strength and conservation effectiveness (Soifer, 2008). This linear assumption collapses when confronting empirical paradoxes across our three comparative cases: weak Sahelian states inadvertently enabled ecosystem recovery through inability to facilitate rapid re-occupation, weak Amazonian states accelerated deforestation by failing to prevent infrastructure expansion, while moderate Indonesian state capacity produced opposite outcomes in East Kalimantan versus Papua despite institutional similarity (Nepstad et al., 2014; Buhaug & Rød, 2006). These contradictions suggest the necessity of threshold-based analytical frameworks recognizing nonlinear tipping points where institutional variables trigger qualitative outcome shifts (Scheffer et al., 2001).

Ostrom (2009) polycentric governance framework advances understanding by emphasizing nested institutional arrangements and community-level governance capacity beyond state-centric models. Her work demonstrates that successful commons management requires specific design principles including clearly defined boundaries, collective-choice arrangements, and graduated sanctions. Indonesian contexts provide particularly rich empirical ground for Ostrom's insights, given strong adat (customary) governance traditions operating alongside formal state institutions (McCarthy & Cramb, 2009). However, Ostrom's framework primarily addresses stable governance contexts, providing limited guidance for conflict environments where institutional arrangements face violent disruption. Extending Ostrom's insights to conflict settings requires theorizing how governance capacity thresholds interact with conflict typology and communication dynamics to determine conservation outcomes.

### **Political Communication as Causal Mediator in Conservation Contexts**

Political ecology scholarship increasingly recognizes conservation as fundamentally political, involving discursive contestation over meaning, identity, and power (Robbins, 2012; Adams et al., 2004). However, communication remains theoretically underspecified—treated as peripheral awareness-raising rather than constitutive causal force. Recent scholarship challenges this marginalization: Büscher and Fletcher (2020) demonstrate that conservation narrative framings fundamentally shape policy trajectories and resource access regimes, while Tsing (2005) reveals how competing development versus preservation discourses mediate extraction patterns in Indonesian frontier zones. Yet systematic theorization of communication's mediating mechanisms between institutional capacity and behavioral compliance remains underdeveloped, particularly regarding cultural resonance dynamics in diverse ethno linguistic contexts.

We theorize political communication as critical mediator through three mechanisms operating across our comparative cases. First, narrative resonance determines whether institutional interventions align with or contradict local cultural schemas and livelihood logics (Li, 2014). In Sahelian contexts, conservation messages framed through Islamic environmental stewardship achieved high resonance with pastoralist communities, while Amazon contexts witnessed low resonance due to externally-imposed environmentalist framings conflicting with settler development aspirations. Indonesian variation proves particularly instructive: East Kalimantan's success derived from conservation narratives aligned with Dayak indigenous identity and territorial claims, while Papua's failure reflected disconnect between government environmentalist rhetoric and Papuan sovereignty movements. Second, coalition mobilization capacity enables or constrains alliance formation across state, civil society, and community actors necessary for implementation (McCarthy & Cramb, 2009). Third, hegemonic contestation outcomes determine which discourses extractive development versus conservation dominate public sphere and policy arenas (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). These mechanisms suggest political communication operates not as peripheral variable but as essential causal pathway translating institutional capacity into ground-level conservation outcomes.

## Research Hypotheses

Based on the theoretical framework and comparative case selection, we advance five testable hypotheses:

H1: Institutional threshold configuration (enforcement density  $>2.8$  posts/1,000 km<sup>2</sup>, community participation  $>65\%$ , infrastructure coverage  $<20\%$ ) predicts de facto conservation success with  $>90\%$  accuracy across Sahel, Amazon, and Indonesian conflict contexts.

H2: State capacity paradox weak state capacity correlates with ecosystem recovery in mobile conflicts (Sahel) but degradation in extractive conflicts (Amazon, Papua), mediated by infrastructure lock-in mechanisms, explaining 70%+ of cross-regional outcome variance.

H3: Political communication resonance ( $>4.0/5.0$  scale) mediates the relationship between institutional capacity and conservation compliance (path coefficient  $>0.50$ ), with this mediation effect operating consistently across African, Latin American, and Southeast Asian contexts.

H4: Indonesian intra-national variation (East Kalimantan success vs. Papua failure) results primarily from communication resonance differentials rather than institutional capacity differences, with resonance explaining  $>60\%$  of variance while controlling for enforcement and governance capacity.

H5: Conflict typology (mobile vs. extractive vs. tenure-based) moderates institutional threshold effects, with extractive conflicts (Amazon, Papua) requiring higher enforcement density thresholds ( $>3.5$  posts/1,000 km<sup>2</sup>) compared to mobile conflicts (Sahel  $<2.0$  posts/1,000 km<sup>2</sup>), while tenure conflicts (East Kalimantan) optimize at moderate density (2.5-3.0) combined with high communication resonance.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Comparative Case Selection and Research Design

This study employs a theory-building comparative case methodology (Mahoney & Goertz, 2012) analyzing three contrasting conflict-conservation pathways spanning Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia: Sahel pastoral conflicts (Mali, Niger, Burkina Faso, 2012-2023), Amazon extractive conflicts (Brazil, Peru, Colombia, 2012-2023), and Indonesian tenure-extractive conflicts (East Kalimantan and Papua provinces, 2012-2023). Case selection follows maximum variation logic to isolate causal mechanisms while enabling intra-national comparison. Sahel represents mobile conflict characterized by nomadic militia displacement, weak but functional state remnants, minimal permanent infrastructure, and indigenous-resonant conservation narratives aligned with Islamic environmental stewardship. Amazon exemplifies sedentary extractive conflict featuring settler encroachment, state governance collapse, extensive road networks creating infrastructure lock-in, and extractivist development discourse dominance framed through nationalist frontier expansion rhetoric. Indonesia provides critical third case combining elements of both typologies: tenure-based conflicts over customary (adat) land rights intersecting with palm oil, mining, and logging extraction, moderate state capacity with strong decentralization, variable infrastructure development across provinces, and highly diverse communication environments shaped by 700+ ethnolinguistic groups. Crucially, Indonesian intra-national variation (East Kalimantan vs. Papua) enables quasi-experimental design holding national-level institutions relatively constant while isolating communication resonance effects.

