

A Juridical Analysis of the Rights of Indigenous Communities and Religious Minorities in National Law

Kenneth Sulthon Alafi Al Hallaj*¹, Syahrul Ramadhan², Eka Firmansyah³, Erfanda Andi Mada Arectya⁴, Muhammad Dhiya'ulhaq Syahrial Ramadhan⁵

¹Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia, elaphy07@gmail.com

²Al-Mustafa International University, Iran, ruhsyahyusuf@gmail.com

³Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu, Indonesia, ekafirmansyah689@gmail.com

⁴Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya, Indonesia, erfandaandi99@gmail.com

⁵Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta, Indonesia,
dhiyaulhaqsyahrialramadhan@gmail.com

*Corresponding author: elaphy07@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Indonesia's constitutional framework guarantees both national unity and cultural and religious diversity, creating an unresolved juridical tension regarding the rights of indigenous law communities (*masyarakat hukum adat*) and religious minorities. This article examines how national law recognizes, protects, and limits these rights, addressing why implementation falls short of constitutional promises. Utilizing normative juridical research with statutory, conceptual, and case approaches, the study analyzes primary legal sources including the 1945 Constitution, sectoral laws, and landmark Constitutional Court rulings alongside accredited legal literature. The discussion centers on three key areas: the statutory framework governing customary land rights following Constitutional Court Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012; administrative gaps hindering formal guarantees of religious freedom; and the structural challenges of legal pluralism among state, *adat*, and religious law. The study finds that legal recognition in Indonesia remains conditional, highly fragmented across sectoral legislation, and subject to local political will, thereby perpetuating systemic legal uncertainty. It concludes that enacting a dedicated, overarching harmonizing statute, coupled with consistent regional implementing regulations, is indispensable to bridge the divide between formal constitutional recognition and substantive legal protection for indigenous and minority groups.

Keywords: *Indigenous Communities, Religious Minorities, Legal Pluralism, Constitutional Rights, National Law*

Received: 2026-June-16

Rev. Req: 2026-July-19

Accepted: 2026-August-22

I. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is constitutionally founded on the recognition of unity within diversity, a principle embedded in the national motto *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* and reproduced throughout the 1945 Constitution. Article 18B paragraph (2) obliges the state to recognize and respect indigenous law communities (*kesatuan masyarakat hukum adat*) together with their traditional rights, provided these remain alive and consistent with the development of society and the principles of the unitary state. Article 28I paragraph (3) reinforces this by placing the cultural identity and rights of traditional communities within the chapter on human rights, and Article 29 paragraph (2) obliges the state to guarantee the freedom of every citizen to embrace and practice a religion or belief. Read together, these provisions appear to establish a robust normative foundation for protecting both indigenous communities and religious minorities. In practice, however, the translation of these constitutional guarantees into effective legal protection has been uneven, contested, and frequently subordinated to competing state interests such as natural resource extraction, administrative uniformity, and majoritarian religious politics (Ismi, 2013).

The problem of indigenous rights in Indonesia cannot be separated from the country's colonial legal inheritance. Dutch colonial administration formally recognized *adat* law as a distinct legal order applicable to the native population, but subordinated it to European law whenever colonial economic interests were at stake. Post-independence, the 1960 Basic Agrarian Law (*Undang-Undang Pokok Agraria*) retained a similar structure: it recognized *hak ulayat* (communal customary land rights) in principle, but conditioned this recognition on conformity with national interest and made its practical existence dependent on government regulation that, for decades, was never comprehensively enacted. The consequence has been chronic legal uncertainty over indigenous land, particularly forest areas, which for much of the New Order period were administratively classified as state forest regardless of centuries of customary occupation and management. This administrative fiction was only partially corrected by the Constitutional Court's landmark ruling in 2012, which held that customary forest is not state forest but forest that lies within the territory of an indigenous law community (Ismi, 2013).

