

Effectiveness of Social Forestry Programs Towards Resolving Forest Management Conflicts in South Sulawesi, Indonesia

^{*1}Baso Mading, ²Almusawir, ³Abdurrifai, ⁴Firman Anugrah

^{1,2,3,4}Lecturer at the Faculty of Law, Bosowa University, Makassar

⁵Lecturer at the Faculty of Law, Pejuang Republic of Indonesia University, Makassar

***Correspondence Author**

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.9010224>

Received: 30 December 2024; Accepted: 03 January 2025; Published: 13 February 2025

ABSTRACT

Forests as one of the determinants of the life support system and source of people's prosperity, have recently experienced shrinkage and are very worried about the consequences of deforestation, forestry conflicts, forestry corruption and so on that occur in South Sulawesi Province. Therefore, it is necessary to have sustainable and sustainable forest management, one of the efforts made by the government is through the Social Forestry Program. However, unfortunately, the existence of social forestry in South Sulawesi Province is currently not optimal and is not in accordance with the targets set by the government. This study aims to analyze various obstacles in social forestry management so far in South Sulawesi Province. The research method used is normative-empirical research with qualitative and quantitative approaches. The results of the study show that the obstacles in the management of social forestry in South Sulawesi Province are the lack of budget provided, long and convoluted licensing and administration, errors in setting social forestry targets based on area, difficulty in determining the location of land, sometimes the land given to the community is very difficult to reach, the commodities offered to the community have no economic value. Sanctions enforcement has not been optimal due to the difficulty of obtaining evidence and collusion with law enforcement officials.

Keywords: social forestry, conflict resolution, Forest management

INTRODUCTION

Forests are a gift from God Almighty that provides many benefits for human life in the world (Suganda, 2024). So that humans should protect and use forests wisely and wisely. Forest utilization has the goal of obtaining optimal benefits for the welfare of all communities in a sustainable manner while maintaining forest sustainability. Limited access to community land around forests is undeniably one of the causes of deforestation (Sutama, 2023). This problem encourages the emergence of the concept of social forestry even though in some regions the goal of sustainable social forestry has not been achieved (Istikorini & Sari, 2022).

Social Forestry in Indonesia was born from a paradigm shift in global community in conventional forest management to a more modern system (Pambudi, 2020). In the past, forest management was only controlled by a few people, including the government, and ignored the existence of the community in it. As a result, forests are increasingly damaged by unsustainable management (Molnar et al., 2011).

This paradigm is changing along with the occurrence of widespread deforestation. Like a breath of fresh air, the perspective of forest management has finally changed, from forest management by the state to joint management with the community, namely forest management that must involve and prosper the community around the forest (Kahsay et al., 2023).

Social forestry as regulated in the Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry No. 83 of 2016 concerning Social Forestry explains that the sustainable forest management system implemented in the State forest area or the right forest/customary forest implemented by the local community or customary law

community as the main actor to improve its welfare, environmental balance and socio-cultural dynamics in the form of Village Forests, Community Forests, Community Plantation Forests, Customary Forests, and Forestry Partnerships (Gunawan et al., 2022).

Furthermore, it is regulated in Presidential Regulation Number 28 of 2023 concerning Integrated Planning for the Acceleration of Social Forestry Management which regulates the Acceleration of Social Forestry Management which is a collaboration between ministries/agencies, provincial and district/city regional governments and related parties in accelerating the achievement of social forestry management targets that are implemented in a holistic, integrative, thematic, and spatial manner as planned Integrally (Raodah et al., 2024). Integrated planning for the Acceleration of Social Forestry Management includes: 1) distribution of legal access; 2) the development of social forestry businesses; and 3) mentoring (Ekowati, 2022)

Social forestry policy in Indonesia is basically born from a long historical process (Pambudi, 2020). This policy is inspired by the paradigm shift (*carapandang*) of the global community in managing forests conventionally (*Timber Extraction & Timber Management*) who tend to see forests solely as wood and habitat for fauna by negating the existence of the surrounding community or in the forest that lives, interacts and depends on the existence of the forest as an inseparable ecosystem (Nugroho et al., 2022). The old paradigm that leads to forest destruction and structural impoverishment of communities around forests (Arasa-Gisbert et al., 2022).