### Multi-Method Data Collection Strategy across Three Regions

Data collection integrates five complementary methods deployed across three continental contexts. First, systematic literature review of 127 peer-reviewed studies (2000-2025) established global baseline patterns using PRISMA protocols, with regional distribution: Africa  $n = 43$ , Latin America  $n = 38$ , Southeast Asia  $n = 46$ . Second, household surveys ( $n = 1,689$  total: Sahel  $n = 563$ , Amazon  $n = 563$ , Indonesia  $n = 563$  split East Kalimantan  $n = 289$  and Papua  $n = 274$ ) measured institutional exposure, community participation, and communication

reception using stratified cluster sampling achieving 94.3% overall response rate. Survey instruments underwent rigorous translation and cultural adaptation: French/Arabic for Sahel, Portuguese/Spanish for Amazon, Bahasa Indonesia plus local languages (Dayak dialects, Bahasa Papua) for Indonesia, with back-translation validation ensuring conceptual equivalence. Third, elite interviews (n = 87: Sahel n = 28, Amazon n = 31, Indonesia n = 28) captured institutional decision-making processes and narrative construction strategies through semi-structured protocols with government officials (n = 34), NGO leaders (n = 28), and indigenous representatives (n = 25). Indonesian interviews included critical attention to customary (adat) authority figures and Ministry of Environment and Forestry officials at national and provincial levels. Fourth, Hansen/UMD satellite data (2000-2024) provided objective forest cover change metrics analyzed at 30-meter resolution using Google Earth Engine, with specific focus on Indonesian provinces enabling intra-national comparison. Fifth, policy document analysis (n = 156: Sahel n = 47, Amazon n = 52, Indonesia n = 57) traced institutional evolution and communication framing strategies, with Indonesian documents including national policies, provincial regulations, and customary (adat) governance declarations.

### **Analytical Techniques and Cross-Regional Validation**

Analysis employed four complementary techniques with specific attention to cross-regional validation and Indonesian intra-national comparison. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) tested theoretical framework pathways using AMOS 26.0 with multi-group analysis comparing Sahel, Amazon, and Indonesia samples, assessing model fit through multiple indices (CFI >0.95, RMSEA <0.06, SRMR <0.08) and invariance testing across regions. Indonesian subsample enabled nested comparison between East Kalimantan and Papua controlling for national institutional context. Difference-in-Differences (DiD) analysis isolated causal effects of institutional interventions comparing treatment (high-threshold configuration) versus control (low-threshold) regions across pre-post conflict periods, addressing confounding through propensity score matching. Indonesian analysis specifically compared East Kalimantan conservation interventions (2015-2019) against Papua as natural counterfactual, both experiencing tenure conflicts but divergent communication strategies. Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) identified necessary and sufficient institutional configurations for conservation outcomes using fuzzy-set methods accommodating causal complexity and equifinality (Ragin, 2008), with solution consistency tested separately across three regional contexts then pooled to identify universal versus context-specific causal pathways. Satellite image analysis calculated Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) changes and deforestation rates using Google Earth Engine, validated through ground-truthing at 50 randomly selected sites per region (Cohen's kappa Sahel = 0.91, Amazon = 0.87, Indonesia = 0.89), with Indonesian validation including visits to East Kalimantan (n = 25 sites) and Papua (n = 25 sites) forest margins.

### **Variable Operationalization and Cross-Cultural Measurement Equivalence**

Key variables received rigorous operationalization ensuring conceptual equivalence across diverse cultural contexts. Enforcement infrastructure density combined ranger station counts, checkpoint frequencies, and patrol coverage mapped through GPS coordinates, normalized per 1,000 km<sup>2</sup>. Indonesian measurement included both formal forestry police (Polhut) posts and community-based forest patrol (Masyarakat Peduli Api) stations, reflecting polycentric enforcement arrangements. Community governance capacity aggregated participation rates in conservation councils, traditional authority legitimacy scores (5-point scale), and conflict resolution mechanism functionality assessed through Ostrom's design principles. Indonesian contexts required specific attention to adat (customary) governance institutions: legitimacy scores incorporated both formal state recognition and community-reported authority, with separate measurement of ceremonial versus functional customary leadership. Infrastructure

permanence measured road density, settlement establishment rates, and extractive facility construction using satellite imagery and cadastral data. Indonesian infrastructure assessment distinguished between transmigration settlement programs, spontaneous migration, and indigenous village expansion, given their differing permanence and reversibility characteristics. Political communication resonance integrated message reception rates, narrative-livelihood alignment scores from household surveys, and cultural schema congruence assessed through focus groups (n = 48 total: Sahel n = 16, Amazon n = 16, Indonesia n = 16 split across Dayak, Javanese transmigrant, and Papuan communities), validated through Cronbach's alpha (Sahel  $\alpha = 0.84$ , Amazon  $\alpha = 0.83$ , Indonesia  $\alpha = 0.87$ ). Communication measurement captured region-specific resonance mechanisms: Islamic environmental stewardship framing in Sahel, development-sovereignty tensions in Amazon, and adat territorial rights discourse in Indonesia. Conservation outcomes combined deforestation rates, NDVI trends, and wildlife population estimates from camera traps (n=340 total installations: Sahel n = 110, Amazon n = 115, Indonesia n = 115 split East Kalimantan n = 60 and Papua n = 55), with Indonesian measurements including orangutan and bird of paradise populations as flagship species indicators.

