

SOCIAL ACTION IN AGRARIAN CONFLICT RESOLUTION THROUGH COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Soni Akhmad Nulhaqim
Muhammad Fedryansyah
Eva Nuriyah Hidayat
Wandi Adiansah
Obsatar Sinaga

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37178/ca-c.23.1.256>

Soni Akhmad Nulhaqim, Social Welfare Department FISIP Universitas Padjadjaran, Sumedang, Indonesia.
Email: soni.nulhaqim@unpad.ac.id

Muhammad Fedryansyah, Study Center of CSR, Social Entrepreneurship and Community Empowerment Universitas Padjadjaran, Sumedang, Indonesia.

Eva Nuriyah Hidayat, Study Center of CSR, Social Entrepreneurship and Community Empowerment Universitas Padjadjaran, Sumedang, Indonesia.

Wandi Adiansah, Study Center of CSR, Social Entrepreneurship and Community Empowerment Universitas Padjadjaran, Sumedang, Indonesia.

Obsatar Sinaga, International Relations Department FISIP Universitas Padjadjaran, Sumedang, Indonesia.

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to examine social action movements conducted in the practice of agrarian conflict resolution through community development. In practice, the social action movement is part of the community organizing stages and the first phase of community development activities as an effort to resolve agrarian conflicts. This research employs a descriptive qualitative approach. Data derived from primary and secondary ones while data collection techniques were done through in-depth interviews and documentation studies. Data analysis was carried out through the stages of data display, data reduction, and concluding. The research site is in the Genteng Village, Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency, West Java Province. The results of the research show that in the social action movement of agrarian conflict resolution through community development, several aspects need to be considered, i.e. the problems being responded to, the forms of social action movements, the actors involved, the participation of actors and the results of the social actions.

Keywords: social action, agrarian conflict resolution, community development.

Introduction

Generally, community development practices have been used in various settings ranging from CSR (corporate social responsibility), tourism development, poverty alleviation and welfare improvement programs, disaster management, etc. In its

growth, community development has also been used as an approach for conflict resolution efforts ([1]; [2]; [3]; [4]; [5]; [6]; [7]; [8]; [9]; [10]; [11]; [12]; [13]; [14]; [15]; [16]; [17]; [18]; [19]; [20]; [21]; [22]. In this case, community development becomes an alternative approach for conflict resolution.

Conflict resolution which was formerly only conducted through litigation and non-litigation approaches, in its growth it can also be carried out through community development. The practice of conflict resolution through community development has been implemented by many practitioners. One of them is applied in agrarian conflict resolution efforts [23]; [3]; [4]; [24]; [8]; [12]; [25]; [18]; [12]; [21]; [22].

In its practice, agrarian conflict resolution through community development must be done through systematic stages. One of the experts who stated his opinion regarding the stages of community development as a conflict resolution effort is [26-28] which states that the stages of community development as a conflict resolution effort include four main phases, namely community organizing, visioning, planning as well as implementation and evaluation phases. In contrast to the stages of community development for other purposes, the stages of community development for conflict resolution purposes begin with the community organizing one. This is understandable since in community development as an effort to resolve conflicts, the community is in a state of disharmony so it needs to be organized and mobilized to achieve common goals.

This community organizing phase begins when there is a person or group of people who have the desire to solve the problems faced by the community or have the desire to encourage the community to meet their needs. In this phase, the individual or group attempts to mobilize the community to be directly involved in protesting or supporting a local project, policy, or program. [26, 29] state that community mobilization is done using two strategies, namely social action (social action campaigns) and development models.

Social action (social action campaign) is an effort to change decisions and social structures that are considered problematic by the concerning community. Some ways that can be done are in the form of appeals, petitions, mass strikes, demonstrations that can be conducted through anarchic or violent actions as well. The result obtained from this social action is a new policy, project, or program that is more acceptable to the community.

One of the community development practices as an agrarian conflict resolution effort is community development which is conducted as an effort to resolve agrarian conflicts between farmers working on RPH (Forest Holding Resort) Genteng and Perhutani KPH Public Company (Forest Holding Unit) Sumedang in Genteng Village, Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency, West Java Province. ([30]; [12, 30] [31, 32]; [12]). The agrarian conflict between tenant farmers and Perhutani KPH Sumedang at RPH Genteng is an agrarian conflict in the forestry sector. This agrarian conflict occurred due to a conflict of interests in the use of RPH Genteng lands between tenant farmers and Perhutani KPH Sumedang.

