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The conventional definition of development sees it as interventions geared towards the improvement of people’s welfare. In contrast to this conceptualisation, this presentation will argue that development is a process of exclusion that brings marginalization and creates poverty. In this regard, the paper will provide an example of development in Jambi that has excluded the Orang Rimba from their place of life and livelihoods. The development, which in this context took the form of logging and forest conversion to plantation, not only threatened the survival of the Orang Rimba due to the significant decrease of natural resources upon which the people depended, but also the loss of space where they can express or practice their culture as a system of ideas. After describing some tangible impacts of this exclusion in regard to the Orang Rimba, to
confirm that the condition was really the impact of development, the paper will look at the condition of Orang Baduy who have --to some degree-- rejected such development. The rejection of development by the Orang Baduy has resulted in a relative socio-cultural integrity in the community. Finally, the presentation will close with a discussion of some scenarios of development and its impact upon traditional communities.
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**How Development and Conservation Interventions May Both Exacerbate and Mitigate Marginality: Shifting Power Relations on the Lindu Plain, Central Sulawesi**
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Among the development interventions of the Indonesian government briefly following independence was a program of ‘seeding’ numerous lakes across Indonesia with the spawn of Mozambique tilapia (*Oreochromis mossambicus*), i.e. *mujair* or *nila*). This paper traces the chain of consequences across decades of this fish’s introduction in Lake Lindu in highland Central Sulawesi beginning in 1951. Initially, this intervention did not provide the enhanced livelihood opportunities to the Indigenous Lindu people intended by the government. Instead, Bugis migrants, IDPs from sectarian conflict in South and Central Sulawesi, used gill nets to intensify harvesting of the species and established a fish marketing system to the Palu Valley and beyond by recruiting kin and clients through chain migration. However, when the Bugis depleted the stock of tilapia in the early 1990s, the Indigenous Lindu people struck back, having been re-empowered by their successful resistance to a hydro-electric scheme (PLTA) at Lindu and by their emergent partnership with the Lore Lindu National Park authority and the park’s co-manager, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), recognised through community conservation agreements. Once the lake had been reseeded, the Lindu customary council forced Bugis to adhere to customary *ombo* restrictions on fishing as part of reasserting control of the lake and surrounding resources. This emergent role has also given the Indigenous Lindu some control of further in-migration to the Lindu plain, further countering the socioeconomic dominance of migrants. This process of power reversal was also facilitated by the widening of the trail to accommodate the use of motorcycles by the Central Sulawesi Integrated Area Conservation and Development Project (CSIACDP) and the availability of cheap credit for motorcycle purchase in the early 2000s, which facilitated motorcycle purchases by Indigenous Lindu families and greatly lessened the role of Bugis intermediate marketers for transport of produce from the plain.
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**BACKGROUND**

This paper considers the ‘unintended consequences’ of various development and conservation interventions. In the context of a developmental state, such as is exemplified by New Order Indonesia, government interventions assumed projected benefit for communities assumed to be homogeneous. However, benefits were not equally shared, as cleavages along lines of ethnicity, religion, livelihood specialisation, language and other dimensions meant that some groups (and individuals) benefited more from development than others. This was particularly the case with regard to the differential benefits between entrepreneurially oriented migrants and marginalised...