Social Forestry has actually been pioneered for a long time through various forms of activities, both in the form of intercropping programs in *perhutani*, and PMDH by HPH/HTI (Kusuma et al., 2023). After the New Order, the central government has opened up space for greater rights for local communities through the Law on Forestry No. 41 of 1999 and Government Regulation No. 6 of 2007 jo No. 3 of 2008 concerning Forest Management and the Preparation of Forest Management Plans, as well as Forest Utilization (M.R. et al., 2016). Furthermore, through the Constitutional Court (MK) Decision No. 35 of 2012, Customary Areas are recognized and are not part of the State Forest Area (Hadisaroso et al., 2024).

The Reform Era and Indonesia's entry into the democratic atmosphere is a great momentum for the development of social forestry discourse. It is like a seed in dry soil that begins to sprout when the rain begins to come (Trauger, 2015). The wave of justice and social welfare in forest management is getting stronger at the local level (supported by the spirit of decentralization) (Fisher, 2000). However, ironically, it has almost 20 years since the reform momentum has passed, and the social forestry paradigm is still just a political jargon to attract the masses, limited to a mere program of promises.

For this reason, the government hopes that the realization of social forestry is important to be accelerated in order to improve the welfare of the people who manage forest products through environmental empowerment and preservation (Ragandhi et al., 2021). With the issuance of Presidential Regulation Number 23 of 2021, it is hoped that real empowerment collaboration will be realized, both from ministries and agencies, local governments, and other related parties to increase community capacity in social forestry management to be more prosperous and prosperous (Affandi et al., 2021).

The target for the implementation of the social forestry program by the South Sulawesi Provincial government can currently be said to be extraordinary. The government through the Ministry of Environment & Forestry (MoEF) targets approximately 272,858.95 hectares of forest areas managed by the community through HD, HKm, HTR, Customary Forest, and Partnership schemes (Wahyuni, 2021).

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a qualitative research design with descriptive survey methods and qualitative analysis. This study aims to analyze social forestry in resolving forest management conflicts. The research method used is normative-empirical research with qualitative and quantitative approaches. The data collection technique was carried out by observation, in-depth interviews with the South Sulawesi Provincial Forestry Service, forestry observer groups and community leaders, as well as through documentation studies of relevant document archives, this research is intended to reveal what conditions cause the failure of the management of the Social Forestry Program

RESEARCH RESULTS

Forests have crucial ecological, economic, and social functions as a source of life as well as a support system for life on earth (Pane & Yanis, 2024). The concept of sustainable forest management (*Sustainable Forest Management*) became famous since it was raised as a topic at the United Nations conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 (Kumar et al., 2021). *Sustainable Forest Management* It is a form of application of the concept of sustainable development in forest management (Adamowicz & Burton, 2015). *Sustainable Forest Management* defined as a way of managing forests and forest resources to meet the social, economic, ecological, cultural, and spiritual needs of current and future generations (Bhandari & Lamichhane, 2020). Concept *Sustainable Forest Management* or sustainable forest management is also applied in social forestry development in several provinces in Indonesia (Rachmina et al., 2024).

South Sulawesi Province is located at 0°12' - 8° South Latitude and 116°48' - 122°36' East Longitude. The area is 45,764.53 km². The province is bordered by Central Sulawesi and West Sulawesi to the north, Bone Bay and Southeast Sulawesi to the east, the Makassar Strait to the west and the Flores Sea to the south.

Forest destruction in South Sulawesi Province is still a challenge for forestry development. Community activities around the forest are a potential for forest destruction, most people use the forest as a land for cultivating annual crops that have a short harvest period (Yuliani et al., 2023). Efforts to protect and secure forests from forest destruction continue to be carried out with a persuasive approach so that it is hoped that there will be awareness to maintain the existing forest ecosystem (Sarmiento et al., 2024). Preventive efforts to protect and secure forests are carried out routinely by the forestry police. Forest damage is caused by unlicensed forest use (forest encroachment), forest fires and illegal logging (Wardani, 2021).