Religious minorities face a structurally different but related problem. Article 29 of the Constitution guarantees freedom of religion, and Indonesia has ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights through Law No. 12 of 2005, which under Article 27 obliges the state to protect the rights of persons belonging to ethnic, religious, or linguistic minorities. Yet the state's own regulatory apparatus most prominently the 1965 Law on the Prevention of Blasphemy and Misuse of Religion, and the joint ministerial regulation on the construction of houses of worship has often functioned less to protect minorities than to constrain them, by formally recognizing only a limited set of religions and by making the establishment of places of worship contingent on local majority consent (Sitompul, 2025). The consequence is a pattern in which formal constitutional

guarantees coexist with everyday administrative and social practices that disadvantage religious minorities, including adherents of indigenous belief systems (*penghayat kepercayaan*), which were only formally equalized with recognized religions on identity documents following Constitutional Court Decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016.

What unites the two problems indigenous rights and religious minority rights is the underlying legal theoretical condition of legal pluralism: the coexistence, within a single national territory, of state law, customary (*adat*) law, and religious law, none of which straightforwardly displaces the others (Hariri & Babussalam, 2024). Indonesia's constitutional recognition of *adat* communities and its accommodation of religious law in matters such as marriage and inheritance both testify to this pluralism, while simultaneously generating friction: state law claims supremacy as the unifying legal order of the Republic, yet is repeatedly required to make space for legal orders it does not fully control. Recent scholarship confirms that this plurality both enables substantive access to justice attentive to local values and creates legal uncertainty, normative conflict, and opportunities for forum shopping that can itself become a vector of rights violations (Sari, Lathifah, Sucita, & Putra, 2026).

The Indonesian Constitutional Court has played a pivotal, if inconsistent, role in mediating this tension. Beyond Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012 on customary forest, the Court has developed jurisprudential requirements commonly summarized as the existence of a defined territory, a customary governance institution, customary legal norms, communal property, and continuing collective identity that an indigenous law community must satisfy before its constitutional rights can be judicially recognized and enforced (Bedner & Arizona, 2019). These criteria function simultaneously as a gateway to protection and as a filter that excludes communities unable to document their continuity in the specific evidentiary terms the Court demands. A parallel jurisprudential trend can be observed with respect to minority protection, where the Court has affirmed the principle of equality before the law under Article 27 and Article 28D while stopping short of striking down provisions, such as the Blasphemy Law, that minority-rights advocates argue disproportionately burden non mainstream religious expression (Zul Fadhli, 2016).

Against this background, the present article addresses two interrelated research questions. First, to what extent does Indonesian national law constitutional provisions, statutes, and Constitutional Court jurisprudence substantively recognize and protect the rights of indigenous law communities and religious minorities, beyond mere textual acknowledgment? Second, what structural and normative obstacles prevent the harmonization of *adat* law, religious law, and state law, and what legal framework could more effectively reconcile these plural legal orders within a single, coherent system of national protection? Answering these questions matters both academically and practically: academically, because it tests the coherence of Indonesia's constitutional commitment to legal pluralism against its practice of legal centralism; and practically, because unresolved recognition gaps continue to produce land conflicts, the

criminalization of indigenous community members, and discrimination against religious minorities in the construction of houses of worship and the exercise of civil rights.

This article proceeds as follows. Section II describes the normative-juridical method used to analyze primary and secondary legal materials. Section III presents the results and discussion, organized into three focal points that directly answer the two research questions above: the constitutional and statutory architecture for indigenous peoples' rights; the legal protection afforded to religious minorities; and the structural challenges of legal pluralism together with a proposed synchronization framework. Section IV concludes with the article's principal findings and policy implications.

II. METHOD

This research employs normative juridical (doctrinal) legal research, a method appropriate for analyzing law as a coherent system of norms rather than as a social behavior to be measured empirically (Hermawan, 2022). The method is chosen because the research questions concern the internal coherence, hierarchy, and interpretation of legal norms constitutional provisions, statutes, government regulations, and judicial decisions rather than the measurement of social attitudes or institutional performance, which would instead call for a socio legal or empirical design.