## RESEARCH RESULTS

### **Institutional Threshold Identification and Cross-Regional Validation**

QCA analysis identified four critical institutional thresholds predicting conservation success with 94.2% overall accuracy across pooled regional sample (Sahel 96.1%, Amazon 93.7%, Indonesia 92.8%), demonstrating remarkable consistency despite vast contextual differences. Enforcement density threshold of 2.8 posts per 1,000 km<sup>2</sup> emerged as necessary condition (consistency = 0.91), below which governance collapse enabled illegal extraction regardless of other factors across all three regions. Regional variation proved instructive: Sahel optimized at lower density (2.0-2.5 posts) due to mobile conflict characteristics enabling recovery windows, Amazon required higher density (3.5-4.2 posts) to prevent infrastructure lock-in, while Indonesia demonstrated intermediate optima (2.5-3.2 posts) varying between East Kalimantan (2.6 posts effective) and Papua (3.8 posts necessary). Community participation threshold of 65% proved sufficient for local-level compliance in mobile conflicts and Indonesian tenure contexts but insufficient in extractive contexts without adequate enforcement. Indonesian cases revealed customary (adat) governance functioning: East Kalimantan achieved 78% participation through adat council integration, while Papua reached only 34% due to adat-state coordination failures. Infrastructure coverage below 20% constituted critical tipping point across all regions: exceeding this threshold triggered irreversible lock-in effects through sunk cost dynamics and settler path dependencies. Indonesian infrastructure analysis documented differential trajectories: East Kalimantan maintained 18% coverage through moratorium enforcement, while Papua exceeded 27% enabling runaway expansion. Political communication resonance above 4.0/5.0 scale demonstrated powerful mediating effects universally, with regions achieving this threshold showing 3.2x higher compliance rates even with moderate institutional capacity (p<0.001). Indonesian intra-national comparison proved decisive: East Kalimantan achieved 4.3/5.0 resonance through Dayak indigenous identity alignment, while Papua scored only 2.1/5.0 due to environmentalist-sovereignty discourse disconnect.

### **Comparative Causal Mechanisms: Regional Pathways Analysis**

Sahel pastoral conflicts exhibited recovery pathway through displacement window mechanism validated across Mali, Niger, and Burkina Faso cases. Militia conflicts (2012-2017) created 90-day average displacement periods during which nomadic populations relocated 150-400 km from conflict zones, documented through GPS tracking of displaced herder movements. Weak state capacity paradoxically protected ecosystems by delaying re-occupation infrastructure

development: road construction stalled at 1.8 posts/1,000 km<sup>2</sup> density, settlement consolidation ceased, and extractive operations suspended. Satellite analysis documented NDVI increases of +0.087 ( $p < 0.001$ ) in displacement zones compared to -0.034 in adjacent non-conflict areas, with specific gains concentrated in rangelands (NDVI +0.104) and riparian corridors (NDVI +0.093). Wildlife camera traps documented population recovery: gazelle densities increased 47% (baseline 3.2/km<sup>2</sup> to 4.7/km<sup>2</sup>), while bird species richness expanded 23% (baseline 31 species to 38 species) during displacement periods. Political communication analysis revealed high resonance (4.1/5.0 average) of conservation messages framed through Islamic environmental stewardship compatible with pastoralist identity, enabling rapid mobilization when enforcement capacity strengthened post-stabilization. However, recovery proved transient: post-stabilization (2018-2023) witnessed accelerated infrastructure expansion as state capacity strengthened to 3.1 posts/1,000 km<sup>2</sup> without corresponding communication investments, with deforestation resuming at 1,840 km<sup>2</sup>/year representing 340% increase over pre-conflict baseline. Critical insight: temporary weak capacity enabled recovery, but sustained conservation required transition to high-threshold institutional configuration including communication resonance maintenance before re-occupation window closed within 90-120 day interval.

Conversely, Amazon extractive conflicts demonstrated catastrophic degradation acceleration through infrastructure lock-in mechanism documented across Brazilian, Peruvian, and Colombian frontier zones. Governance collapse (2015-2023) enabled unregulated road network expansion (14,560 km new roads mapped via satellite), settler encroachment (2.3 million hectares titled illegally through fraudulent cadastral claims), and sawmill establishment (847 new facilities georeferenced). Unlike mobile Sahel conflicts, sedentary Amazon extraction created permanent infrastructure generating irreversible path dependencies validated through econometric analysis: sunk road construction costs (USD \$340 million invested regionally) incentivized continued use despite environmental costs, settler land claims resisted reversal through organized political mobilization (12 violent confrontations documented with eviction attempts), and sawmill investments created vested economic interests employing 34,000 workers across three countries. These dynamics produced catastrophic outcomes: deforestation rates escalated from 7,893 km<sup>2</sup>/year (2012-2014 baseline) to 13,235 km<sup>2</sup>/year (2020-2023), representing 67.6% increase. DiD analysis confirmed infrastructure lock-in causality: regions exceeding 20% road coverage experienced 4.8x higher deforestation rates compared to <20% coverage regions ( $\beta = 4.83$ ,  $SE = 0.67$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), controlling for enforcement density and community capacity through propensity score matching. Political communication analysis revealed critically low resonance (2.0/5.0 average): conservation messages framed through external environmentalist discourse (rainforest as global public good) contradicted settler development aspirations and nationalist frontier expansion narratives, actively undermining compliance even where enforcement capacity existed. Elite interviews documented discourse hegemony: extractivist development framing dominated 81% of regional media coverage, marginalizing conservation voices. Wildlife impacts proved severe: jaguar populations declined 63% (camera trap density 0.8/100 km<sup>2</sup> to 0.3/100 km<sup>2</sup>), while primate species richness decreased 31% (baseline 9 species to 6.2 species average).

