

Research Horizon

ISSN: 2808-0696 (p), 2807-9531 (e)

Research Horizon

Volume: 05

Issue: 03

Year: 2025

Page: 879-888

Citation:

Pribadi, A. K., & Gautama, T. (2025). Legal Analysis of Government Intervention in the Management of Cassava Agricultural Commodities in East Lampung Regency. *Research Horizon*, 5(3), 879-888.

Article History:

Received: May 26, 2025

Revised: June 19, 2025

Accepted: June 25, 2025

Online since: June 30, 2025

Legal Analysis of Government Intervention in the Management of Cassava Agricultural Commodities in East Lampung Regency

Adhimaz Kondang Pribadi^{1*}, Tirta Gautama¹

¹ Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro, Lampung, Indonesia

* Corresponding author: Adhimaz Kondang Pribadi (adhimazkondang@ummetro.ac.id)

Abstract

This article aims to analyze the government's legal intervention in the management of cassava as an agricultural commodity in East Lampung Regency through a normative juridical approach. The background of this study stems from the weak bargaining position of farmers in the cassava value chain and the lack of effective legal protection at the regional level. This research applies normative legal methods by examining statutory regulations, legal doctrines, and relevant academic literature. The findings indicate that although the legal basis for state intervention is sufficiently established at the national level, its implementation remains ineffective due to the absence of clear operational norms, disharmony between central and regional regulations, and the lack of legal enforcement mechanisms to control exploitative market practices. The implications highlight the urgent need for a regional regulation that specifically governs cassava trade systems, including price floor policies, legal empowerment of farmer cooperatives, and strengthened legal oversight through administrative law instruments. A law-based government intervention is necessary to ensure economic justice distribution and meaningful protection for vulnerable groups in the agricultural sector.

Keywords

Administrative Law, Agricultural Law, Cassava Commodity, Farmer Protection, Government Intervention.

1. Introduction

Agriculture is a vital sector that plays a strategic role in ensuring food security, strengthening the foundations of the national economy, and promoting regional development based on local resources (Saneei & Parvin, 2020). In the context of Indonesia as an agrarian country, the presence of strategic food commodities such as cassava (*Manihot esculenta*) has a significant contribution, both in terms of providing alternative food sources, ensuring domestic industrial resilience, and creating employment opportunities for rural communities. East Lampung, as one of the national cassava hubs, presents a duality: on one hand, it is the primary producer of this strategic commodity, but on the other hand, it faces structural challenges in management, distribution, and farmer protection (BPS Provinsi Lampung, 2023). Price disparities, exploitative trade practices, and the absence of legal certainty regarding farmers' bargaining power reflect the state's weak intervention as a protector of this strategic sector.

From the perspective of the rule of law and the welfare state framework, government intervention in the agricultural sector is not an optional policy choice but a constitutional obligation (Baraggia & Bonelli, 2022; Inawati et al., 2024). The state must ensure that market mechanisms operate fairly and do not burden vulnerable groups such as small farmer (Ariyadi, 2021). Such intervention should not only be technocratic in the form of production assistance, price subsidies, or technical training programmed, but must also have a strong legal foundation and guarantee the sustainability of normative protection in the long term (Bosselmann, 2022; Kipāne & Vilks, 2022). This is in line with the spirit of Law No. 19 of 2013 on the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers, which emphasises that the state must guarantee farmers' rights to fair market access, decent income, and legal protection against agricultural business risks (Saptana et al., 2016; Suastuti et al., 2023; Andjarwati, 2025).