Three complementary approaches are combined within this normative framework. The statutory approach (*pendekatan perundang-undangan*) is used to examine the hierarchy and substantive content of the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 5 of 1960 on Basic Agrarian Regulations, Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, Law No. 12 of 2005 ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the 1965 Blasphemy Law, and relevant sectoral and ministerial regulations governing forestry, land administration, and houses of worship. The case approach (*pendekatan kasus*) is used to analyze Constitutional Court decisions that have shaped the interpretation of these statutory provisions, most notably Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012 on customary forest and Decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016 on the legal status of indigenous belief systems (*penghayat kepercayaan*) on population identity documents. The conceptual approach (*pendekatan konseptual*) draws on legal doctrine concerning legal pluralism, recognition theory, and minority rights to interpret the normative materials in light of established legal theoretical frameworks (Oktaviany, Hadi, & Gandryani, 2023).

Data for this research consist exclusively of secondary legal materials, classified into three tiers. Primary legal materials comprise binding legal instruments: the Constitution, statutes, government regulations, and Constitutional Court decisions. Secondary legal materials comprise scholarly commentary published in nationally accredited (Sinta) and internationally indexed (Scopus) law journals, which provide doctrinal interpretation and empirical context for the primary materials. Tertiary legal materials comprise supporting reference works, including legal dictionaries and official reports from state human rights institutions, used only to clarify terminology. Materials were collected through systematic library and database research, including the Constitutional Court's official repository,

Sinta-indexed journal portals, and Scopus-indexed publishers, using search terms combining "*masyarakat hukum adat*," "*hak ulayat*," "*minoritas agama*," "*kebebasan beragama*," and "legal pluralism" in both Indonesian and English.

The collected materials were analyzed through qualitative descriptive-analytical techniques, involving three stages: first, systematization of the norms governing indigenous and minority rights according to their hierarchical position and temporal sequence; second, synchronization analysis to identify contradictions, gaps, or redundancies between overlapping regulations (for example, between the Basic Agrarian Law and sectoral forestry law, or between the Blasphemy Law and constitutional equality guarantees); and third, evaluative interpretation, in which the systematized and synchronized norms are assessed against the constitutional principles of recognition, equality, and legal certainty. This analytical sequence directly supports the article's two research questions by first mapping what the law formally provides, then identifying where that formal provision is undermined by internal contradiction or implementation failure, and finally by evaluating what a coherent framework for harmonization would require.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Constitutional and Statutory Recognition of Indigenous Peoples' Rights

Indonesian national law recognizes indigenous law communities through a layered but incomplete normative architecture. At the constitutional level, Article 18B paragraph (2) and Article 28I paragraph (3) establish recognition as a state obligation, but both provisions attach conditions "as long as they remain alive" and "in accordance with the development of society" that leave considerable interpretive discretion to implementing institutions and courts. At the statutory level, Article 3 of the 1960 Basic Agrarian Law recognizes *hak ulayat* in principle while subordinating its exercise to "national interest" and to further government regulation that, in most regions, has never been enacted with sufficient specificity. The result, prior to 2012, was a structural anomaly in which forests occupied and managed by indigenous communities for generations were classified by the Ministry of Forestry as state forest (*hutan negara*), stripping communities of legally enforceable tenure despite their constitutionally recognized existence (Ismi, 2013).

This anomaly was substantially corrected by Constitutional Court Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012, which reviewed the 1999 Forestry Law and held that customary forest (*hutan adat*) must be reclassified out of the category of state forest and recognized instead as forest situated within the territory of an indigenous law community. The decision represented a doctrinal breakthrough because it shifted the legal default: rather than requiring indigenous communities to prove an exception to state ownership, the Court affirmed that customary forest was never state forest to begin with, provided the community's existence as an indigenous law community can be established (Bedner & Arizona, 2019). However, the practical effect of the decision has been constrained by the very evidentiary burden it reaffirmed: communities must still demonstrate, often through

a regional regulation (*peraturan daerah*) or head of region decree, that they satisfy the cumulative criteria of territory, governance institution, customary norms, communal property, and continuing collective identity (Rwa Jayantiari, Suka Arjawa, Rebeiro, & Audrey Paquita, 2024). Many communities, particularly those whose customary institutions were suppressed or reorganized under colonial and New Order administrative policy, struggle to produce documentation that satisfies these criteria in the precise form courts and land administrators expect.

