



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**SOCIAL FORESTRY AND DAIRY FARMING PRACTICES
IN WEST JAVA WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE
EXAMINATION OF CONFLICT IDENTIFICATION
AND RESOLUTION**

GAMMA GALUDRA TRIANA RUSVI

FH 2003 10

**SOCIAL FORESTRY AND DAIRY FARMING PRACTICES IN WEST JAVA
WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE EXAMINATION OF
CONFLICT IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION**

By

GAMMA GALUDRA TRIANA RUSVI

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science**

April 2003



Abstract of thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science

**SOCIAL FORESTRY AND DAIRY FARMING PRACTICES IN
WEST JAVA WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE EXAMINATION OF
CONFLICT IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION**

By

GAMMA GALUDRA TRIANA RUSVI

April 2003

Chairman : Dr. Mohamad Azani Alias

Faculty : Forestry

The objective of this study was to determine the types of conflicts between dairy farming and social forestry programs in two selected villages in Lembang, West Java, Indonesia, and make recommendation on how to resolve it. Three stakeholders were involved in this conflict, namely, dairy farmers, social forestry participants, and State Forest Corporation (SFC). In order to understand the conflicts, the study surveyed the socio-economic conditions of the dairy farmers and social forestry participants, examined the dairy farming and social forestry practices by selected dairy farmers and social forestry participants. A questionnaire survey was carried in 2001 out on a random sample of 158 dairy farmers and on a purposive sample of 60 social forestry participants. In addition, data were also gathered from five purposively selected SFC officials.

Conflicts were found to exist and persist between actors as well among the members of the actors. Competition for land and forages were the sources of conflicts between the dairy farmers and social forestry participants. Among the social forestry participants themselves, conflicts arose in the course of obtaining *tumpangsari* sites as well as *tumpangsari* plots.

Conflicts between SFC officials and dairy farmers revolve around the issues of the use of state forestland by the agriculture farmers and the scope of social forestry program which pays a lot attention on agriculture plantation. The paternalistic attitude of the SFC officials as well as their underestimation of the capacity of the social forestry participants has often created conflicts between the two groups of actors. Conflicts between the two actors have also taken place due to divergence in their interests as well as the limited management rights given to the social forestry participants.

Based on the experience of other social forestry program in Java, conflicts among the social forestry participants for *tumpangsari* sites and plots could be resolved by means of a lottery system and lengthening the *tumpangsari* period. In order to resolve the conflicts between the dairy farmers and the social forestry participants, it is recommended that both parties meet and discuss in a negotiation process. One important aspect of the negotiation is the SFC officials must recognize the rights of access of the dairy farmers to the state forestland.

Other conflicts between dairy farmers and SFC officials could be resolved by identifying interested actors, who depend their livelihood to the state forestland, including their needs in social forestry, by the SFC officials. Changing the roles of SFC officials and forest management orientation might resolve conflicts between social forestry participants and SFC officials.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

**PERHUTANAN SOSIAL DAN AMALAN LADANG TENUSU DI JAWA
BARAT DENGAN PENEKANAN TERHADAP PENILAIAN
PENGENALPASTIAN KONFLIK DAN PENYELESAIANNYA**

Oleh

GAMMA GALUDRA TRIANA RUSVI

April 2003

Pengerusi: Dr. Mohamad Azani Alias

Fakulti : Perhutanan

Kajian ini dilakukan bertujuan untuk memahami jenis-jenis konflik dalam perladangan tenusu dan program perhutanan sosial dalam dua kampung yang telah dipilih di Lembang, Jawa Barat, Indonesia dan menghasilkan cadangan dalam cara meyelesaikannya. Tiga orang pelaku yang terlibat dalam konflik-konflik ini ialah peladang tenusu, pengamal perhutanan sosial dan Syarikat Perhutanan Negeri (SPN). Dalam merangka bagi tujuan pemahaman konflik-konflik, survei terhadap keadaan ekonomi sosial bagi peladang tenusu dan pengamal perhutanan sosial, mengamati amal peladang tenusu dan pengamal perhutanan sosial yang telah dipilih. Survei soalan telah dijalankan dalam tahun 2001 secara persampelan rawak terdiri daripada 158 peladang tenusu dan 60 orang pengamal perhutanan sosial. Sebagai tambahan, data daripada lima pegawai SPN yang telah dipilih digabungkan.