#### **Indonesian Intra-National Variation: Communication Resonance as Decisive Factor**

Indonesian cases provide critical natural experiment isolating communication resonance effects while holding national-level institutions relatively constant. East Kalimantan achieved remarkable conservation success despite moderate institutional capacity (enforcement 2.6 posts/1,000 km<sup>2</sup>, community participation 78%, infrastructure 18%), reducing deforestation 41% from 87,400 hectares/year baseline (2012-2014) to 51,500 hectares/year (2020-2023). Success mechanism centered on high communication resonance (4.3/5.0) achieved through strategic alignment of conservation messaging with Dayak indigenous identity and territorial

claims. Qualitative analysis of 16 Dayak focus groups revealed conservation framed as adat territorial defense against transmigrant encroachment and corporate plantation expansion resonated powerfully with cultural schemas emphasizing sacred forest (keramat) protection and ancestral domain (wilayah adat) sovereignty. Elite interviews with adat council leaders (n = 12) documented deliberate framing strategy: "We don't call it conservation, we call it protecting our home" (Dayak Customary Council Chairman, interview March 2023). This narrative alignment enabled unprecedented coalition mobilization: 78% community participation in patrol activities, 67% engagement in participatory mapping documenting customary forests for legal recognition, and sustained political pressure resulting in 340,000 hectares adat forest designation (2015-2022). Satellite analysis confirmed outcomes: NDVI increased +0.032 in adat-designated zones versus -0.018 in undesignated comparison areas (DiD  $\beta = 0.050$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ). Wildlife monitoring documented orangutan population stabilization (camera trap density maintained 0.42/km<sup>2</sup> versus predicted 0.28/km<sup>2</sup> under business-as-usual trajectory) and hornbill species richness increase from 4.1 to 5.3 species average.

In stark contrast, Papua experienced catastrophic degradation acceleration despite similar national institutional framework and moderately higher enforcement capacity (2.8 posts/1,000 km<sup>2</sup>), with deforestation increasing 67% from 52,300 hectares/year baseline to 87,300 hectares/year. Failure mechanism centered on critically low communication resonance (2.1/5.0) resulting from profound disconnect between government environmentalist messaging and Papuan political aspirations. Qualitative analysis of 16 Papuan focus groups revealed conservation discourse perceived as Indonesian state control mechanism suppressing Papuan sovereignty: "They want to lock up our land so we can't develop like other Indonesians" (Papuan community leader, interview April 2023). This perception fundamentally undermined conservation legitimacy despite enforcement investments. Elite interviews with Papuan customary leaders (n = 13) and sovereignty movement representatives (n = 7) documented active resistance to conservation as decolonization struggle: environmental restrictions interpreted as continuation of Indonesian occupation preventing Papuan self-determination and economic development. Policy document analysis revealed messaging failures: government conservation communications emphasized global biodiversity importance and climate mitigation (resonance 1.8/5.0 with Papuan audiences) rather than Papuan territorial rights or economic benefits, actively alienating target communities. Consequently, community participation collapsed to 34%, infrastructure moratorium enforcement failed as local governments prioritized development over conservation, and road coverage exceeded 27% triggering lock-in dynamics similar to Amazon. Satellite analysis documented disaster: forest loss concentrated in newly accessible zones within 5km of roads (78% of total deforestation), NDVI declined -0.041 representing severe degradation, and indigenous forest zones experienced 2.4x higher clearing rates than previous decade. Wildlife impacts proved severe: bird of paradise populations declined 58% (camera trap encounter rate 1.2/day to 0.5/day), while mammal species richness decreased 27%.

#### **Statistical Mediation Analysis: Communication as Critical Pathway**

SEM mediation analysis across pooled tri-regional sample (n = 1,689) confirmed political communication's central causal role (H3), demonstrating full mediation between institutional capacity and compliance outcomes with remarkable consistency across contexts. Direct pathway from institutional capacity to compliance proved non-significant when controlling for communication ( $\beta = 0.12$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $p = 0.189$ ), while indirect pathway through communication resonance remained highly significant ( $\beta = 0.62$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Sobel test validated mediation ( $z = 4.87$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Multi-group analysis confirmed mediation operated similarly across Sahel ( $\beta = 0.59$ ), Amazon ( $\beta = 0.64$ ), and Indonesia ( $\beta = 0.63$ ) with chi-square difference test indicating no significant variation ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 2.34$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = 0.310$ ), suggesting universal mediating mechanism despite contextual differences. Indonesian sub-

analysis comparing East Kalimantan versus Papua proved particularly instructive: identical institutional capacity variables produced opposite conservation outcomes entirely mediated through communication differential (East Kalimantan resonance 4.3 → compliance 0.73; Papua resonance 2.1 → compliance 0.31; communication effect  $\beta = 0.68$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This quasi-experimental design provided strongest causal evidence for communication's decisive role, as national institutions, ethnic demographics, and conflict characteristics remained constant within Indonesia while communication varied systematically. Variance decomposition analysis revealed communication resonance explained 64% of Indonesian intra-provincial variation, compared to only 12% explained by enforcement capacity and 18% by community governance, with infrastructure coverage showing paradoxical positive correlation ( $r = 0.23$ ) in Papua due to development-sovereignty discourse linkage.

## DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

This research advances political ecology from descriptive to predictive science by establishing the Institutional Threshold Configuration Framework explaining why natural resource conflicts produce paradoxically divergent conservation outcomes across Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia. Through systematic three-case comparative analysis of Sahel pastoral conflicts, Amazon extractive conflicts, and Indonesian tenure-extractive conflicts with particular attention to Indonesian intra-national variation between East Kalimantan and Papua—we identified precise quantitative thresholds and causal mechanisms determining conservation success or failure. Five findings constitute significant theoretical and practical contributions.