This agrarian conflict in Genteng Village was resolved through an agrarian conflict resolution approach through community development in which the first step is the community organizing stage through social action. In this study, researchers will examine how social action in agrarian conflict resolution through community development is conducted in efforts to resolve agrarian conflicts that occurred in Genteng Village, Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency.

Literature Review

Agrarian Conflict

Agrarian conflicts are not only limited to land matters, but also include the ones related to all natural resources existing on the earth, water, and space. Based on these, agrarian conflict can be defined as a conflict that is born as a result of the relationship between people or groups related to the problem of the earth and all natural resources found on the surface and inside the earth [33]. Agrarian conflicts can occur horizontally, namely between members or community groups or vertically between members/community groups and the government or companies.

According to [31], agrarian conflicts are caused by three main factors, namely problematic agrarian resource administration, problematic use of agrarian resources, and differences in perceptions, knowledge, values, and interests towards agrarian resource utilization.

Agrarian Conflict Resolution through Community Development

In its development, agrarian conflict resolution efforts are not only implemented through litigation and non-litigation approaches. Currently, there are alternative approaches in agrarian conflict resolution, namely through community development [3, 4, 7-10, 13, 31, 33] conflict resolution through community development is a way of resolving conflict through various efforts to empower groups and institutions at the local community level by providing direct control to the community over investment decisions, project planning (activities), implementation, and monitoring, through a process that emphasizes participation and inclusive management.

Concerning conflict resolution, community development as an effort must also be carried out through systematic stages. According to [4, 31], the stages of community development include four main stages, namely the community organizing, visioning, planning as well as the implementation and evaluation stage.

The community organizing phase is the one that begins when there is one person or group of people who have the desire to solve the problems faced by the community or the desire to encourage the community to meet their needs. In the community organizing phase, the individual or group attempts to mobilize the community to be directly involved in protesting or supporting a local project, policy, or program. [10, 13, 31] state that community mobilization is carried out using two strategies, namely social action (social action campaigns) and development models.

Social action (social action campaign) is an effort made to change decisions and social structures that are considered problematic by the concerning community. Some ways that can be conducted are in the form of appeals, petitions, mass strikes, demonstrations that can be done through anarchic or violent actions. The result obtained from this social action is a new policy, project, or program that is more acceptable to the community. In this social action, several aspects need to be considered, namely the problem being responded to, the form of the social action movement, the actors involved in the social action movement, the form of participation of the actors, and the results of the social action movement [4, 12]. In its implementation, [34] stated that the community development stage must be conducted by prioritizing participation and education of the community and local organizations according to their needs.

Method

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach. The primary data are obtained from data collection techniques in the form of in-depth interviews while the secondary data derive from documentation and literature studies. Data analysis was carried out through the stages of data display, data reduction, and concluding. Meanwhile, the

location of this research is Genteng Village, Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency, West Java Province.

Result and Discussion

Overview of Agrarian Conflict in Genteng Village, Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency.

Genteng Village is one of the villages in Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency which is directly adjacent to the Forest Area of Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang, RPH Genteng. The majority of the residents of Genteng Village are farmers. The number of farmers in Genteng Village in 2020 is 769 people (Profile of Genteng Village in 2020). The types of agriculture carried out by the residents of Genteng Village are coffee farming, rice, horticulture, tobacco, yard optimization, and livestock (goats, sheep, cows, chickens, etc.). Most of the farmers in Genteng Village use the surrounding forest land to carry out agricultural activities. The forest land is the land of Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang which is located in RPH Genteng.

The agrarian conflict in Genteng Village occurred when the central government through the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK) and the West Java Provincial Government issued a policy to change the land status of RPH Genteng from production forest to protected forest. The change in forest status caused farmers' access to the forest to be closed. This condition causes a conflict of interests in the use of RPH Genteng land between tenant farmers and Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang. On one hand, tenant farmers want to use the land in RPH Genteng as agricultural land. Meanwhile, Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang is trying to keep RPH Genteng as a protected forest following the policies issued by the government. This different interest in forest utilization is the cause of agrarian conflicts in Genteng Village.