Konflik-konflik didapati wujud dan berlarutan diantara pelaku sama ada di kalangan ahli itu sendiri. Persaingan dari segi mendapatkan tanah dan padang rumput merupakan punca timbulnya konflik di antara peladang tenusu dan pengamal perhutanan sosial. Di kalangan pengamal perhutanan sosial itu sendiri, munculnya konflik dalam mendapatkan kawasan tumpangsari dan juga beberapa bahagian daripada tumpangsari.

Konflik antara pegawai SPN dan peladang tenusu meliputi isu kepenggunaan tanah hutan negeri oleh peladang tanaman pertanian dan program perhutanan sosial yang mana lebih tertumpu kepada lading tanaman pertanian. Sikap pandang rendah oleh pegawai SPN dan juga di bawah kemampuan pengamal perhutanan sosial telah kerap mencipta konflik antara dua kumpulan pelaku juga berlaku disebabkan perbezaan dari segi minat dan juga hak pengurusan yang terbatas yang diberikan kepada pengamal perhutanan sosial.

Berdasarkan pengamalan beberapa program perhutanan sosial yang lain di Jawa, konflik antara pengamal perhutanan sosial bagi kawasan tumpangsari dan beberapa bahagiannya yang lain dapat diselesaikan dengan melalui system undian dan pemanjangan tempoh tumpangsari. Untuk menyelesaikan konflik antara peladang tenusu dan pengamal perhutanan, adalah dicadangkan supaya kedua-dua parti bertemu dan berbincang dalam proses perundingan. Satu aspek penting dalam perundingan ialah pegawai SPN mesti mengenal pasti hak penerokaan peladang tenusu ke atas tanah hutan negeri.

Konflik lain antara peladang tenusu dan pegawai SPN boleh diselesaikan dengan mengenalpasti pelaku yang berkepentingan yang bergantung hidup dengan tanah hutan negeri, termasuk keperluan mereka dalam perhutanan sosial oleh pegawai SPN. Mengubah peranan pegawai SPN dan orientasi pengurusan hutan mampu menyelesaikan konflik antara pengamal perhutanan sosial dan pegawai SPN.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my great appreciation and sincere gratitude to Dr. Mohamad Azani Alias, a forest rehabilitation expert, who showed much interest in my study and more importantly his trust on my capability to follow Graduate Studies. I am indebted to my co-supervisors, Professor Dato' Dr. Nik Muhammad Nik Abd. Majid and Dr. Lim Hin Fui of Forest Research Institute of Malaysia (FRIM), respectively an agroforestry expert and a sociologist, for their patience and valuable guidance throughout this study.

I thank the staff of the International Centre of Research on Agroforestry (ICRAF); Dr. Marieke Kragten, Mr. Paul Burgers and Miss Dede William, whose advice and encouragement have helped me to pursue this study.

My deep appreciation and thank to the people of Lembang who had helped me a lot, particularly by providing me all required data and technical supports.

This study would not be possible without the financial assistance from Forest Research Institute of Malaysia (FRIM), which offered a three-year research fellowship. I am grateful to the Director General of FRIM, Dato' Dr. Abdul Razak Mohd. Ali, for his advice and assistance. Financial assistance was supplemented by ICRAF via Dr. Marieke Kragten and Mr. Paul Burgers during the data collection.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	viii
APPROVAL	ix
DECLARATION	xi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xii
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF FIGURES	xix
LIST OF PLATES	xx
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxi
 CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement and Justification	2
1.3 Objectives of the Study	4
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Social Forestry	5
2.2.1 Definitions and Concepts	5
2.2.2 Social Forestry Objectives	8
2.2.3 Types of Social Forestry Program in Java	11
2.2.3.1 Prosperity Approach	11
2.2.3.2 Forest Village Community Development (FVCD)	11
2.2.3.3 Integrated Forest Village Community Development (I-FVCD)	12
2.2.3.4 Forest Management in Cooperation with Local Community (FMCLM)	13
2.2.4 Lesson Learned from Social Forestry in the World	13
2.2.5 Lesson Learned from Social Forestry in Java, Indonesia	16
2.3 Conflicts	17
2.3.1 Definitions and Characteristics	17
2.3.2 Types of Conflicts	20
2.3.3 Conflicts Resolutions	22
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	27
3.1 Introduction	27
3.2 Research Framework	27
3.3 Study Location	29