Although regulations governing intervention in the agricultural sector are in place, such as Law Number 18 of 2012 on Food, Law Number 41 of 2009 on the Protection of Sustainable Food Agricultural Land, and Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government, their implementation at the regional level often falls short of optimal. In East Lampung Regency, intervention policies targeting cassava commodities exhibit sporadic, non-systematic tendencies and are often not grounded in clear legal norms. The failure to implement basic price policies, weaknesses in monitoring business actors, and inconsistencies between central and local regulations indicate that the interventions carried out are not based on a structured and integrated legal system (Muzakki et al., 2019; Osmani et al., 2022; Siradjuddin, 2023). The absence of a specific Regional Regulation that regulates cassava trade, the weakness of operational norms of national regulations that can be adopted at the regional level, and disharmony between central and regional policies indicate a substantive legal gap that has not been filled effectively.

This article aims to analyze the government's legal intervention in the management of cassava as an agricultural commodity in East Lampung Regency through a normative juridical approach. A normative legal study is relevant to critically examine the validity and effectiveness of existing legal norms in regulating government intervention in agricultural commodities, particularly cassava. This research is not only important in an academic context but also has significant practical implications for the formulation of law-based policies that are responsive to farmers' issues. By focusing the analysis on normative legal aspects, including testing the consistency of regulations, the strength of operational norms, and the effectiveness of legal protection, this study is expected to contribute to the design of agricultural policies that are fair, participatory, and oriented towards social justice.

2. Literature Review

Legal studies on government intervention in the agricultural sector must be based on a theoretical framework that can explain the relationship between the state, law, and economic governance (Wahyudi, 2020; Arifin, 2021). In this context, there are two main approaches that form the basis of this thinking: Welfare State Theory and State Economic Intervention Theory in Public Law.

The Welfare State Theory argues that the state does not only function as a supervisor, but also as a protector and provider of welfare for all citizens. State intervention is considered a tool to achieve distributive justice, protect vulnerable groups, and correct market failures. In the context of agriculture, the presence of the state is very important considering the characteristics of farming businesses that are vulnerable to price fluctuations, climate risks, and information asymmetries in the supply chain (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Atkinson, 2015). In line with that, the theory of state economic intervention in public law emphasizes that legal instruments are the normative basis for the state to improve market mechanisms (Audzei, 2019; Shevchuk, 2021).

In a modern state based on the supremacy of law, intervention cannot be carried out carelessly, but must be based on strong legal legitimacy, either in the form of laws, government regulations, or regional policies that are in accordance with constitutional norms. Intervention that is not based on law has the potential to create uncertainty and violate the principles of legality and procedural justice (Trebilcock & Iacobucci, 2010; Krasniqi, 2013). Therefore, the normative legal framework is a key element in evaluating government intervention policies.

In the field of agricultural law, this theory requires substantive and procedural legal protection for farmers as structurally weak legal subjects. State intervention must include basic price regulation, trade supervision, incentives, and guarantees of farmers' rights to access land, markets, and technology. In Indonesia, this legal framework has been manifested in several key regulations such as Law Number 19 of 2013 concerning the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers and Law Number 18 of 2012 concerning Food, and Law No. 41 of 2009 concerning the Protection of Sustainable Food Agricultural Land. However, the implementation of these norms still faces challenges at the regional level due to weak operational norms, a lack of synchronisation between regulations, and a lack of administrative law-based supervisory instruments (Siradjuddin, 2023).

Furthermore, the theory of intervention in public law is also relevant to the principles of state administrative law, which places government actions as part of *bestuursrecht* that must be principled, proportional, and accountable. In this case, a regulatory governance approach is needed so that intervention policies are not merely a response to market pressures, but rather rational, fair, and accountable legal policies (Baldwin et al., 2012; Husodo, 2015). Thus, this theoretical foundation becomes an important basis for analysing the validity, effectiveness, and legal legitimacy of government intervention in the management of cassava commodities in East Lampung. This study positions law as an instrument that is not neutral but rather a tool of social engineering to achieve agrarian justice and an inclusive economy.

3. Methods

This study uses a normative legal research approach, which is a legal research method that relies on systematic review of written legal norms, legal principles, and legal doctrines that have developed in practice and academic literature. This approach is not oriented towards empirical facts or field data collection, but rather towards conceptual analysis of the applicable positive legal system and how these

norms can provide legal protection and certainty for interested parties (Marzuki, 2017).