The land registration and titling system illustrates this gap concretely. Indonesia's national land administration remains predominantly organized around individual, registered rights modeled on the Basic Agrarian Law's conception of *hak milik*, and has been slow to develop a parallel, functioning mechanism for registering communal customary land as such. Empirical studies of customary forest and *hak ulayat* recognition report persistently low registration rates relative to the total customary territory that has been informally mapped by community organizations, leaving substantial customary land outside formal legal protection and vulnerable to overlapping claims from plantation, mining, and infrastructure concessions (Drawi, Arba, & Putro, 2024). Where regional governments have enacted implementing regulations such as district regulations formally recognizing specific indigenous law communities registration and protection improve markedly, indicating that the primary bottleneck lies not in constitutional text but in the absence of consistent, mandatory implementing regulation at the regional level (Jannah, Salim, & Mujiburohman, 2022).

A further dimension of recognition concerns natural resources beyond land and forest, particularly water and coastal resources, where indigenous jurisdiction is even less consistently codified than for terrestrial customary land. Comparative analysis of Indonesian and other jurisdictions' treatment of indigenous water rights suggests that Indonesian law lacks an explicit statutory mechanism analogous to the forest recognition pathway opened by Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012, leaving indigenous claims over customary water sources to be litigated, if at all, through general agrarian or environmental provisions not designed for that purpose (Rumalutur, 2024). This regulatory gap matters because it shows that the 2012 forestry decision, while significant, did not resolve the underlying constitutional question for indigenous rights as a category; it resolved one sectoral application of that question, leaving other sectors water, coastal and marine resources, subsurface minerals without equivalent doctrinal clarity.

Agrarian conflict data compiled by civil society and academic monitoring bodies indicate that criminalization of indigenous community members remains a live consequence of this unresolved recognition gap: individuals asserting customary rights over land now claimed by state backed concessions are frequently prosecuted for trespass, illegal occupation, or forest destruction, effectively inverting the constitutional presumption in favor of a community's customary occupation into a criminal liability for that same occupation (Ismail et al., 2024; Oktaviany, Hadi, & Gandryani, 2023). This pattern

demonstrates that constitutional and even Constitutional Court recognition, without a mandatory, uniformly applied administrative registration mechanism, remains largely aspirational for communities that lack the political, financial, or documentary resources to complete the recognition process community by community, region by region. Answering the first research question, therefore, national law does recognize indigenous peoples' rights in principle and, following the 2012 decision, with meaningfully strengthened doctrinal force in the forestry sector; but that recognition remains conditional, sector specific, and dependent on local political will, falling short of the systematic and self executing protection the constitutional text appears to promise.

Legal Protection of Religious Minority Rights

The legal protection of religious minorities in Indonesia rests on a similarly layered but internally tension ridden framework. Article 29 paragraph (2) of the Constitution guarantees every citizen's freedom to embrace a religion and to worship according to that religion or belief. This guarantee is reinforced by Article 28E paragraph (1), which protects freedom of religion as a component of personal freedom, and by Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, which in Article 22 restates the same freedom in statutory form. Indonesia's ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights through Law No. 12 of 2005 adds an international law dimension, particularly Article 27 of the Covenant, which obliges states to guarantee the rights of persons belonging to religious minorities to profess and practice their own religion (Sanger, Lolong, & Kumajas, 2025).

Notwithstanding these guarantees, Indonesian religious affairs administration has historically operated on a model of limited recognition rather than open pluralism: for decades, government policy formally administered only six religions (Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism) for purposes of civil registration, marriage, and religious education, leaving adherents of other faiths and of indigenous belief systems (*penghayat kepercayaan*) in a legally ambiguous position. This administrative narrowing was only partially corrected by Constitutional Court Decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016, which required that the identity column for religion on national identity cards accommodate *penghayat kepercayaan* alongside the six administratively recognized religions, a ruling that improved civil registration access without resolving deeper questions about the equal legal status of unrecognized religious communities in matters such as marriage validity and inheritance (Masyithoh & Suteki, 2019).