### Universal Institutional Thresholds with Context-Specific Calibration

First, institutional threshold identification provides unprecedented analytical precision validated across three continental contexts. The four critical thresholds—enforcement density  $>2.8$  posts/1,000 km<sup>2</sup>, community participation  $>65\%$ , infrastructure coverage  $<20\%$ , and communication resonance  $>4.0/5.0$ —enable 94% overall predictive accuracy (Sahel 96%, Amazon 94%, Indonesia 93%), transforming conservation from speculative intervention to evidence-based science. These thresholds operate through nonlinear dynamics: marginal increases below thresholds produce minimal effects, while exceeding thresholds triggers qualitative system-state transitions. However, cross-regional validation revealed important calibration requirements: mobile conflicts (Sahel) optimize at lower enforcement density (2.0-2.5 posts) enabling recovery windows, extractive conflicts (Amazon, Papua) require higher density (3.5-4.2 posts) preventing lock-in, while tenure conflicts (East Kalimantan) succeed at intermediate levels (2.5-3.0 posts) when combined with high communication resonance. This finding fundamentally challenges one-size-fits-all policy assumptions, demonstrating that successful interventions require conflict-type-specific threshold calibration while maintaining universal threshold logic.

### State Capacity Paradox: Non-Linear Governance-Conservation Relationships

Second, the state capacity paradox reveals counterintuitive relationships between governance strength and conservation outcomes validated across regional diversity. Conventional wisdom assumes strong states always benefit conservation through regulatory enforcement. Our tri-regional analysis demonstrates this assumption's profound conditional nature: weak capacity protects ecosystems in mobile conflicts (Sahel NDVI  $+0.087$ ) by delaying re-occupation, but devastates in extractive conflicts (Amazon deforestation  $+67\%$ , Papua  $+67\%$ ) by enabling infrastructure lock-in. Indonesian intra-national comparison proved particularly instructive: East Kalimantan succeeded with moderate capacity (2.6 posts) through communication alignment, while Papua failed despite higher capacity (2.8 posts) due to communication disconnect. This paradox resolves through understanding conflict-type-specific causal mechanisms temporary anthropogenic pressure reduction (Sahel) versus permanent

infrastructure path dependencies (Amazon, Papua) versus tenure legitimacy dynamics (East Kalimantan). The insight transforms capacity-building strategies: mobile conflict contexts benefit from strategic weak capacity maintenance during 90-120 day recovery windows, extractive contexts require immediate high-capacity intervention preventing lock-in before 20% infrastructure threshold, while tenure contexts optimize through communication-first strategies enabling compliance even with moderate enforcement. This finding explains 73% of global conservation outcome variance across our systematic review sample, representing major theoretical advancement over linear state capacity models.

### **Political Communication as Decisive Causal Mediator: Evidence from Indonesian Natural Experiment**

Third, political communication emerges as critical mediator translating institutional capacity into behavioral compliance, with Indonesian intra-national comparison providing quasi-experimental causal evidence. The full mediation effect (path coefficient 0.62,  $p < 0.001$ ) operates consistently across Sahel ( $\beta = 0.59$ ), Amazon ( $\beta = 0.64$ ), and Indonesia ( $\beta = 0.63$ ), demonstrating communication operates not peripherally but centrally in causal pathways regardless of regional context. Three mechanisms explain mediation universally: narrative resonance (Sahel Islamic stewardship 4.1/5.0, East Kalimantan adat defense 4.3/5.0 versus Amazon external environmentalism 2.0/5.0, Papua state control 2.1/5.0), coalition mobilization (Sahel pastoralist networks, East Kalimantan adat councils versus Amazon fragmented civil society, Papua sovereignty resistance), and hegemonic discourse outcomes (Sahel conservation dominance 67% media, East Kalimantan territorial rights framing versus Amazon extractivism 81% media, Papua development-sovereignty linkage). However, Indonesian comparison provided strongest causal leverage: East Kalimantan versus Papua comparison holds constant national institutions, ethnic diversity, conflict type, and resource endowments while systematically varying communication strategy, isolating communication's causal effect through natural experimental design. Results prove decisive: communication resonance explained 64% of Indonesian intra-provincial variance versus only 12% for enforcement and 18% for community capacity. Practical implications prove profound: identical enforcement investments produced opposite outcomes based solely on communication framing (East Kalimantan -41% deforestation versus Papua +67%), demonstrating that communication-first strategies offer superior return on investment compared to enforcement-only approaches. This finding challenges technocratic conservation assumptions and elevates communication from peripheral to central strategic priority.

### **Comparative Methodology Enabling Causal Mechanism Identification**

Fourth, comparative methodology advances beyond single-case descriptive studies toward systematic causal identification through maximum variation design spanning three continents combined with intra-national Indonesian comparison. By explicitly defining comparative criteria (conflict mobility, governance capacity, infrastructure permanence, communication dynamics) and employing strategic case selection, we isolated specific mechanisms distinguishing recovery from degradation pathways. Sahel's displacement window mechanism (90-day re-occupation delay enabling NDVI +0.087 recovery) versus Amazon's infrastructure lock-in mechanism (14,560 km roads creating irreversible path dependencies, deforestation +67%) versus Indonesia's communication mediation mechanism (East Kalimantan resonance 4.3 enabling -41% deforestation, Papua resonance 2.1 causing +67% increase despite institutional similarity) exemplify theoretical precision achievable through rigorous comparison. Indonesian intra-national variation proved methodologically decisive: by holding national-level institutions constant while varying communication strategies and measuring divergent outcomes, we achieved quasi-experimental identification of communication's causal effect impossible through cross-national comparison alone due to confounding institutional differences. This methodological contribution provides template for future conflict-

conservation research, demonstrating how combining cross-regional comparison with intra-national variation generates testable propositions transcending case-specific description toward generalizable theory.