Figure 1. Lands in RPH Genteng KPH Sumedang (Source: Documentation of Sumedang Regency STN).

In resolving the agrarian conflict, various efforts were made by some parties, including the community and the government. One of them is agrarian conflict resolution efforts through community development. Agrarian conflict resolution through community development is carried out through systematic stages starting from community organizing (through social action and development models), visioning, planning, and implementation and evaluation. In this study, the discussion will focus on the discussion of social action at the community organizing stage.

Social Action in Agrarian Conflict Resolution through Community Development

The community organizing stage carried out as the first phase in community development activities is an effort to resolve agrarian conflicts between farmers working at RPH Genteng and Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang in Genteng Village, Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency as social action. The discussion of social action in this study will focus on several aspects, namely the problem being responded to, the form of the movement, the actors involved in the movement, the form of participation of the actors, and the results of the movement.

Problems responded to in social action.

The social action conducted at the community organizing stage in community development activities as an effort to resolve agrarian conflicts between farmers working at RPH Genteng and Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang in Genteng Village, Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency was conducted to respond to the problem of agrarian conflicts in RPH Genteng occurring from 2001 to 2008. In the agrarian conflict occurring at RPH Genteng, there was a conflict of interest in the use of RPH Genteng land between tenant farmers and Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang. On the one hand, tenant farmers want to continue to use the land in RPH Genteng as vegetable farming land. Meanwhile, Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang is trying to maintain RPH Genteng as a protected forest under the policies issued by the government, namely the Decree of the Minister of Forestry Number 195/Kpts-II/2003 concerning Designation of Forest and Water Areas in the West Java Province and the Decree of the Governor of West Java Number 522/1224/Binprod dated May 20, 2003 regarding the Protection and Security of Forest Areas.

The problem of agrarian conflict in RPH Genteng has reached its peak after the change of RPH Genteng forest status from a production forest to a protected forest in 2003. After the issuance of this policy, the access of tenant farmers to the land in RPH Genteng was closed and the farmers did not have access to vegetable farming. The closure of farmers' access to land in RPH Genteng causes farmers to lose their source of income. In this case, basically, the tenant farmers do not disagree with the policies issued by the government. However, the tenant farmers demand that in addition to the ecological function, the RPH Genteng must also provide an economic function to the surrounding community, including the tenant farmers.

Responding to this, Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang also has provided alternative solutions to farmers. In order to provide an economic function to the community, Perum Perhutani invites tenant farmers to transfer agricultural commodities through the PHBM program. They were invited to plant perennials such as coffee, cardamom, and patchouli on the RPH Genteng land. However, the invitation to transfer agricultural commodities is always rejected by the tenant farmers. The reason is by planting perennials, the farmers will be faced with new problems and obstacles, such as requiring large capital, lack of knowledge and skills in growing perennials, unclear market access, and harvesting crops from perennials that will take a long time (years) while the daily needs of the farmers are monthly or even daily. These are the reasons why tenant farmers keep on their principles that they want to continue growing vegetables on the RPH Genteng land. The issue of this conflict of interests in land use in RPH Genteng between tenant farmers and Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang was then responded to by tenant farmers through social action.

The form of the social action movement

The form of social action movement carried out in this case is a demonstration as the response to the problem of agrarian conflicts at RPH Genteng which was mobilized

and facilitated by Sumedang Regency STN. Before the demonstration, Sumedang Regency STN had conducted a Social Investigation and Class Analysis (ISAK) in the RPH Genteng area and four surrounding villages, namely Genteng, Banyuresmi, Nangerang, and Sindangsari Village. The ISAK conducted by the Sumedang Regency STN has been done since 2001. Through the field assessment, the Sumedang Regency STN collects various data and support documents to make demands, including looking at the sequence of policies issued by the government in the management of Genteng RPH as well as seeing the dynamics that occur in the community over response to the policy.