Normative legal research is conducted based on identified legal issues, in this case concerning the effectiveness of government intervention in the management of cassava commodities in East Lampung, reviewed from the perspective of validity, normative strength, and consistency between relevant laws and regulations. Therefore, this approach does not only focus on the inventory of laws and regulations but also involves statutory interpretation, legal reasoning, and the systematisation of norms to achieve a comprehensive understanding of the legal issues being studied.

The types of legal materials used in this study are divided into three categories, primary legal materials, which are laws and regulations that directly regulate the substance of government intervention in the agricultural sector, such as Law Number 19 of 2013 on the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers, Law Number 18 of 2012 concerning Food, Law Number 41 of 2009 concerning the Protection of Sustainable Food Agricultural Land, Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, as well as their implementing regulations at the ministerial and regional levels. Secondary legal materials, in the form of academic literature, scientific legal journals, policy articles, and research institution reports discussing government intervention, agricultural law, and food security policies. Tertiary legal materials, in the form of legal encyclopaedias, legal dictionaries, and legislation indexes used to reinforce terminology and clarify legal concepts used in the analysis.

The method of collecting legal materials was carried out through library research techniques, namely by searching various legal sources from digital repositories, government regulation databases, reputable national and international journals, as well as official documents from relevant government and international institutions. The search was carried out systematically and selectively to ensure the validity and authority of the sources used.

Data analysis in this study uses descriptive-analytical and systematic interpretative methods, namely by objectively describing the structure and substance of applicable legal norms, then interpreting and evaluating the integration between these norms in the context of government intervention in cassava commodities. Furthermore, deductive legal reasoning is used to draw conclusions based on legally tested premises. If necessary, a limited comparative legal approach is also used to examine how other countries apply legal-based interventions to strategic agricultural sectors, in order to formulate applicable and progressive legal recommendations. With this methodological approach, it is hoped that this study will contribute theoretically and practically to strengthening the design of fair, effective government intervention laws based on the principles of a democratic and socially just rule of law. This approach also allows for evaluation of regulatory disharmony, the absence of operational norms in the regions, and the weak effectiveness of the law, which are the causes of low legal protection for cassava farmers. Limited comparative studies also strengthen the relevance of the resulting legal recommendations.

4. Results

4.1. Legal Basis of Government Intervention in Cassava Sector

Government intervention in the agricultural sector, particularly in strategic commodities such as cassava, has strong legal legitimacy through national regulations such as Law Number 19 of 2013 on the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers. This law mandates the state to safeguard farmers across production, distribution, and pricing aspects. Legally, such interventions are not merely administrative, but must adhere to the principles of legality, accountability, and

proportionality within the framework of a democratic *Recht Staat*. However, in practice, especially in East Lampung, this legal legitimacy is not fully realized. Although the legal foundation exists, there are no concrete operational norms to protect farmers when cassava prices fall or when middlemen dictate prices due to limited market access. This reveals a gap between the normative mandate of the law and its implementation, undermining the effectiveness of government intervention at the regional level.

4.2 Lack of Regulation and Legal Certainty for Farmers

The absence of price floor regulations or provisions regarding minimum prices for cassava at the regional level reinforces the perception that the law does not substantively protect farmers. In the context of public law, the primary function of the state is to ensure access to justice for marginalised groups through affirmative action based on the law. The law should serve as a means of redistributive justice, not merely an elitist or procedural administrative tool.

Furthermore, limitations in harmonising central and regional regulations also contribute to the ineffectiveness of government intervention. Law Number 23 of 2014 on Regional Government does provide autonomy to regional governments in agricultural matters, but it does not include adequate fiscal and institutional mechanisms (Susanti & Nugroho, 2022). As a result, intervention policies in regions such as East Lampung are often nothing more than seasonal programmes without legal and institutional sustainability. On the other hand, large businesses or agricultural product processors have far greater economic and political power than local government institutions, which weakens farmers' bargaining position and leaves them unprotected by law.