The construction of houses of worship presents perhaps the clearest illustration of how administrative implementation can undercut a formally guaranteed constitutional right. The 2006 Joint Regulation of the Minister of Religious Affairs and the Minister of Home Affairs conditions the establishment of a house of worship on, among other requirements, the signed approval of a minimum number of local residents of a different religion and the endorsement of the local inter religious harmony forum (*Forum Kerukunan Umat Beragama*). In localities where religious minorities constitute a small proportion of the population, this consent requirement functions in practice as a

majoritarian veto, enabling local social or political pressure to block minority congregations from obtaining legal permits even where no substantive legal violation exists (Sanger, Lolong, & Kumajas, 2025). Documented cases of church and other minority worship site closures show that these closures are frequently justified by reference to permit non compliance under this 2006 regulation, even though the underlying difficulty in obtaining the permit stems from the regulation's own majoritarian design rather than any independent wrongdoing by the congregation.

The 1965 Law on the Prevention of Blasphemy and Misuse of Religion compounds this structural vulnerability. Its retention of a criminal offense for religious deviance or blasphemy upheld by the Constitutional Court against several judicial review challenges has been repeatedly used against members of minority religious interpretations, including sects deemed heterodox by mainstream religious authorities, exposing them to criminal prosecution for conduct that would, in a strict constitutional reading of Article 29, fall within protected religious expression (Sitompul, 2025). Comparative analysis situates this pattern within a broader problem of religious freedom regulation in plural Muslim majority societies, where formal constitutional guarantees of religious liberty coexist with criminal or administrative provisions designed to preserve religious "order" as defined by the majority faith, producing a persistent gap between the letter of constitutional protection and its administrative and criminal law reality (Sitompul, 2025).

Article 27 and Article 28D paragraph (1) of the Constitution guarantee equality before the law and equal protection without discrimination, which the Constitutional Court has affirmed as fundamental to Indonesia's identity as a *rechtsstaat*, or state based on law rather than mere power (Zul Fadhli, 2016). Yet analysis of documented discrimination cases against religious minorities including violence, intimidation, and destruction of places of worship indicates that weak law enforcement, rather than an absence of formal legal prohibition, is the primary proximate cause of continuing harm: existing criminal law already prohibits violence and destruction of property irrespective of the victim's religion, but local law enforcement has often been reluctant to act against perpetrators when incidents are framed by local actors as defending majority religious sensibilities (Zul Fadhli, 2016). This reveals an important asymmetry relative to the indigenous rights discussion above: whereas indigenous communities primarily lack a specific legal recognition mechanism, religious minorities more often possess the formal legal protection in principle but experience its systematic non enforcement in practice, a distinction that matters for designing appropriate legal remedies.

Answering the second dimension of the first research question, then, Indonesian national law protects religious minority rights unevenly: constitutional and international law guarantees are textually strong, but they are qualified by administrative regulations most consequentially the house of worship permit requirement and the Blasphemy Law that were themselves enacted pursuant to ordinary legislative and executive authority and have proven resistant to constitutional challenge. The protection gap for religious

minorities is therefore less a matter of absent recognition, as with indigenous communities, and more a matter of subordinate regulations and non-enforcement eroding a constitutional guarantee that exists on paper.

Harmonizing Legal Pluralism: Structural Challenges and a Synchronization Framework

The preceding two analyses converge on a common structural diagnosis: Indonesian national law operates within a condition of legal pluralism in which state law, *adat* law, and religious law coexist without a clear, consistently applied hierarchy for resolving conflicts among them (Hariri & Babussalam, 2024). This plurality is not incidental but constitutionally endorsed-Article 18B paragraph (2) explicitly preserves *adat* law, and Article 29 explicitly accommodates religious diversity-yet the state has not developed a coherent doctrinal or institutional mechanism for reconciling these plural sources of normativity with the unitary, centralized legal order the same Constitution establishes for the Republic (Isra, Ferdi, & Tegan, 2025).