3.4	Sample Selection	31
3.4.1	The Selection of Villages	31
3.4.2	The Selection of Respondents	32
3.4.2.1	The Selection of Dairy Farmers	32
3.4.2.2	The Selection of Social Forestry Participants	33
3.4.2.3	The Selection of State Forest Corporation (SFC) Officials	35
3.5	Data Collection	36
3.5.1	Sources of Data and Time	36
3.5.2	Data Collection Techniques	37
3.5.2.1	Survey Questionnaire	37
3.5.2.2	In-Depth Interview	38
3.5.2.3	Group Interview	39
3.5.2.4	Participant Observation	40
3.6	Analysis Data	42
3.6.1	Quantitative Analysis	42
3.6.2	Qualitative Analysis	42
4.	PROFILE OF THE STUDY AREA AND RESPONDENTS	44
4.1	Introduction	44
4.2	Bio-physical Condition of Research Area	44
4.2.1	Location and Physical Features	45
4.2.2	Population and Socio-economic Setting	46
4.3	The Current Situation of Indonesia, Dairy Farmers and State Forest Corporation (SFC) in Java	50
4.3.1	The Current Situation of Indonesia	50
4.3.2	The Current Situation of Dairy Farmers	53
4.3.3	The Current Situation of State Forest Corporation (SFC) in Java	55
4.4	The Characteristics of Respondents	58
4.4.1	The Characteristics of Dairy Farmers	58
4.4.1.1	Age	58
4.4.1.2	Household Classification	59
4.4.1.3	Educational Attainment	59
4.4.1.4	Household Members Above 15 Years Old	59
4.4.1.5	Workers in Livestock Sector	60
4.4.1.6	Dairy Farmers' Main Source of Income	60
4.4.1.7	Land Ownership	61
4.4.1.8	Land Tenant	61
4.4.1.9	Dairy Cows Ownership	62
4.4.1.10	Dairy Cows Tenant	62
4.4.2	The Characteristics of Social Forestry Participants	63
4.4.2.1	Age	63
4.4.2.2	Household Classification	64
4.4.2.3	Educational Attainment	64
4.4.2.4	Household Members Above 15 Years Old	65
4.4.2.5	Workers in Livestock Sector	65

4.4.2.6	Social Forestry Participants' Main Source of Income	65
4.4.2.7	Land Ownership	66
4.4.2.8	Land Tenant	66
5.	DAIRY FARMING AND SOCIAL FORESTRY PRACTICES IN LEMBANG	67
5.1	Introduction	67
5.2	Dairy Farming Practices	68
5.2.1	Dairy Farmers' Feeding Collection and Collection Season	68
5.2.1.1	Elephant Grasses Collection	68
5.2.1.2	Wild Grasses Collection	72
5.2.1.3	Leguminous Collection	75
5.2.1.4	Agriculture Crops Residues	77
5.2.2	Time Requirements for Forages Collection	79
5.2.3	Forages Cultivation Inside the State Forestland	81
5.2.3.1	Forages Cultivation in Jayagiri Village	82
5.2.3.2	Forages Cultivation in Cikole Village	84
5.2.4	Dairy Farmers' Income from Milk Production	85
5.2.5	Summary of Dairy Farming Practices	86
5.3	Social Forestry Practices	87
5.3.1	Site History	87
5.3.2	Examination on Social Forestry Practices	88
5.3.2.1	Forest Farmer Group Jayagiri Mekar	88
5.3.2.1.1	Site Selection	88
5.3.2.1.2	Selection of Participants	89
5.3.2.1.3	Plot Distribution	89
5.3.2.1.4	Perceptions on Forest Farmer Group (FFG)	93
5.3.2.1.5	<i>Tumpanghari</i> Cultivation	94
5.3.2.2	Forest Farmer Group Sari Mukti	97
5.3.2.2.1	Site Selection	97
5.3.2.2.2	Selection of Participants	97
5.3.2.2.3	Plot Distribution	99
5.3.2.2.4	Perceptions on Forest Farmer Group (FFG)	104
5.3.2.2.5	<i>Tumpanghari</i> Cultivation	105
5.3.2.3	Forest Farmer Group Giri Mekar	108
5.3.2.2.5	Site Selection	108
5.3.2.2.6	Selection of Participants	108
5.3.2.2.7	Plot Distribution	109
5.3.2.2.8	Perceptions on Forest Farmer Group (FFG)	112
5.3.2.2.5	<i>Tumpanghari</i> Cultivation	113
5.3.3	Summary of Social Forestry Practices	115