As stated by Trebilcock and Iacobucci (2010), the success of public regulation is highly dependent on the existence of clear, enforceable legal instruments with oversight mechanisms. In the context of East Lampung, government intervention in the cassava trade has not yet established enforceable legal mechanisms capable of deterring market actors who deviate from regulations, let alone regulating the fair distribution of value added from farmers to end consumers.

4.3 Weak Monitoring and Enforcement Mechanisms in Trade

In addition, the role of supervisory agencies such as the Business Competition Supervisory Commission has so far not touched on local non-rice commodities such as cassava. However, cartel practices or unilateral price fixing by cassava processing factories and middlemen are very common and often go unaddressed due to weak substantive legal support (Yuliana & Hidayat, 2023). This highlights a gap in law implementation, where the law exists only on paper but not in practice (law in books versus law in action).

This condition reflects that government intervention remains within the realm of administrative policy alone and has not been pushed into the dimension of systemic legal intervention. Regional legal policies are needed that not only address aspects of crop distribution or subsidy provision but also strengthen farmers' positions structurally through minimum price regulations, the formation of public legal cooperatives, and the involvement of local governments in agribusiness contracts. Such provisions can be realised in the form of a Regional Regulation specifically governing the Trade of Cassava Commodities, including administrative sanctions and legal oversight based on the principles of good governance (Lestari & Rachman, 2022).

Furthermore, it is important to develop a legal approach that not only focuses on corrective measures when market failures occur but also on preventive and affirmative actions. For example, providing farmers with direct access to market information, strengthening farmers' legal position in the supply chain, and legal education through local institutions such as agricultural legal advisors. Such models

have been implemented in several countries, such as Thailand and Brazil, which have community-based agricultural legal systems (Da Silva, 2017), where local laws function as protective and empowering tools, not merely as administrative constraints or controls.

4.4 Price Intervention Policy

In the context of agrarian economic reality, state intervention through price floor is not always effective without complementary policies that address structural issues, such as high production costs and the lack of competitive market alternatives. The government cannot fully control the market price of commodities such as cassava without reducing production costs, including fertilizer prices, transportation costs, and the availability of agricultural tools and machinery (alsintan). A minimum price policy without subsidies for production inputs will only become a fiscal burden or create the illusion of price stability at the farmer level. Therefore, price intervention must be holistic, not merely setting a nominal minimum purchase price, but also paving the way for production efficiency and institutional innovation. For example, through the distribution of subsidised fertilisers, the provision of free or low-cost alsintan, and the development of farmer cooperatives capable of independently managing distribution.

Furthermore, the state can strengthen farmers' bargaining power through policies to establish state-backed buyers operating under the principles of the Pancasila economy. By introducing entities capable of purchasing cassava at fair prices such as regionally owned enterprises (*Badan Usaha Milik Daerah*/BUMD) or public-law-based production cooperatives an indirect market control mechanism is formed, where private actors can no longer arbitrarily set prices without considering the standards established by official institutions. Strategies like India's Minimum Support Price (MSP) system demonstrate that the state must create fair market structures, not just dictate prices. Without a structural approach, administrative price interventions will fail and perpetuate price injustice. A new paradigm of legal and economic intervention is needed that is more constructive and participatory.

4.5 Legal Intervention as an Instrument of Social Justice

Thus, government intervention in the cassava sector should not be viewed as a mere economic policy, but rather as a legal policy with a social justice dimension. An ideal legal state is not sufficient to merely guarantee farmers' formal rights but must also ensure their actual empowerment within a market system that is often unfair. Only in this way can the law truly fulfil its role as a substantive and inclusive instrument of social change.