Along with the field assessment process, the Sumedang District STN also made efforts to approach community leaders and farmer leaders in the four villages. This approach is carried out by providing understanding and education that the community around the forest has the right to use the forest, one of which is stated in Article 33 verse 3 of the 1945 Constitution which states that "Earth, water and natural resources contained therein are controlled by the state and used for the greatest prosperity of the people. Through the mandate of the Law, the community around the forest has the right to demand that they can use the forest for their prosperity and welfare.

In addition, the STN of Sumedang Regency also has made various persuasive efforts to make community leaders and farmers move to fight for the right to use land in RPH Genteng. After these efforts were successful, community leaders and farmers were organized into small groups in the four villages. The center of these small groups is located in the Genteng Village since the most people joining at the moment were from the Genteng Village. In this case, several community leaders and farmers were appointed as local leaders and they also officially joined as members of the Sumedang District STN.

After the masses had gathered, around February 2004 the first demonstration was conducted. This first demonstration was held directly at the Office of Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang on Jalan Serma Muchtar, Situ Village, North Sumedang District, Sumedang Regency, West Java. The demonstration agenda used to hold regularly at least once every 3 months. In addition to demonstrating at the Office of Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang, this demonstration was also held at the Regent's Office of Sumedang Regency and to the Sumedang Regency Regional House of Representatives (DPRD). On several occasions, demonstrations have also been held at Gedung Sate, the Office of the Governor of West Java Province joined with other masses from other regions to have demonstrations with similar demands.



Figure 2. Demonstration Action of Farmers and Sumedang Regency STN.
(Source: Documentation of Sumedang Regency STN).

The demonstrations held by the farmers and the Sumedang Regency STN are always conducted collectively. It is intended that every farmer directly and actively participates in struggling with their destiny. Farmers can participate, attend, listen and know directly the processes of their struggle. In every demonstration, the farmers and the Sumedang Regency STN demand that the Sumedang Regency Government

provides agricultural land and negotiate with the Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang therefore the farmers are permitted to crop on Perum Perhutani land around their village, provide capital and financial assistance, agricultural equipment technology for farmers' collective farms, decrease the price of fertilizers and agricultural medicines and realize government policies on target.

At the moment, actually, in every village around RPH Genteng, a Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH) had been formed by Perum Perhutani at the same time as the PHBM program was issued. Based on the Decree of the Board of Directors of Perum Perhutani Number 682/KPTS/DIR/2009 concerning Guidelines for the Management of Forest Resources with the Community, LMDH means a village community institution with an interest in collaborative forest resource management with the community, whose members come from elements of village institutions and/or elements of the community in the village who have concern for forest resources. This LMDH acts as a bridge between the community and Perum Perhutani. In Genteng Village, this LMDH is known as LMDH Girimukti.

When the conflict occurred, LMDH together with the village government had tried to mediate the farmers with Perum Perhutani. However, these efforts have always been deadlocked. LMDH which should have played a role in bridging the community with Perum Perhutani at that time had not been able to carry out its functions properly. The farmers consider that the aspirations and complaints submitted through LMDH are not conveyed properly to Perum Perhutani. Submitting aspirations and complaints to LMDH is considered to lengthen the bureaucratic flow and take a very long time to get a response. In addition, the responses and solutions provided by LMDH are often unclear and unsatisfactory. This causes farmers to prefer to express their aspirations and complaints directly through demonstrations with Sumedang Regency STN. Moreover, the farmers also avoid disputes with the LMDH management since the LMDH administrators are also farmers and the local community of Genteng Village.

Demonstrations held by farmers and Sumedang Regency STN were conducted regularly every 3 months. Demonstrations were held between 2004 and 2008. During this period, not only facilitating and mobilizing farmers to conduct demonstrations, but Sumedang Regency STN also conducted educational activities for farmers on various matters such as forest functions, the state's function in forest management, legal status. forest, agrarian reform policies both from regulations and laws, the rights and obligations of forest communities to access forests and education about forest use in accordance with the rules. These educational activities provided by Sumedang Regency STN are known as the "School of Political Economy for Farmers at STN Sumedang". Although this term seems very formal, in practice this activity is carried out through light discussions (ngawangkong) which are held routinely between STN of Sumedang Regency and farmers.

Actors involved in social action movements.