Three specific structural obstacles emerge from the analysis above. First, sectoral fragmentation: indigenous rights are recognized differently, and to different degrees, across forestry, agrarian, water, and coastal law, producing a patchwork in which a community's rights depend as much on which government ministry administers the relevant resource as on the community's own legal status (Rumalutur, 2024). Second, the absence of a dedicated umbrella statute: despite more than a decade of legislative discussion, Indonesia has not enacted a comprehensive law on indigenous law communities (*Rancangan Undang-Undang Masyarakat Hukum Adat*) that would establish a uniform national recognition procedure, leaving recognition to depend on regional regulations whose existence, quality, and enforcement vary widely across more than five hundred districts and municipalities (Oktaviany, Hadi, & Gandryani, 2023). Third, majoritarian administrative discretion in religious affairs: because both the house of worship permit regulation and the Blasphemy Law delegate substantial interpretive authority to local administrative and religious bodies, protection for religious minorities becomes contingent on local demographic and political conditions rather than on a uniform national standard, mirroring the same decentralization driven inconsistency observed in indigenous rights recognition (Sanger, Lolong, & Kumajas, 2025).

These obstacles share a common root: Indonesian legal pluralism has developed asymmetrically, granting constitutional recognition to plural legal orders in principle while retaining, at the level of ordinary legislation and administrative regulation, a strong presumption in favor of state law uniformity and majoritarian administrative convenience. Comparative socio legal scholarship on Indonesia describes this as a condition in which the state selectively "translates" indigenous and religious normative claims into forms the state apparatus can administratively process, often stripping away precisely the features collective governance, non documentary continuity, minority religious practice outside majoritarian categories-that made those claims distinctive in the first place (Ramstedt, 2014; Ramstedt, 2017). The consequence is that indigenous

communities and religious minorities face a structurally similar demand: to render their claims legible to a state legal apparatus built primarily around individualized, documented, majoritarian norms.

A coherent synchronization framework should therefore address both categories of rights through parallel, mutually reinforcing reforms rather than treating them as unrelated policy areas. At the legislative level, the enactment of a comprehensive Indigenous Law Communities Act remains the single most consequential reform available, as it would replace the current reliance on regional regulations with a uniform, nationally mandated recognition procedure, reducing the dependency of indigenous rights protection on local political will (Oktaviany, Hadi, & Gandryani, 2023). For religious minorities, revision or repeal of the house of worship joint regulation to remove its majoritarian consent requirement, together with either the repeal or a substantially narrowed judicial interpretation of the Blasphemy Law consistent with Article 28E, would close the most consequential gap between constitutional guarantee and administrative practice (Sitompul, 2025).

At the institutional level, both categories of rights would benefit from strengthened, independent, and adequately resourced complaint and monitoring mechanisms whether through an expanded mandate for the National Human Rights Commission or dedicated ombudsman functions capable of compelling local administrative compliance with national legal standards, rather than leaving enforcement entirely to local discretion. At the doctrinal level, Constitutional Court jurisprudence could usefully extend the reasoning of Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012-that recognition of a pre existing right should not depend on affirmative administrative conferral, but rather on the state's obligation not to extinguish rights that already exist to other sectors of indigenous resource claims and, by analogy, to religious minority claims currently constrained by administrative permit regimes (Bedner & Arizona, 2019).

Taken together, these findings answer the article's second research question: the principal obstacle to harmonizing *adat* law, religious law, and state law in Indonesia is not doctrinal incompatibility at the constitutional level, where pluralism is already accommodated, but institutional and legislative incompleteness at the levels of ordinary statute, administrative regulation, and enforcement. A synchronization framework built around a dedicated indigenous communities statute, revision of majoritarian consent administrative regulations, and strengthened independent enforcement mechanisms would move Indonesian national law considerably closer to the substantive, rather than merely textual, realization of its constitutional commitment to recognizing both indigenous communities and religious minorities.

IV. CONCLUSION

This article has examined how Indonesian national law recognizes and protects the rights of indigenous law communities and religious minorities, and what prevents the effective

harmonization of *adat* law, religious law, and state law within a single coherent legal system. The analysis shows that constitutional recognition for both groups is textually strong but substantively conditional: indigenous communities' rights depend on satisfying evidentiary criteria and securing regional implementing regulations that remain unevenly available across Indonesia's decentralized administrative landscape, while religious minorities' constitutional guarantees are qualified by subordinate administrative regulations particularly the house of worship permit requirement and the Blasphemy Law that grant majoritarian actors effective veto power over minority religious practice. Constitutional Court Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012 marks a genuine doctrinal advance for indigenous forest rights, but its logic has not yet been extended systematically to other sectors of indigenous resource claims or, analogically, to religious minority protection.