In the framework of public legal intervention for strategic agricultural commodities such as cassava, local governments need to transform from normative regulators to executive actors in market control. One strategic step is the establishment of a Regionally Owned Enterprise (BUMD) that controls the price and distribution of cassava. BUMD must have a business unit that manages cassava trade exclusively, from harvest to marketing. The existence of BUMD will provide an alternative market for farmers and create a price benchmark to reduce the dominance of middlemen. The role of BUMD can be equated with the Logistics Agency (BULOG) which manages rice and paddy nationally, ensuring price and supply stability. However, unilateral price cuts by processing factories and lack of state supervision have made farmers lose bargaining power, so that the implementation of price policies is ineffective.

When compared to the handling of rice, which has been included in the national priority agenda, including price intervention, distribution, and national stock provision, cassava appears to receive less attention. However, Lampung Province is the largest cassava-producing region in Indonesia, contributing more than 30% to national production according to 2023 data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS)

(BPS Provinsi Lampung, 2023). This fact underscores that despite being classified as a regional commodity, cassava's strategic role in food security, processing industries, and rural livelihoods makes it worthy of being designated as a national commodity that must be legally and institutionally safeguarded.

The East Lampung Regional Government needs to establish special regulations, such as Regional Regulations or Regional Head Regulations, to form a BUMD that functions as a price stabilization institution, post-harvest manager, and distributor of cassava agricultural products. This regulation is supported by Article 274(1) of Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government and PP Number 54 of 2017 concerning BUMD which gives authority to regions to form business units according to local potential. The substantial basis is strengthened by Law No. 19 of 2013 concerning Protection and Empowerment of Farmers which guarantees farmers' rights to price protection and fair market access.

Without the establishment of such an institution, price intervention will remain symbolic and administrative. Farmers will continue to be victims of economic power asymmetries that are not corrected by the state. Therefore, government intervention should move from a normative approach to structural intervention that provides legal guarantees, market certainty, and real social protection. This transformation is key to ensuring that agricultural policies are not merely present in planning documents but truly address the root causes of economic inequality in the upstream sector.

5. Discussion

Government intervention in the agricultural sector, particularly in cassava commodities, has strong legal legitimacy through Law Number 19 of 2013 concerning the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers, which mandates the state to protect farmers from agricultural risks (Arifin, 2021). However, this intervention often falls short of key legal principles such as legality, accountability, and proportionality. In East Lampung, regulatory frameworks have not fully addressed complex normative problems, such as falling prices due to market oversupply or the lack of direct access for farmers to formal markets. This reflects the absence of operational legal mechanisms to safeguard farmers' bargaining position and ensure distributive justice.

One major issue is the absence of a floor price policy for cassava, which leads to the perception that existing laws fail to protect farmers. From the standpoint of public law, the state bears a constitutional obligation to protect marginalized groups, including smallholder farmers, by using law as an instrument of redistributive justice. However, weak regulatory harmonization between central and regional governments has resulted in fragmented and unsustainable intervention strategies. Susanti and Nugroho (2022) argue that Law Number 23 of 2014 on Regional Government lacks sufficient fiscal and institutional instruments to support local agricultural policies. Furthermore, corporate dominance exacerbates the weak bargaining power of farmers, particularly when there are no legal safeguards to prevent exploitative pricing by large processors and intermediaries (Trebilcock & Iacobucci, 2010).

Supervisory institutions such as the Business Competition Supervisory Commission have not addressed market distortions in non-rice local commodities like cassava, even though cartel practices and unilateral price-setting are widely reported (Yuliana & Hidayat, 2023). This gap between written law and practical enforcement illustrates the phenomenon of law in books versus law in action. A regional legal framework is urgently needed to govern cassava trade, including price control measures, fair distribution mechanisms, and legal empowerment of farmer cooperatives.

Comparatively, regions such as Central Java have experimented with integrating floor price mechanisms for staple crops through partnerships between Regional-Owned Enterprises and farmer groups. This model, supported by regulatory clarity at the regional level, has improved market stability and farmer incomes (Hartono et al., 2021). The absence of similar structures in East Lampung demonstrates the need for legal innovation that is both normative and adaptive to local realities. Without dedicated institutions like BUMD to serve as alternative market actors, farmers remain vulnerable to predatory market behavior.