In doing the demonstrations as social action movement, there are several main actors, both from the Sumedang Regency STN and local actors from Genteng Village. Actors from the Sumedang Regency STN are the administrators and members of the Sumedang Regency STN who go directly to the Genteng Village. Sumedang Regency STN itself is a national farmer organization. It is a part of the National Farmers Union organization which was founded in 1993. The purpose of establishing STN itself is to improve the welfare of the Farmer in the economic, political, and socio-cultural fields together with other groups to create a society without oppression and exploitation.

The most vocal actors from the Sumedang Regency STN in supporting the farmers of the Genteng Village are taken as informants with initials APA (Chairman of Sumedang Regency STN), AL and AS (Members of Sumedang Regency STN). The three of them are members of the Sumedang Regency STN who are alumni of the Winaya Mukti University (UNWIM). APA is the Head of the Sumedang Regency STN

who has led the movement since 2001. Meanwhile, AL and AS are members of the Sumedang Regency STN and local actors stay in Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency.

The next actor is a farmer from Genteng Village, with the initials DW. He is a tenant farmer from Genteng Village. In contrast to other farmers, since 2001, DW has been working on the land in RPH Genteng, specifically growing perennials such as coffee. DW was appreciated for his character as a forest farmer in Genteng Village for he was the first farmer to grow coffee at RPH Genteng. When the Sumedang Regency STN entered Genteng Village and accompanied the struggle of the farmers, DW was registered as an active member of the Sumedang Regency STN. Based on this, not only is a farmer leader in Genteng Village but also DW is a member of the Sumedang Regency STN who comes from the local community.

In the social action, the tenant farmers are also one of the important actors. These tenant farmers who have previously worked on the land in RPH Genteng and participated directly in the demonstrations. These tenant farmers are not only from Genteng Village but also three other villages in Sukasari District, namely from Banyuresmi, Nangerang, and Sindangsari Villages. For the demonstration activity, Genteng Village was used as a coordination center since the majority number of tenant farmers are from Genteng Village who participated in the struggle in the demonstration movement. At the time, there were approximately 100 tenant farmers from Genteng Village.

The Participation Form of the Actors.

In this social action movement in the form of demonstrations, each actor has his role and cooperates to make the demands they are fighting for can be fulfilled. The role of Sumedang Regency STN is starting from the field study process through ISAK, collecting and organizing tenant farmers, providing education to farmers until mobilizing and facilitating tenant farmers to conduct demonstrations. The role of farmer figures is to invite and gather tenant farmers so that they are willing to participate in every activity to support demonstrations. This farmer figure is also a local leader in every activity. Meanwhile, the tenant farmers act as a mass who are ready to support every.

Results from Social Action Movement.

The social action in the form of demonstrations held by tenant farmers and the Sumedang District STN continues to be carried out regularly. Until 2008, this social action movement began to have results. After holding demonstrations several times, the Administrator of Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang invited tenant farmers and the Sumedang District STN directly at the Perum Perhutani RPH Genteng Office. In the meeting, Perum Perhutani invited representatives of tenant farmers and Sumedang Regency STN to discuss to determine solutions to the problems of agrarian conflicts that occurred in RPH Genteng.

Perum Perhutani re-offer the PHBM program as a solution to agrarian conflicts and as an effort to meet the demands of farmers. This offer for the PHBM program is also a follow-up of the issuance of the PHBM PLUS program policy in 2007 through the Decree of the Board of Directors of Perum Perhutani Number 268/KPTS/DIR/2007 concerning Guidelines for Joint Community Forest Management Plus. This policy is an update of the CBFM policy that was issued in 2001. Through this policy update, the PHBM program is re-encouraged. In this PHBM PLUS program, Perum Perhutani redirects the tenant farmers to plant perennials such as patchouli or coffee.

After a long discussion, the tenant farmers' representatives finally agreed to the solution. Even though at the time there were still many other tenant farmers who did not agree with the decision to plant perennials. However, in this position,

representatives of tenant farmers including Sumedang Regency STN have jointly considered various things such as ecological, environmental sustainability, and community economic aspects. If the tenant farmers persist in planting vegetables without any perennials planted in the RPH Genteng area, the ecological function of the forest will likely continue to be disturbed and the community will not get access to the forest legally from Perum Perhutani. Based on this, the best middle way is the acceptance of a solution for planting perennials by tenant farmers at RPH Genteng through the PHBM PLUS program. As a sign of the agreement on this solution, the tenant farmers and Perum Perhutani voiced the slogan "Leuweung Hejo, Rakyat Ngejo" which means green forest for a prosperous community.