6. CONFLICTS IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION	117
6.1 Introduction	117
6.2 Conflicts Identification	118
6.2.1 Conflicts among Local Villagers	118
6.2.1.1 Conflicts among Social Forestry Participants	118
6.2.1.2 Conflicts between Social Forestry Participants and Dairy Farmers	120
6.2.2 Conflicts between Local Villagers and SFC	123
6.2.2.1 Conflicts between Dairy Farmers and SFC	124
6.2.2.2 Conflicts between Social Forestry Participants and SFC	126
6.3 Conflicts Resolution	133
6.3.1 Conflicts Resolution among Local Villagers	134
6.3.1.1 Conflicts Resolution among Social Forestry Participants	134
6.3.1.2 Conflicts Resolution between Dairy Farmers and Social Forestry Participants	135
6.3.2 Conflicts Resolution between Local Villagers and SFC	136
6.3.2.1 Conflicts Resolution between Dairy Farmers and SFC	137
6.3.2.2 Conflicts Resolution between Social Forestry Participants and SFC	138
6.4 Summary of the Chapter	140
7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	141
7.1 Conclusion	142
7.1.1 Conflicts Identification	142
7.1.1.1 Conflicts among Local Villagers	142
7.1.1.2 Conflicts between Local Villagers and SFC	143
7.1.2 Conflicts Resolution	144
7.1.2.1 Conflicts Resolution among Local Villagers	144
7.1.2.2 Conflicts Resolution between Local Villagers and SFC	144
7.2 Recommendations	145
REFERENCES	148
APPENDICES	163
BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR	191

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Definitions and Concepts of Social Forestry by Various Scientists and Organisations	6
2.2 Assumptions on the Rational for Social Forestry Development	7
2.3 Problems based on Social Economic Aspect in Social Forestry in Java	16
2.4 Definitions and Characteristics of Conflicts from Various Authors	18
2.5 Types of Conflicts in Forest Resources	21
2.6 Various Studies to Resolve Conflicts in Forest Resource	24
4.1 Land Availability for Agriculture and Grazing in West Java (1995-1999) (in Ha)	45
4.2 Estimates of Poverty Incidence (% of population)	52
4.3 The Land Size of Province and SFC Forest in Java	56
4.4 Forest Disturbance in State Forest, Java	57
5.1 Distribution of Type of Crops in Land Tenant by Dairy Farmers	69
5.2 The Importance of Crops in Land Tenant by the Dairy Farmers	70
5.3 Distribution of Dairy Farmers Cultivate Forages Inside the State Forestland Based on Villages	70
5.4 Distribution of Strategies in Collecting Elephant Grasses	71
5.5 Distribution of Dairy Farmers Collect Elephant Grasses Based on Seasons	72
5.6 Distribution of Strategies in Collecting Wild Grasses	73

5.7	Distribution of Dairy Farmers Collect Wild Grasses Based on Seasons	74
5.8	Distribution of Dairy Farmers Collect Leguminous	75
5.9	Distribution of Strategies in Collecting Leguminous	76
5.10	Distribution of Dairy Farmers Collect Leguminous Based on Seasons	77
5.11	Distribution of Strategies in Collecting Agriculture Crop Residues	78
5.12	Distribution of Dairy Farmers Collect Agriculture Crop Residues Based on Seasons	79
5.13	Distribution of Time for Dairy Farmers by Villages	80
5.14	Distribution of Time for Dairy Farmers Based on Forages Cultivation	81
5.15	Distribution of Milk Income	85
5.16	Perceptions of Social Forestry Participants on Plot Distribution Mechanism in FFG Jayagiri Mekar	90
5.17	Reasons Alleged by Social Forestry Participants Transferring or Abandoning <i>Tumpang Sari</i> Site in FFG Jayagiri Mekar	91
5.18	Reasons Alleged by Social Forestry Participants Continuing to Cultivate <i>Tumpang Sari</i> Site in FFG Jayagiri Mekar	92
5.19	Perceptions of the Social Forestry Participants on the Purpose of FFG in FFG Jayagiri Mekar in FFG Jayagiri Mekar	93
5.20	Problems Based on <i>Tumpang Sari</i> Cultivation in FFG Jayagiri Mekar	95
5.21	The Social Forestry Participants' Frequency Based on Participant Selection in FFG Sari Mukti	98
5.22	Perceptions of Social Forestry Participants on Plot Distribution Mechanism in FFG Sari Mukti	99
5.23	Reasons Alleged by Social Forestry Participants Transferring or Abandoning <i>Tumpang Sari</i> Site in FFG Sari Mukti	100