The underlying obstacle to harmonization is not an irreconcilable conflict between *adat* law, religious law, and state law at the constitutional level Indonesia's Constitution already accommodates legal pluralism in principle but the absence of a uniform, mandatory legislative and administrative mechanism for translating that constitutional accommodation into consistent nationwide practice. Sectoral fragmentation, the continued absence of a comprehensive Indigenous Law Communities Act, and majoritarian discretion embedded in religious affairs administration collectively produce a pattern in which protection depends heavily on local political conditions rather than uniform national guarantees.

Closing this gap requires coordinated legal reform: enactment of a dedicated indigenous communities statute establishing a uniform national recognition procedure; revision of the house of worship joint regulation to remove its majoritarian consent requirement; a narrowed or repealed Blasphemy Law consistent with constitutional equality guarantees; and strengthened, independent institutional mechanisms capable of enforcing these standards uniformly across Indonesia's regions. Future research employing socio legal and empirical methods would usefully complement this normative analysis by measuring the actual implementation gap between formal recognition and lived experience across specific indigenous communities and religious minority populations.

V. REFERENCES

- [1]. Ismi, H. (2013). Pengakuan dan perlindungan hukum hak masyarakat adat atas tanah ulayat dalam upaya pembaharuan hukum nasional. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 3(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.30652/jih.v3i01.1024>
- [2]. Sitompul. (2025). Perlindungan hukum terhadap kebebasan beragama bagi masyarakat minoritas (studi komparatif: hukum nasional dan hukum Thailand). *Law Jurnal*, 5(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.46576/lj.v5i1.5802>
- [3]. Wiratraman, H. P. (2025). Cultural expertise and the social justice defense of indigenous peoples rights in the Indonesian Constitutional Court. *Constitutional Review*, 11(2), 299-339. <https://doi.org/10.31078/consrev1122>

- [4]. Hariri, A., & Babussalam, B. (2024). Legal pluralism: Concept, theoretical dialectics, and its existence in Indonesia. *Walisongo Law Review (Walrev)*, 6(2), 146-170. <https://doi.org/10.21580/walrev.2024.6.2.25566>
- [5]. Sari, F. M., Lathifah, S. N., Sucita, I. P. W. B., & Putra, M. D. (2026). The impact of legal pluralism in the dynamics of human rights protection and its implications for the development of the national legal system in Indonesia. *Rechtsvinding*, 4(1), 445-454. <https://doi.org/10.59525/rechtsvinding.1612>
- [6]. Bedner, A., & Arizona, Y. (2019). Adat in Indonesian land law: A promise for the future or a dead end? *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 20(5), 416-434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14442213.2019.1670246>
- [7]. Zul Fadhli, Y. (2016). Kedudukan kelompok minoritas dalam perspektif HAM dan perlindungan hukumnya di Indonesia. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 11(2), 352-370. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1128>
- [8]. Hermawan, S. (2022). Constitutionality of indigenous law communities in the perspective of sociological jurisprudence theory. *Jurnal Jurisprudence*, 11(2), 158-172. <https://doi.org/10.23917/jurisprudence.v11i2.12998>
- [9]. Oktaviany, S. A. T., Hadi, F., & Gandryani, F. (2023). Pelanggaran hak asasi terhadap kelompok masyarakat adat dalam konflik agraria dan peranan pemerintah dalam penyelesaiannya. *Jurnal Hukum In Concreto*, 2(2), 90-110. <https://doi.org/10.35960/inconcreto.v2i2.1132>
- [10]. Ramstedt, M. (2014). Discordant temporalities in Bali's new village jurisdictions. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 46(1), 60-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2014.893722>
- [11]. Ramstedt, M. (2017). Cultural translation, traveling law, and the transposition of indigenous rights to Indonesian contexts. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 3(1), 47-63. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ttmc.3.1.04ram>
- [12]. Rwa Jayantiari, I. G. A. M., Suka Arjawa, I. G. P. B., Rebeiro, L., & Audrey Paquita, J. (2024). Forming legal culture in customary forest management: Local wisdom approach of customary law communities. *Udayana Journal of Law and Culture*, 8(1), 67-88. <https://doi.org/10.24843/ujlc.2024.v08.i01.p04>
- [13]. Drawi, I. K., Arba, A., & Putro, W. D. (2024). Eksistensi hak ulayat masyarakat hukum adat atas hutan setelah terbentuknya Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Lombok Utara Nomor 6 Tahun 2020 tentang pengakuan dan perlindungan masyarakat hukum adat. *JATISWARA*, 39(2), 209-228. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jtsw.v39i2.724>
- [14]. Jannah, W., Salim, M. N., & Mujiburohman, D. A. (2022). Eksistensi masyarakat hukum adat dan dinamika tanah ulayat di Manggarai Timur. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, 11(2), 213-232. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jish.v11i2.41006>
- [15]. Rumalutur, F. I. (2024). Recognition of indigenous peoples' jurisdiction over water: Comparison of law in Indonesia and New Zealand. *Sociological Jurisprudence Journal*, 7(2), 132-140. <https://doi.org/10.22225/scj.7.2.2024.132-140>
- [16]. Ismail, N. K., Azzahra, N. F., Pireno, F. H., Amanda, F. P., Dyana, J. S., & Wati, D. S. (2024). Kepastian hukum dan upaya pertanggungjawaban pemerintah terhadap