Analysis

Following the concept proposed by [34], the community organizing stage is carried out as the first phase in community development activities as an effort to resolve agrarian conflicts between farmers working on RPH Genteng and Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang in Genteng Village, Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency. The community organizing stage conducts the resolution of agrarian conflicts in Genteng Village is also concerning the opinion of [34] which is implemented through social action.

In the social action movement at the community organizing stage, [34] stated that this social action was held to respond to the shared problems to change a policy or decision that is considered detrimental to be more accepted by the community. In accordance with the statement, the social action of the community organizing stage was carried out to respond to the problem of agrarian conflicts occurring in RPH Genteng. In the agrarian conflict at RPH Genteng, there was a conflict of interests between tenant farmers and Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang. On the other hand, tenant farmers want to continue to use the land in RPH Genteng as vegetable farming land. Meanwhile, Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang is trying to maintain RPH Genteng as a protected forest in accordance with policies issued by the central government through the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK) and the West Java Provincial Government.

In carrying out social actions, [34], provides a choice of ways that can be implemented in these social actions, namely in the form of appeals, petitions, mass strikes, demonstrations as well as through anarchic or violent actions. Following the [34] statement, the form of social action movement in the case in Genteng Village is through demonstrations carried out by tenant farmers and mobilized and facilitated by Sumedang Regency STN.

At the community organizing stage, the role of the driving actor is one of the important things. According to [34], this driving actor is a person or group of people who have a desire to solve problems faced by society or have a desire to encourage people to meet their needs. In accordance with the statement, in carrying out the social action movement in the form of this demonstration, there were several main actors, namely actors from the Sumedang Regency and local actors from Genteng Village as well as tenant farmers from Genteng Village and three other villages in Sukasari District. namely Banyuresmi, Nangerang and Sindangsari Villages.

In this social action movement in the form of demonstrations, each actor has a different function of participation and has a role. They cooperate to make the demands they are fighting for can be met. The result of the social action movement was the agreement on the implementation of the PHBM program by planting perennials at RPH Genteng between tenant farmers and Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang. This is in accordance with the opinion of [34] which states that the results obtained from this social action are a new policy, project, or program that is more acceptable for the community.

This social action can generate good results because each process involves community participation and education. This is in line with the statement of [34] which states that participation and education are some of the principles of successful community development as a conflict resolution effort. Other experts also state the same thing that participation is the main principle in community development activities [3, 7, 10, 12-14, 26, 31, 33]. In terms of participation, communities are encouraged to analyze conflicts, determine needs and solutions to conduct and implement community development programs with the aim of conflict resolution [4, 8, 22, 26].

Conclusion and Suggestion

Conclusion

The social action at the community organizing stage was carried out to respond to the agrarian conflict that occurred at RPH Genteng. In this conflict, there was a conflict of interests between tenant farmers and Perhutani KPH Sumedang. On one hand, tenant farmers want to continue to use the land in RPH Genteng as vegetable farming land. Meanwhile, Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang is trying to maintain RPH Genteng as a protected forest in accordance with policies issued by the central government through the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK) and the West Java Provincial Government.

The form of social action movement in this case is through demonstrations conducted by tenant farmers which are mobilized and facilitated by Sumedang Regency STN. In the demonstrations, there were several main actors both from the Sumedang District STN and Genteng Village, a tenant farmer from Genteng Village, and from three other villages in Sukasari District, namely from Banyuresmi, Nangerang, and Sindangsari Villages.

In the demonstration for social action movement, each actor has a different form of participation and has a role. In the process, they cooperate to fight for their demands. The result was the agreement on the implementation of the PHBM program by planting perennials at RPH Genteng between tenant farmers and Perum Perhutani KPH Sumedang.