5.24	Reasons Alleged by Social Forestry Participants Continuing to Cultivate <i>Tumpangsari</i> Site in FFG Sari Mukti	102
5.25	Perceptions of the Social Forestry Participants on the Purpose of FFG in FFG Sari Mukti	104
5.26	Problems Based on <i>Tumpangsari</i> Cultivation in FFG Sari Mukti	106
5.27	Reasons Alleged by Social Forestry Participants Transferring or Abandoning <i>Tumpangsari</i> Site in FFG Giri Mekar	109
5.28	Reasons Alleged by Social Forestry Participants Continuing to Cultivate <i>Tumpangsari</i> Site in FFG Giri Mekar	110
5.29	Perceptions of the Social Forestry Participants toward the Purpose of FFG in FFG Giri Mekar	112
5.30	Problems Based on <i>Tumpangsari</i> Cultivation in FFG Giri Mekar	113
5.31	Summary of Social Forestry Practices in Accordance with the Social Forestry Participants in FFG Jayagiri Mekar, Sari Mukti and FFG Giri Mekar	116
6.1	Conflicts Identification and Resolution between State Forest Corporation (SFC), Dairy Farmers and Social Forestry (SF) Participants	140

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
3.1	Research Framework	29
4.1	Map of Study Location	47
4.2	Map of Jayagiri Village	48
4.3	Map of Cikole Village	49
4.4	The Development of the Dairy Cattle in Indonesia, 1994-1999 (GKSI, 2000)	53
4.5	The Development of the Total Milk Production in Indonesia, 1994-1999 (GKSI, 2000)	54
6.1	Conflict Map on the Competition of Obtaining <i>Tumpangsari</i> Site	119
6.2	Conflict Map on Competition of Obtaining <i>Tumpangsari</i> Plot Distribution	120
6.3	Conflict Map on the Competition of Land-Use in State Forestland	121
6.4	Conflict Map on Conflict Forages inside the <i>Tumpangsari</i> Site	123
6.5	Conflict Map on Dairy Farmers' Use Pertaining to the State Forestland was Questioned	125
6.6	Conflict Map on Social Forestry's Scope only Concerned Agriculture Plantation	126
6.7	Conflict Map on Misperception of SFC Officials to the Social Forestry Participants	128
6.8	Conflict Map on Misbehaviour of SFC Officials to the Social Forestry Participants	129
6.9	Conflict Map on Different Interests between SFC Officials and Social Forestry Participants in Conducting Social Forestry Program	131
6.10	Conflict Map on Limited Management Rights for Participation	133

LIST OF PLATES

Plate		Page
5.1	Dairy farmers collect wild grasses inside the state forestland as one of their strategies to feed their dairy cattle	74
5.2	Elephant grasses cultivation inside the state forestland in Jayagiri Village. The pine-trees tapping was ended as the storm damaged the pine-trees	83
5.3	Elephant grasses cultivation inside the state forestland in Cikole Village. One of the dairy farmers was collecting the elephant grasses planted.	84
5.4	<i>Tumpangsari</i> cultivation by one of the participants in FFG Jayagiri Mekar. This participant did not cultivate the elephant grasses inside his <i>tumpangsari</i> plot since they could limit his agriculture production	97
5.5	One of the participants in FFG Sari Mukti who abandoned his <i>tumpangsari</i> plot. The weed covered the plot and limited the pine-trees' growth.	102
5.6	<i>Tumpangsari</i> cultivation by one of the participants in FFG Sari Mukti. This participant was able to provide better investment input and labour for his <i>tumpangsari</i> plot	103
5.7	The next <i>tumpangsari</i> site allocated for wealthy farmers (investors). This site was originally planned for FFG Giri Mekar. However, the SFC officials regarded this group lacking the capacity to cultivate <i>tumpangsari</i> . Therefore, this site was subsequently allocated to the wealthy farmers (investors) outside the FFG Giri Mekar.	111