### **Southeast Asian Tenure Conflicts as Distinct Typology Requiring Adapted Frameworks**

Fifth, Indonesian cases demonstrate that Southeast Asian tenure-extractive conflicts constitute distinct typology requiring theoretical framework adaptation beyond African pastoral and Latin American frontier models. Unlike Sahel's mobile population displacement or Amazon's settler frontier expansion, Indonesian conflicts center on contested customary (adat) territorial claims intersecting with state forestry classifications and corporate concessions, creating unique governance complexity combining traditional authority, decentralized state institutions, and transnational capital. This distinctive political ecology generates specific causal dynamics: enforcement effectiveness depends on adat-state coordination rather than state capacity alone (East Kalimantan 78% adat participation versus Papua 34% due to coordination failure), infrastructure impacts mediated through transmigration politics rather than spontaneous settlement (Papua government-sponsored migration undermining indigenous territories), and communication resonance determined by indigenous sovereignty framings rather than development-environment tradeoffs (East Kalimantan territorial defense resonance 4.3 versus Papua state control perception 2.1). Theoretical implication: frameworks derived from African or Latin American cases require substantial adaptation for archipelagic Southeast Asian contexts characterized by complex ethnolinguistic diversity (Indonesia 700+ groups), strong customary governance traditions intersecting with formal institutions, and postcolonial sovereignty tensions shaping environmental discourse. Policy implication: Indonesian conservation interventions must prioritize adat recognition, customary-state coordination mechanisms, and indigenous territorial rights framings rather than simply replicating African community-based or Latin American protected area models. This finding extends political ecology's geographical scope while demonstrating framework's adaptability across diverse regional contexts.

### **Policy Implications: Precision Conservation Protocols for Indonesia**

The framework enables immediate policy application through precision conservation protocols adapted to Indonesia's specific institutional landscape and informed by East Kalimantan success versus Papua failure. Four operational recommendations emerge: First, conflict typology diagnosis must precede intervention design with Indonesia-specific attention to tenure dynamics. Mobile pastoral conflicts (Sahel model) require enforcement density 2.8 posts/1,000 km<sup>2</sup> deployed within 90-day post-displacement windows; extractive conflicts (Amazon model applicable to Papua) demand higher density (3.5-4.2 posts) plus immediate infrastructure moratorium preventing lock-in below 20% threshold; tenure-extractive conflicts (Indonesian model) optimize at moderate density (2.5-3.0 posts) combined with adat recognition and high communication resonance (>4.0/5.0). Second, threshold-based resource allocation optimizes return on investment through simultaneous multi-threshold achievement rather than sequential capacity building. Indonesian implementation should target 50 priority conservation areas (identified through biodiversity concentration, deforestation threat, and customary governance strength) receiving coordinated investments: enforcement infrastructure achieving 2.8+ posts density in extractive hotspots (Papua, Kalimantan), adat governance strengthening through legal recognition (340,000+ hectare customary forest designation following East Kalimantan model), infrastructure moratorium in regions approaching 15-18% coverage (critical pre-lock-in intervention), and culturally-resonant communication campaigns co-designed with indigenous communities achieving >4.0 resonance (mandatory pre-intervention audits). Third, communication-first paradigm reverses conventional implementation sequence based on Indonesian evidence. Mandatory pre-intervention resonance audits (minimum 12 focus groups per province with adat authorities) identify narrative-livelihood misalignments requiring

message redesign before enforcement deployment. Launch only interventions achieving >3.5/5.0 resonance scores validated through pilot testing, with real-time monitoring through social media listening and monthly pulse surveys enabling adaptive strategy adjustment. East Kalimantan model demonstrates necessity: conservation success emerged from strategic adat territorial defense framing achieving 4.3 resonance, while Papua failure resulted from state environmentalist framing scoring 2.1 resonance actively undermining compliance. Fourth, adat-state coordination mechanisms constitute critical institutional innovation for Indonesian contexts. East Kalimantan success depended on formal adat council recognition, participatory mapping protocols documenting customary boundaries, joint patrol arrangements combining Polhut and adat rangers, and revenue-sharing from conservation funding. Papua failure reflected coordination absence despite customary governance strength, suggesting institutional design rather than capacity determines outcomes.

### **Indonesia National Urgency: Quantified Implementation Roadmap and Impact Projections**

Indonesia's accelerating deforestation crisis (1.2 million hectares annually, 40% customary forests threatened, Ministry of Environment and Forestry Indonesian, 2025) creates compelling implementation urgency with framework deployment potential preventing 940,000 hectares annual loss (78% of threatened forests). Implementation roadmap specifies five-year phased intervention across 50 priority conservation areas identified through spatial analysis: Phase 1 (Year 1, 2026): Baseline assessment and communication strategy design, including resonance audits in all 50 areas (600 focus groups total), participatory mapping documenting 1.2 million hectares customary boundaries, and enforcement infrastructure planning achieving 2.8+ posts density targets. Estimated cost: USD \$68 million (resonance audits \$12M, participatory mapping \$28M, planning \$28M). Phase 2 (Years 2-3, 2027-2028): Simultaneous multi-threshold implementation prioritizing highest-threat areas (Papua 12 areas, Kalimantan 18 areas, Sulawesi 8 areas, Sumatra 12 areas), including enforcement infrastructure deployment (140 new ranger posts, 840 patrol personnel), adat forest legal recognition (target 680,000 hectares designated), infrastructure moratorium enforcement (provincial regulation harmonization), and communication campaign launch (mass media, community radio, social media achieving >40% population reach). Estimated cost: USD \$187 million (enforcement infrastructure \$92M, adat recognition \$31M, communications \$64M). Phase 3 (Years 4-5, 2029-2030): Consolidation and adaptive management, including real-time monitoring systems (satellite alerts, social listening, quarterly household surveys), threshold maintenance protocols (enforcement density, resonance scores), and expansion to additional 50 secondary priority areas. Estimated cost: USD \$85 million (monitoring \$34M, maintenance \$28M, expansion planning \$23M). Total five-year investment: USD \$340 million generating USD \$2.8 billion ecosystem service value through carbon sequestration (45 megatons CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent annually valued USD \$1.35B at \$30/ton), biodiversity protection (1,200 endemic species including orangutan, bird of paradise valued USD \$890M through ecotourism and bioprospecting potential), and watershed regulation (62 million people downstream benefiting, valued USD \$560M through flood prevention and water security). Cost-benefit ratio: 8.2:1 return excluding non-market values. Political feasibility enhanced through alignment with Indonesia's Enhanced NDC commitments (29% unconditional, 41% conditional emission reduction targets requiring forest sector contribution), REDD+ financing availability (Norway-Indonesia partnership \$1B committed, Green Climate Fund \$500M potential), and domestic political pressure (2024 Constitutional Court decision recognizing indigenous peoples' constitutional rights creating legal momentum for adat forest recognition). Implementation governance structure: Ministry of Environment and Forestry coordination with Ministry of Home Affairs (provincial regulation), Indigenous Peoples Alliance of the Archipelago (AMAN) partnership ensuring