Furthermore, minimum price regulation alone is not a silver bullet. Without subsidies to lower production costs such as fertilizers and transport price interventions may become a fiscal burden without significantly improving farmer welfare (Yuliana & Hidayat, 2023). Thus, a holistic intervention is necessary, combining legal enforcement, input subsidies, and institutional strengthening to ensure fair trade practices. Such interventions must be grounded in law to ensure accountability and sustainability. Ultimately, government intervention in the cassava sector must be framed as a legal policy embedded with a social justice mandate. Law should not only secure formal rights for farmers but also enable their empowerment in an often-asymmetrical market structure. Strengthening regional regulatory authority, establishing cassava-specific BUMDs, and creating enforceable operational norms will be key to transforming legal legitimacy into actual protection and economic justice for cassava farmers in East Lampung (Wahyudi, 2020).

6. Conclusion

This study finds that government intervention in the management of cassava commodities in East Lampung has strong legal legitimacy, primarily grounded in Law No. 19 of 2013 on the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers and Law No. 18 of 2012 on Food. However, its local implementation remains ineffective due to weak operational norms, regulatory disharmony between central and regional authorities, and the absence of concrete enforcement mechanisms. These shortcomings result in the failure to protect farmers from exploitative pricing and market asymmetry. While the normative framework exists, intervention has been largely administrative and lacks binding legal instruments to ensure substantive protection and empowerment of cassava farmers.

The practical implication of this study highlights the urgent need for a local regulatory framework such as a Regional Regulation on Cassava Trade Practices that can establish price floors, curb cartel practices, and formally empower farmers within the distribution chain. Strengthening regional institutions through such regulations would enhance transparency and fairness in local agricultural markets. Theoretically, this research contributes to understanding government intervention not merely as an economic instrument, but as a legal mechanism embedded in the principles of the rule of law and distributive justice. In a welfare state context, intervention policies must be normatively grounded and oriented toward structural empowerment of marginalized groups.

This study is limited by the absence of empirical data from farmers and field actors, as well as the evolving interpretations of legal relations between central and regional authorities. Future research should incorporate participatory methods to capture farmers lived experiences, assess institutional enforcement barriers, and evaluate the economic impacts of cassava-focused regulatory interventions in decentralized governance systems. Such studies will be vital in designing inclusive and effective agricultural legal frameworks.