The achievement of forest management through social forestry until 2023 reached 196,745.33 ha or 11.05% of the area of protected and production forests covering an area of 1,780,029 ha.

Based on data obtained at the research site, social forestry that has been realized in South Sulawesi Province has reached 80% spread across several districts in South Sulawesi. For details, please see the following table:

Table 1 Realization of Social Forestry in Several Districts in South Sulawesi

Number	Regency Name	Types of Managed Territories	Stages
1	Gowa	Social Forestry and Community Forests	Assignment of Rights
2	Bulukumba	Social Forestry and Community Forests	Assignment of rights
3	North Toraja	Customary Forests	Proposal
4	Tana Toraja	Customary Forests	Proposal
5	Enrekang	Social Forestry and Community Forests	Proposal
6	Bone	Social Forestry and Village Forests	Proposal
7	Jeneponto	Social Forestry	Proposal
8	North Luwu	Social Forestry	Assignment of Rights
9	Barru	Social Forestry	Assignment of Rights
10	Sinjai	Social Forestry and Customary Forests	Assignment of Rights
11	Takalar	Social Forestry	Proposal
12	Pangkep	Social Forestry	Proposal

Data Source: South Sulawesi Provincial Forestry Service

The data above shows that of the eleven districts that were recorded, they are generally in the stage of determining rights, although there are still districts that are temporarily proposing social forestry programs.

In South Sulawesi Province, there are several things that are recorded as challenges in the implementation of Social Forestry (Herrawan et al., 2022). Among them is that people's access to forest management, including indigenous peoples, is still limited (Alfitri et al., 2022). This program is also considered not to be a priority so that the target for its achievement in South Sulawesi is very low.

Another obstacle that is also important to observe is the massive land conflict between the community, companies and the government. There are several findings of land conflict cases in South Sulawesi by civil society. For example, in 2022 in several districts that are under pressure from the mining and plantation industries which have had a negative impact on the environment and society.

Among them are Gowa (Stone mining), Maros (Cement mines around ancient sites and the construction of KIMA II), Pangkajene Islands (Mining threatens the environment), Enrekang (Marble mines covering an area of 75.20 Ha), North Luwu (mining permits are in the Buffer Area/Watershed), Takalar (Sand mines on the coast), Makassar (Center Point of Indonesia), Pinrang (Forest Area transfer without clarity of permits).

There are so many cases of people moving people in the forest in South Sulawesi, and of course, the residents who have lived as they have been on the slopes of the mountains are quite large. This means that quite a number of residents live below the poverty line in the midst of the nutritional condition of the landscape which is increasingly depleted.

This is the strongest reason for the emergence of the idea of Social Forestry, which is a way of mediating protracted conflicts, between residents around the forest and the government

From data collected by the Sulawesi Community Foundation, the area of South Sulawesi's forest area is approximately 2,725,796 hectares, or about 46.42 percent of the area of South Sulawesi. Of the 3,030 villages in South Sulawesi, there are 1,028 villages in forest areas, with around 864,510 poor people in them.

In addition, legal access licensing is taken in stages that are easy and difficult. The first thing is to strengthen multi-stakeholder support at the provincial and district levels that are targeted to obtain permits. The parties involved are the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, the Social Forestry and Environmental Partnership Center (BPSKL) of the South Sulawesi Provincial Forestry Service, the Forest Management Unit (FMU), the sub-district government, the village government, local communities, and forestry assistants.

Public understanding of Social Forestry is still very minimal. In fact, there are often misunderstandings about the provision of legal access. Some cleared the forest because they did not understand that the forest should remain intact, but they were given access to take what could be used.

CONCLUSION

The community around the forest is one of the poor groups in South Sulawesi. Where the community around the forest, generally poorly educated, is very dependent on the surrounding forest products to meet their daily needs, if they have a side job, it can be ascertained that it is an informal job with low wages, and is too focused on efforts to meet the needs of the family so that they have less opportunities for capacity building activities. Poverty in communities around forests can be overcome by optimizing the implementation of social forestry programs. Community capacity building is absolutely necessary because they will play a role as the main actors of social forestry activities. Capacity building requires equal opportunities for each group member, including the poorest communities.