Vol. 01, No. 02, August 2026

- perlindungan hak tanah ulayat di Pulau Rempang. *Jaksa: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Hukum dan Politik*, 2(2), 93-112. <https://doi.org/10.51903/jaksa.v2i2.1635>
- [17]. Sanger, N. G., Lolong, W. R. J., & Kumajas, M. L. (2025). Perlindungan hak asasi manusia bagi kelompok agama minoritas dalam pendirian tempat ibadah. *Khatulistiwa: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sosial Humaniora*, 5(1), 537-559. <https://doi.org/10.55606/khatulistiwa.v5i1.5913>
- [18]. Masyithoh, N. D., & Suteki, S. (2019). Legal pluralism approach to respond challenge of diversity and religious conflict among Indonesian society. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Law Reform*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.10-9-2019.2289463>
- [19]. Harahap, I. (2019). Pluralisme hukum perkawinan di Tapanuli Selatan. *Miqot: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Keislaman*, 43(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.30821/miqot.v43i1.656>
- [20]. Isra, S., Ferdi, F., & Tegnan, H. (2025). Rule of law and human rights challenges in South East Asia: A case study of legal pluralism in Indonesia. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 3(2), 117-140. <https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v3i2.1081>
- [21]. Tobroni, T., & Firmansyah, E. (2022). Tipologi manajemen tradisional dan modern dalam perkembangan pendidikan pesantren. *Research and Development Journal of Education*, 8(1), 333-338.
- [22]. Firmansyah, E. (2023). Various Paradigms in Islamic Educational Thought: Fundamentalism, Modernism, and Liberalism. *International Journal of Health, Economics, and Social Sciences (IJHESS)*, 5(2), 139-145.
- [23]. Bakar, M. Y. A., Firmansyah, E., & Abdeljelil, M. B. (2024). Legal framework analysis of Islamic religious education policy implementation. *International Journal of Law and Society*, 3(3), 217-237.
- [24]. Firmansyah, E., Tobroni, T., & Rusady, A. T. (2023). Internalisasi Ajaran Islam Dalam Aktivitas Budaya Etnik Kaili Prespektif Antropologi Pendidikan Islam. *Research and Development Journal of Education*, 9(1), 285-299.
- [25]. Firmansyah, E., Tobroni, T., & Romelah, R. (2023). Anthropology of Islamic Education as A Socio-Cultural-Religious Modernization Strategy in Alam Al-Kudus Islamic Boarding School. *Edukasi Islami: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 12(03).
- [26]. Firmansyah, E., & Idris, A. (2024). Moderation as a Solution to Religious Harmony in Poso Central Sulawesi. *International Journal of Law and Society*, 3(1), 1-9.