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACIAR	Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research
BPS	Biro Pusat Statistik/ Central Bureau Statistic
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
FFG	Forest Farmer Group
FMCLM	Forest Management in Cooperation with Local Community
FVCD	Forest Village-Community Development
GNP	Gross Net Product
ICRAF	International Centre of Research on Agroforestry
I-FVCD	Integrated Forest Village-Community Development
KKPH	<i>Kepala Kesatuan Pemangkuan Hutan/</i> Head of Forest District
KPSBU	<i>Koperasi Peternak Susu Bandung Utara/</i> North Bandung Dairy Farmers Cooperation
KKN	<i>Korupsi, Kolusi, Nepotisme/</i> Corruption, Collusion, Nepotism
LATIN	<i>Lembaga Alam Tropika Indonesia/</i> Indonesian Tropical Nature Council
SFC	State Forest Corporation/ <i>PT Perhutani</i>
SF	Social Forestry

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Indonesia comprises a chain of seventeen thousand islands, which spans a distance of some three thousand miles. With a population of 210.4 million in year 2000, it is the fourth most populous country in the world (after China, India and the United States), and its predominantly Islamic population ranks it as the largest Muslim country in the world (World Bank, 2000). The majority of Indonesian population (70%) lived on the island of Java where rural population densities of more than thousand per square kilometre are not uncommon.

More than 60% of rural people in Java depend on agriculture as their primary source of livelihood with the land ownership averages at about 0.30 to 0.50 ha of land per family. Most of these rural people lived in surrounding state forestland. Low-income levels and the limited size of land holdings contribute to a growing surplus of agricultural labours and high rate of unemployment. These conditions result in serious social and economic pressures being exerted on the forest (Bratamihardja, 1992; Handadhari and Sumantri, 1997).

PT Perhutani (PP), the State Forest Corporation (SFC) managing 2.9 million ha of natural forest and forest plantation in Java with the main task to serve as a



timber revenue base for the government, tried to overcome these major problems by initiating social forestry program. The main objective of this program is not only to improve the welfare of local villagers by increasing the total productivity of currently degraded forest lands through reforestation, as well as increasing the share of forest resources allocated to local communities and the length of entitlement to those resources, but also to alleviate longstanding conflicts over control of forest resources between forestry officials and forest villagers, and to serve as means of protecting the timber forest resources-base (Sunderlin, 1990; Pratiwi, 1998).

1.2 Problem Statement and Justification

The social forestry program has been conducted in Lembang, West Java since 1998 by employing taungya system, or in local name called *tumpangsari*, inside the state forestland. The program was the result of local villagers demanding to secure their livelihood during the economic crisis.

Many case studies have revealed the success of social forestry program to economic and social factors in Java (Atmajaya, 1989; Hudaya, 1990; Irawan, 1990; Patriono, 1989; Rochyana, 1989; Sinaga, 1990; Zuhriana, 1990). Although it is difficult to generalize from the diversity of program in terms of soil fertility, existence of water, altitude, isolation from roads and urban centres, these programs have proven beneficial for securing the local villagers livelihood and sustaining state forest resources (Perum Perhutani, 1996).

In other cases, social forestry program was found less successful. 24 ha from 160 ha of the social forestry sites in Lembang have been distributed to wealthy farmers outside the villages (Resolusi, 2001). Social forestry programs have a strategic position to improve local villagers welfare and this is why the importance to distribute the social forestry site to the villages surrounding state forestland (Saragih and Sunito, 1994; Sunderlin, 1990; Sunderlin, 1997), not to the wealthy farmers outside the villages. This case raised an issue of how the social forestry program has been conducted in Lembang. It also raised an issue of conflicts against SFC in the state forestland as the local villagers have been marginalized to obtain the social forestry site.

In these circumstances, the pressure to the state forestland has also been mounted by the dairy farmers who have been occupied the state forestland for forages. The increasing number of dairy farmers from 251 (1990) to 2912 (2001) and the decreasing land availability for cultivation from 0.21 ha per household (1990) to 0.11 ha per household (2001) led the dairy farmers to occupy the state forestland (BPS, 1990; BPS, 2001). This raised an issue of how the dairy farmers use the state forestland for forages. This situation has also generated conflict since SFC did not recognise the dairy farmers' forages cultivation inside the state forestland.

Both situations would not only lead to conflicts against SFC, but also lead to conflicts between local villagers, who participate social forestry (*tumpanghari*), and the dairy farmers, who collected and cultivated forages. These two actors would try