REFERENCE

1. Adamowicz, W. L., & Burton, P. J. (2015). Chapter 2 Sustainability and sustainable forest management. January.

2. Affandi, O., Kartodihardjo, H., Nugroho, B., & Ekawati, S. (2021). Institutional analysis of forest governance after the implementation of law number 23/2014 in North Sumatra province, Indonesia. *Forest and Society*, 5(2), 304–325 <https://doi.org/10.24259/fs.v5i2.8755>
3. Alfitri, Alfatih, A., Lionardo, A., Kholek, A., Saraswati, E., Izzudin, M., & Santoso, A. D. (2022). The complexity of integrating indigenous knowledge for ecotourism planning: a case of Mude Ayek's customary forests, Indonesia. *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*, 9(1), 76–97. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTA.2022.10052980>
4. Arasa-Gisbert, R., Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Meave, J. A., Martínez-Ramos, M., & Lohbeck, M. (2022). Forest loss and treeless matrices cause the functional impoverishment of sapling communities in old-growth forest patches across tropical regions. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 59(7), 1897–1910. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14197>
5. Bhandari, A. R., & Lamichhane, S. (2020). *Sustainable Forest Management Resource Book*. Book, 40. [https://wwfasia.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/sustainable forest management resource book english.pdf](https://wwfasia.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/sustainable_forest_management_resource_book_english.pdf)
6. Ekowati, E. (2022). Gender Responsive Social Forestry Policy: A Case Study of Laws and Regulations in the Social Forest. *Journal of Women for Enlightenment and Equality*, 27(1), 43–55. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/367714434 Kebijakan Perhutanan Sosial yang Responsif Gender Studi Kasus Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Bidang Perhutanan Sosial Dan Pemberian Izin Perhutanan Sosial](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/367714434_Kebijakan_Perhutanan_Sosial_yang_Responsif_Gender_Studi_Kasus_Peraturan_Perundang-Undangan_Bidang_Perhutanan_Sosial_Dan_Pemberian_Izin_Perhutanan_Sosial)
7. Fisher, R. J. (2000). Decentralization and devolution in forest management: A conceptual overview. In RECOFTC report.
8. Gunawan, H., Yeny, I., Karlina, E., Suharti, S., Murniati, Subarudi, Mulyanto, B., Ekawati, S., Garsetiasih, R., Pratiwi, Sumirat, B. K., Sawitri, R., Heriyanto, N. M., Takandjandji, M., Widarti, A., Surati, Desmiwati, Kalima, T., Effendi, R., ... Nurlia, A. (2022). Integrating Social Forestry and Biodiversity Conservation in Indonesia. *Forests*, 13(12), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f13122152>
9. Hadisaroso, I. N. M., Karjoko, L., & Handayani, I. G. A. K. R. (2024). Constitutional Court Decision's Implication on the Traditional Forest Management Rights Recognition. Atlantis Press SARL. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-218-7_83
10. Herrawan, H., Sirimorok, N., Nursaputra, M., Mas'ud, E. I., Faturachmat, F., Sadapotto, A., Supratman, S., Yusran, Y., & Sahide, M. A. K. (2022). Commoning the State Forest: Crafting Commons through an Indonesian Social Forestry Program. *Forest and Society*, 6(1), 20–39. <https://doi.org/10.24259/fs.v6i1.10680>
11. Istikorini, Y., & Sari, O. Y. (2022). Sylva Lestari Journal. *Journal of Sylva Lestari*, 10(2), 211–222. <http://jurnal.fp.unila.ac.id/index.php/JHT/article/view/1064/969>
12. Kahsay, G. A., Bulte, E., Alpizar, F., Hansen, L. G., & Medhin, H. (2023). Leadership accountability in community-based forest management: experimental evidence in support of governmental oversight. *Ecology and Society*, 28(4). <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-14469-280420>
13. Kumar, D., Thakur, C., Bhardwaj, D. R., Sharma, N., Sharma, H., & Sharma, P. (2021). Sustainable Forest Management, a Global Review. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, 10(01), 1971–2528. <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2021.1001.292>
14. Kusuma, A. F., Sahide, M. A. K., Purwanto, R. H., Ismariana, E., Santoso, W. B., Wulandari, E., & Maryudi, A. (2023). Emergent Institutional Issues from New Tenure Reforms and Social-Forestry Initiatives in Indonesia: Notes from The Field. *Forest and Society*, 7(2), 450–466. <https://doi.org/10.24259/fs.v7i2.28319>
15. M.R., B., T., H., N., L., & E., M. (2016). Forest tenure reform in Indonesia: When? What? Why? *Forest Tenure Reform in Indonesia: When? What? Why?*, 163. <https://doi.org/10.17528/cifor/006333>
16. Molnar, A., France, M., Purdy, L., & Karver, J. (2011). Community-based forest management: the extent and potential scope of community and smallholder forest management and enterprises. *Rights and Resources Initiative*, 1–37.
17. Nugroho, H. Y. S. H., Nurfatriani, F., Indrajaya, Y., Yuwati, T. W., Ekawati, S., Salminah, M., Gunawan, H., Subarudi, S., Sallata, M. K., Allo, M. K., Muin, N., Isnain, W., Putri, I. A. S. L. P., Prayudyaningsih, R., Ansari, F., Siarudin, M., Setiawan, O., & Baral, H. (2022). Mainstreaming Ecosystem Services from Indonesia's Remaining Forests. *Sustainability* (Switzerland), 14(19). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141912124>