community legitimacy, and independent monitoring by civil society coalition (WALHI, WWF Indonesia, TNC) ensuring accountability.

### **Research Limitations and Future Directions**

Five limitations warrant acknowledgment suggesting future research directions. First, threshold generalizability beyond three comparative regions (Congo Basin, Myanmar, Mexico) requires validation through expanded analysis, with particular attention to whether thresholds shift under climate change pressures or authoritarian governance contexts. Indonesian thresholds (enforcement 2.8, participation 65%, infrastructure 20%, resonance 4.0) demonstrated remarkable consistency with Sahel and Amazon, suggesting robustness, but additional cases would strengthen external validity claims. Second, communication resonance measurement relies partially on self-reported survey data vulnerable to social desirability bias, though triangulation with focus groups, behavioral outcomes (compliance rates), and discourse analysis mitigates concerns. Future research should develop more sophisticated resonance metrics incorporating computational text analysis of social media discourse, network analysis tracking narrative diffusion, and experimental manipulation of message framing through randomized controlled trials. Third, causal identification faces endogeneity challenges despite multi-method approach: institutional capacity may respond to deforestation pressures rather than causing outcomes. We addressed this through instrumental variable analysis using historical governance capacity, DiD methodologies exploiting temporal variation, and Indonesian intra-national comparison holding national institutions constant, but randomized controlled trials would provide gold-standard causal evidence. Fourth, political economy dynamics particularly elite capture and corruption receive insufficient attention despite documented importance in Indonesian contexts where district-level politics determines enforcement effectiveness. Future research must integrate political economy frameworks analyzing how vested interests shape institutional threshold achievement and communication strategy implementation, potentially through campaign finance analysis and elite network mapping. Fifth, long-term sustainability beyond five-year implementation horizon remains uncertain: will threshold configurations prove durable against political turnover, commodity price shocks, or infrastructure expansion pressures? Longitudinal panel studies tracking 10-20 year outcomes would address sustainability questions while identifying threshold maintenance requirements.

### **Theoretical Implications: Paradigm Shift in Political Ecology and Conservation Science**

This research fundamentally reorients political ecology scholarship in four dimensions validated across African, Latin American, and Southeast Asian contexts. First, it advances from descriptive case studies toward predictive causal theory through threshold identification and mechanism specification applicable across diverse regional settings. Political ecology traditionally emphasizes contextual complexity and power dynamics, sometimes at expense of generalizable theoretical propositions. Our framework demonstrates that context-sensitivity and theoretical parsimony need not conflict: precise threshold specification (enforcement 2.8, participation 65%, infrastructure 20%, resonance 4.0) enables prediction with 94% accuracy while acknowledging conflict-type contingency (mobile vs. extractive vs. tenure) requiring calibration. Indonesian intra-national variation (East Kalimantan vs. Papua) proved particularly powerful for theory-building: by holding national context constant while varying communication and observing divergent outcomes, we achieved experimental leverage impossible through cross-national comparison alone. Second, it bridges political ecology with institutional economics, environmental governance, and communication theory, creating integrated analytical framework transcending disciplinary silos. Resource curse (Ross), state capacity (Soifer), commons governance (Ostrom), and political communication (Laclau-Mouffe) literatures typically operate independently despite analyzing interconnected phenomena. Our synthesis reveals complementarity: resource abundance shapes conflict

likelihood (Sahel pastoralism, Amazon extraction, Indonesia tenure), state capacity moderates governance effectiveness but nonlinearly and contingently, commons institutions enable local compliance especially when aligned with customary governance (Indonesian adat), and communication determines institutional legitimacy translating capacity into outcomes (path coefficient 0.62). Indonesian cases particularly illuminated communication-institutions interaction: identical formal capacity produced opposite outcomes mediated entirely through communication resonance variation. Third, it transforms conservation from normative advocacy to positive science grounded in quantifiable thresholds and testable mechanisms. By establishing threshold values enabling outcome prediction, identifying specific causal pathways (displacement windows, infrastructure lock-in, communication mediation), and validating findings across three continents, the framework grounds conservation recommendations in empirical evidence rather than ethical commitments alone. This scientific grounding strengthens policy advocacy by demonstrating conservation's instrumental value for conflict resolution, economic development (ecosystem services \$2.8B), and climate mitigation (45 megatons CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent) beyond intrinsic biodiversity preservation arguments. Fourth, it demonstrates Southeast Asian contexts' theoretical significance beyond empirical richness. Indonesian tenure conflicts combining customary governance, postcolonial sovereignty politics, and archipelagic diversity generated unique insights (adat-state coordination, indigenous territorial framings, intra-national variation as natural experiment) impossible to derive from African or Latin American cases alone, suggesting theoretical frameworks require continuous refinement through geographical expansion rather than assuming universality from limited regional samples.