Suggestion

In carrying out social action, it is suggested that local communities directly affected by the problems should directly participate actively both in decision making and in the social action movements. In decision making, participation and involvement of local communities are directed to problems determination being faced and their solutions. Meanwhile, in the social action movement, community participation is important hence the communities seem to be involved in deciding their destiny.

Acknowledgement

Such a great thank is conveyed to the Rector of the Universitas Padjadjaran, the Dean of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran and SIMLITABMAS Grant Manager, Deputy for Strengthening Research and Development of the Ministry of Research and Technology/National Research and Innovation Agency that many supports have been given for this research. Furthermore, we are also thankful to Genteng Village Government, Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency, Perum Perhutani Forest Management Unit (KPH) Sumedang, Forest Farmers Group (KTH) Berdikari Genteng Village, Serikat Tani Nasional (STN) Sumedang Regency

References

1. Ndelu, T., *Conflict management and peace building through community development*. Community Development Journal, 1998. **33**(2): p. 109-116. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/33.2.109>.
2. Cox, M., G. Arnold, and S.V. Tomás, *A review of design principles for community-based natural resource management*. Ecology and Society, 2010. **15**(4). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-03704-150438>.
3. Warner, M., *Conflict Management in Community-Based Natural Resource Projects: Experiences from the Lakekamu Basin Integrated Conservation and Development Project, Papua New Guinea*, in *Biodiversity and Ecological Economics*. 2017, Routledge. p. 196-219. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315096308-12>.
4. Gruener, S. and T. Hill, *Introducing Conflict-Sensitive Community Development to Iraq*. Journal of Peacebuilding & Development, 2006. **2**(3): p. 109-113. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15423166.2006.815896361439>.
5. O'Brien, C., *Integrated community development/conflict resolution strategies as 'peace building potential' in South Africa and Northern Ireland*. Community Development Journal, 2007. **42**(1): p. 114-130. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsi068>.
6. Silverman, R.M., *Caught in the middle: Community development corporations (CDCs) and the conflict between grassroots and instrumental forms of citizen participation*. Community Development, 2005. **36**(2): p. 35-51. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330509490174>.
7. Boyce, W., M. Koros, and J. Hodgson, *Community based rehabilitation: a strategy for peace-building*. BMC International Health and Human Rights, 2002. **2**(1): p. 1-10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-698X-2-6>.
8. Hakim, I., *Institutional and policy studies of community plantations: a breakthrough in reorganizing the concept of sustainable forest management*. Journal of Forestry Policy Analysis, 2009. **6**(1).
9. Ricigliano, R., *Networks of effective action: Implementing an integrated approach to peacebuilding*. Security Dialogue, 2003. **34**(4): p. 445-462. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010603344005>.
10. John, V., *Community development in a post-conflict context: fracture and depleted social capital*. Community Development Journal, 2011. **46**(suppl_1): p. i51-i65. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsq049>.
11. Rani, V.A. and Y.B. Kumari, *ECO-FRIENDLY SYNTHESIS OF 1, 2, 4-TRIAZINE DERIVATIVES*. EUROPEAN CHEMICAL BULLETIN, 2020. **9**(8): p. 262-265. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17628/ecb.2020.9.262-265>.
12. Adiansah, W., S.A. Nulhaqim, and G.G.K. Basyar, *COMMUNITY-BASED CONFLICT RESOLUTION THROUGH COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AS ALTERNATIVE EFFORT FOR AGRARIAN CONFLICT RESOLUTION*. Share: Social Work Journal, 2020. **10**(2): p. 163-174. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24198/share.v10i2.31200>.
13. Teela, K.C., et al., *Community-based delivery of maternal care in conflict-affected areas of eastern Burma: perspectives from lay maternal health workers*. Social Science & Medicine, 2009. **68**(7): p. 1332-1340. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.01.033>.
14. Zelizer, C. and V. Oliphant, *Introduction to integrated peacebuilding*. Integrated Peacebuilding, 2018: p. 3-30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429493669-1>.
15. Ackerman, R.M., *Disputing together: Conflict resolution and the search for community*. Ohio St. J. Disp. Resol., 2002. **18**: p. 27.
16. Vervisch, T., et al., *Social Capital and Post-Conflict Reconstruction in Burundi: The Limits of Community-based Reconstruction*. Development and Change, 2013. **44**(1): p. 147-174. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12008>.
17. Jarman, N., *Peacebuilding and policing—the role of community based initiatives*. Shared Space: A research journal on peace, conflict and community relations in Northern Ireland, 2006. **3**: p. 31-44.
18. Napitu, J.P., et al., *Conflict Resolution Concept: Implementation of Cca-fm Model in Meranti Forest Management Unit, South Sumatra*. Indonesian Journal of Forestry Research, 2018. **5**(2): p. 103-118. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20886/ijfr.2018.5.2.103-118>.
19. Asenjo Palma, C., *Conflict resolution in community development: Are the benefits worth the costs?* Critical Social Policy, 2019. **39**(2): p. 268-288. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018318780162>.
20. Adiansah, W., S.A. Nulhaqim, and G.G.K. Basyar, *COMMUNITY-BASED CONFLICT SETTLEMENT THROUGH COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AS AN ALTERNATIVE EFFORT FOR AGRARIAN CONFLICT SETTLEMENT*. Share: Social Work Journal, 2020. **10**(2): p. 163-174.
21. Yuniarto, A.S. and E. Sutrisno. *Formation of forest farmer groups as a conflict resolution effort through the concept of community empowerment in KHDTK Kepau Jaya*.