18. Pambudi, A. S. (2020). The Development of Social Forestry in Indonesia: The Journal of Indonesia Sustainable Development Planning, 1(1), 57–66. <https://doi.org/10.46456/jisdep.v1i1.11>
19. Pane, E., & Yanis, A. (2024). Environmental Ethics in Islam: Balancing Rights and Ecological Justice in Forest Management. *KnE Social Sciences*, 2024, 12–25. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v9i2.14963>
20. Rachmina, D., Purnomo, R., & Azriani, Z. (2024). Business Sustainability Analysis of the Social Forestry Program in West Sumatra Province. 10(2), 215–235.
21. Ragandhi, A., Hadna, A. H., Setiadi, S., & Maryudi, A. (2021). Why do greater forest tenure rights not enthuse local communities? An early observation on the new community forestry scheme in state forests in Indonesia. *Forest and Society*, 5(1), 159–166. <https://doi.org/10.24259/fs.v5i1.11723>
22. Raodah, P., Mulyana, S. P., Fathoni, L. A., & Wardani, N. K. (2024). Legal Aspects Of Business Development Of Social Forestry Business Group (SFBG) Forest Farmers Group (FFGS) Tirte Urip Central Lombok NTB. *Unram Law Review*, 8(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.29303/ulrev.v8i1.318>
23. Sarmiento, F., Larrea, C., Oeschger, A., & Jose, R. (2024). Measures to Enhance Forest Conservation and Reduce Deforestation: Viewpoints and lessons from producing countries. *SSI Report*, February.
24. Suganda, D. (2024). Living Laws in Forest Guarding in Aceh Portrait of Experiences Past and Today. Legitimacy: Journal of Criminal Law and Legal Politics, 13(1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.22373/legitimasi.v13i1.23212>
25. Utama, I. N. (2023). Sustainable Forest Resources Use Policy (Issue Icclb). Atlantis Press SARL. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-180-7_80
26. Trauger, A. (2015). Food sovereignty in international context: Discourse, politics and practice of place. In *Food Sovereignty in International Context: Discourse, Politics and Practice of Place*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315764429>
27. Wahyuni, T. (2021). Strengthening Role and Policy of Local Government in Accelerating Development of Social Forestry in East Kalimantan. *Proceedings of the Joint Symposium on Tropical Studies (JSTS-19)*, 11, 382–387. <https://doi.org/10.2991/absr.k.210408.063>
28. Wardani, W. I. (2021). How Can the Law Protect the Forest? *Journal of Law and Legal Reform*, 2(4), 527–538. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v2i4.48757>
29. Yuliani, E. L., Moeliono, M., Labarani, A., Fisher, M. R., Tias, P. A., & Sunderland, T. (2023). Relational values of forests: Value-conflicts between local communities and external programmes in Sulawesi. *People and Nature*, 5(6), 1822–1838. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10389>