#### **Conclusion: From Paradox to Prediction through Comparative Analysis**

The conflict-conservation paradox ecosystem recovery in Sahel pastoral conflicts, catastrophic degradation in Amazon extractive conflicts, and puzzling intra-national variation in Indonesian tenure conflicts no longer constitutes analytical mystery. Through systematic three-case comparative analysis spanning Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia, combined with Indonesian intra-national comparison providing quasi-experimental causal leverage, this research transforms paradox into prediction. Natural resource conflicts constitute neither inevitable environmental disasters nor accidental conservation opportunities. Rather, they represent conditional scenarios whose outcomes depend systematically on institutional threshold configuration (enforcement density, community participation, infrastructure coverage), conflict typology (mobile vs. extractive vs. tenure), and political communication effectiveness (narrative resonance, coalition mobilization, hegemonic discourse). By combining quantitative threshold specification validated across continents (enforcement >2.8, participation >65%, infrastructure <20%, resonance >4.0), state capacity paradox understanding (weak capacity's divergent effects across conflict types), communication mediation recognition (path coefficient 0.62 operating universally), and intra-national variation analysis (Indonesian natural experiment isolating communication causality), the Institutional Threshold Configuration Framework provides actionable blueprint for precision conservation interventions. As Indonesia confronts accelerating deforestation crisis (1.2 million hectares annually) threatening customary forests, biodiversity hotspots, and climate commitments, this framework's ability to convert conflict-conservation knowledge from description to prediction offers essential guidance. The East Kalimantan success model adat territorial defense framing achieving 4.3 resonance, 78% community participation, and 41% deforestation reduction despite moderate enforcement capacity demonstrates pathway toward sustainable conservation reconciling indigenous rights, development aspirations, and environmental protection. Conversely, Papua failure state environmentalist framing scoring 2.1 resonance, 34% participation, and 67% deforestation increase despite higher enforcement capacity illustrates catastrophic consequences of communication neglect. The choice between ecosystem recovery

and degradation resides not in conflict's presence or absence, nor in state strength alone, but in society's capacity to configure institutions crossing critical thresholds at decisive intervention moments while ensuring political communication resonates with communities' cultural schemas and livelihood realities. For Indonesia and globally, this framework transforms conflict from threat into conditional opportunity, requiring strategic institutional design, communication primacy, and respect for indigenous governance to realize conservation potential amid resource pressures and political contestation.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, W. M., Aveling, R., Brockington, D., Dickson, B., Elliott, J., Hutton, J., Roe, D., Vira, B., & Wolmer, W. (2004). Biodiversity conservation and the eradication of poverty. *Science*, 306(5699), 1146-1149.
- Barnett, J., & Adger, W. N. (2007). Climate change, human security and violent conflict. *Political Geography*, 26(6), 639-655.
- Buhaug, H., & Rød, J. K. (2006). Local determinants of African civil wars, 1970-2001. *Political Geography*, 25(3), 315-335.
- Büscher, B., & Fletcher, R. (2020). *The Conservation Revolution: Radical Ideas for Saving Nature beyond the Anthropocene*. (First Edit). Verso Books.
- Cederman, L. E., Wimmer, A., & Min, B. (2010). Why do ethnic groups rebel? New data and analysis. *World Politics*, 62(1), 87-119.
- Collier, P., & Hoeffler, A. (2004). Greed and grievance in civil war. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 56(4), 563-595.
- Daskin, J. H., & Pringle, R. M. (2018). Warfare and wildlife declines in Africa's protected areas. *Nature*, 553(7688), 328-332.
- Gaynor, K. M., Fiorella, K. J., Gregory, G. H., Kurz, D. J., Seto, K. L., Withey, L. S., & Brashares, J. S. (2016). War and wildlife: linking armed conflict to conservation. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 14(10), 533-542.
- Hanson, T., Brooks, T. M., Da Fonseca, G. A., Hoffmann, M., Lamoreux, J. F., Machlis, G., Mittermeier, C. G., Mittermeier, R. A., & Pilgrim, J. D. (2009). Warfare in biodiversity hotspots. *Conservation Biology*, 23(3), 578-587.
- Homer-Dixon, T. (1999). *Environment, Scarcity, and Violence*. Princeton University Press.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Verso.
- Li, T. M. (2014). *Land's end: Capitalist relations on an indigenous frontier*. Duke University Press.
- Mahoney, J., & Goertz, G. (2012). A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research. *Political Analysis*, 20(3), 227-249.
- McCarthy, J. F., & Cramb, R. A. (2009). Policy narratives, landholder engagement, and oil palm expansion on the Malaysian and Indonesian frontiers. *Geographical Journal*, 175(2), 112-123.
- Ministry of Environment and Forestry, I. (2025). *National Deforestation Report 2025*. KLHK.
- Nepstad, D., McGrath, D., Stickler, C., Alencar, A., Azevedo, A., Swette, B., Bezerra, T., DiGiano, M., Shimada, J., Seroa da Motta, R., Armijo, E., Castello, L., Brando, P., Hansen, M. C., McGrath-Horn, M., Carvalho, O., & Hess, L. (2014). Slowing Amazon deforestation through public policy and interventions in beef and soy supply chains. *Science*, 344(6188), 1118-1123.
- Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. *Science*, 325(5939), 419-422.
- Peluso, N. L., & Watts, M. (2001). *Violent Environments*. Cornell University Press.

- Ragin, C. C. (2008). *Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond*. University of Chicago Press.
- Robbins, P. (2012). *Political ecology: A critical introduction*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ross, M. L. (2015). What have we learned about the resource curse?. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18, 239-259.
- Scheffer, M., Carpenter, S., Foley, J. A., Folke, C., & Walker, B. (2001). Catastrophic shifts in ecosystems. *Nature*, 413(6856), 591-596.
- Soifer, H. D. (2008). State infrastructural power: Approaches to conceptualization and measurement. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 43(3-4), 231-251.
- Tsing, A. L. (2005). *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton University Press.

**Data Availability Statement:** The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

**Publisher's Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.



**Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors. This is a fully open-access article distributed under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).