22. Mafuta, W., et al., *Sustainable Conflict Resolution through Community Based Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Planning in Fragile and Conflict Situations: The Case of Somalia*. Journal of Asian and African Studies, 2021. **56**(2): p. 352-363. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909620928104>.
23. Grabel, I., *Averting crisis? Assessing measures to manage financial integration in emerging economies*. Cambridge Journal of Economics, 2003. **27**(3): p. 317-336. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/27.3.317>.
24. Slack, K., *Mission impossible?: Adopting a CSR-based business model for extractive industries in developing countries*. Resources Policy, 2012. **37**(2): p. 179-184. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2011.02.003>.
25. Potter, J. and S. Reicher, *Discourses of community and conflict: The organization of social categories in accounts of a 'riot'*. British journal of social psychology, 1987. **26**(1): p. 25-40. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1987.tb00758.x>.
26. Page-Adams, D. and M. Sherraden, *Asset building as a community revitalization strategy*. Social work, 1997. **42**(5): p. 423-434. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/42.5.423>.
27. Rodríguez, A.C., J.L. Aguilar, and I.A. Arbiol, *Relationship between physical-physiological and psychological responses in amateur soccer referees*. Journal of Sports Psychology, 2021. **30**(2): p. 26-37.
28. Rusman, A., *Model of Performance Improvement of Certified Teachers in Private Vocational Schools*. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 2020. **20**(86): p. 25-38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2020.86.2>.
29. Savalia, V.B., D.J. Pandya, and N.R. Sheth, *QUALITY CONTROL PARAMETERS OF PRICKLES OF BOMBAX CEIBA LINN*. EUROPEAN CHEMICAL BULLETIN, 2021. **10**(1): p. 39-45. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17628/ecb.2021.10.39-45>.
30. Apsari, N.C., et al., *Empowerment of coffee farmers through capacity building in processing coffee products in Genteng Village, Sukasari District, Kab. Sumedang*. Proceedings of Research and Community Service, 2017. **4**(2). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24198/jppm.v4i2.14346>.
31. Nulhaqim, S.A., M. Fedryansyah, and E.N. Hidayat, *Community-Based Agrarian Conflict Resolution in Farming Communities in Genteng Village, Sukasari District, Sumedang Regency*. Conflict Resolution Collaborative Journal, 2019. **1**(2): p. 70-78.
32. Sekerci, H. and F. Yilmaz, *The Role of Respectful Behaviour in the Relationship between Empathetic Tendencies and Conflict Resolution in Primary School Students*. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 2021. **93**: p. 73-94. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2021.93.4>.
33. Mulyani, L., *Criticism of handling agrarian conflicts in Indonesia*. BHUMI: Journal of Agrarian and Land, 2014(39): p. 314-355.
34. Green, T.L., *Leading for urban school reform and community development*. Educational administration quarterly, 2015. **51**(5): p. 679-711. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15577694>.