References

- Andjarwati, A. (2025). Reforming indonesia's agricultural legal system: Empowering family-based farmers for sustainable development and social security integration. *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, 54(1), 92-101.
- Arifin, B. (2021). Landasan Hukum Perlindungan Petani dan Tanggung Jawab Negara. *Jurnal Hukum Agraria Indonesia*, 12(2), 135-150.
- Ariyadi, W. (2021). Analisis Empiris Tingkat Ketahanan Pangan Rumah Tangga Petani di Kota Salatiga, Indonesia. *Research Horizon*, 1 (1), 39-46.
- Atkinson, A. B. (2015). *Inequality: What can be done?* Harvard University Press.
- Audzei, H. (2019). The Role of Environmental Law Education for Sustainable Development. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 8(3), 79-79.
- Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) Provinsi Lampung. (2023). *Statistik Komoditas Singkong Provinsi Lampung Tahun 2022*. Retrieved 2025 from: <https://lampung.bps.go.id/publication.html>
- Baldwin, R., Cave, M., & Lodge, M. (2012). *Understanding regulation: Theory, strategy, and practice* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Baraggia, A., & Bonelli, M. (2022). Menghubungkan uang dengan nilai: Regulasi kondisionalitas aturan hukum yang baru dan tantangan konstitusionalnya. *Jurnal Hukum Jerman*, 23 (2), 131-156.
- Bosselmann, K. (2022). *A normative approach to environmental governance: Sustainability at the apex of environmental law*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Da Silva, C. A. (2017). Contract Farming and Legal Empowerment in Latin America: Brazil as a Model. *Journal of Agricultural Law*, 23(2), 145-162.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Husodo, S. (2015). Pembangunan pertanian: antara pertumbuhan ekonomi dan keberlanjutan. *Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Pertanian*, 22(2), 141-147.
- Inawati, I., Rahmadi, M., & Mahmuctarom, M. (2024). Perlindungan hukum kepentingan persaingan usaha yang sehat di sektor usaha: Analisis pelanggaran anti-trust dan kartel. *Research Horizon*, 4 (3), 189-200
- Kipāne, A., & Vilks, A. (2022). Legal framework for environmental protection in the context of sustainable development. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 11(4), 169-169.
- Krasniqi, A. (2013). Legislative Changes for Economic Development on Regional Basis, the Possibilities or Conditions for the Integration of the West Balkan Countries in th. *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics (JARLE)*, 4(08), 121-127.
- Lampungpro.co. (2024). *Petani Singkong Menjerit, Harga Terpotong hingga 40 Persen*. Retrived 2025 from: <https://lampungpro.co/post/50503/petani-singkong-menjerit-harga-terpotong-hingga-40-persen>
- Lestari, E., & Rachman, H. (2022). *Efektivitas perda dalam tata niaga komoditas lokal: Studi kasus Kabupaten Kulonprogo*. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, 19(3), 301-315.
- Lestari, F. Y., Affandi, M. I., & Ismono, R. H. (2023). Analisis ketimpangan pendapatan antar wilayah di Provinsi Lampung Tahun 2012-2020. *Region: Jurnal Pembangunan Wilayah dan Perencanaan Partisipatif*, 18(2), 456-469.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2017). *Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenadamedia Group.
- Muzakki, A., Wibowo, A., & Rohmah, N. (2019). Analisis kebijakan distribusi hasil pertanian dalam rangka peningkatan kesejahteraan petani. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan: Kajian Masalah Ekonomi dan Pembangunan*, 20(1), 1-10.
- Osmani, M., Kolaj, R., Borisov, P., & Arabska, E. (2022). Mengapa kebijakan pertanian gagal dan dua kasus kegagalan kebijakan di Albania. *Ekonomi pertanian dan sumber daya: Jurnal ilmiah elektronik internasional*, 8 (2), 86-104.
- Risvenjaya, E., Yulianawati, D., & Andrian, T. (2024). Analisis indeks ketahanan pangan di Provinsi Sumatera Selatan. *Jurnal Agribisnis Indonesia*, 7(1), 8516-8524.
- Saneei, M., & Parvin, K. (2020). Legal Analysis of Governments Intervention or Non-Intervention in Development System: An Approach from Public Economic Law. *Public Law Studies Quarterly*, 50(1), 239-254.
- Saptana, Iqbal, M., & Ar-Rozi, A. M. (2016). Evaluasi kebijakan tujuh gema revitalisasi dalam pembangunan pertanian. *Analisis Kebijakan Pertanian*, 11(2), 107-127.

- Shevchuk, L. (2021). Environmental rights of citizens and legal safeguards for their protection: challenges for the future. *Futurity Economics&Law*, 1(2), 4-11.
- Siradjuddin, I. (2023). Pengembangan kawasan perdesaan berkelanjutan berbasis potensi pertanian. *Open Access Journal of Rural Development*, 6(1), 50-57.
- Suastuti, E., Ul Haq, H., Hasanah, U., Martini, D., & Lestari, S. N. (2023). Menelaah Aspek Pidana Rezim Varietas Tanaman Indonesia dan Perlindungan Petani untuk Kedaulatan Pangan. *JILS*, 8 (5), 855-866.
- Susanti, R., & Nugroho, T. (2022). Otonomi Daerah dan Ketimpangan Implementasi Regulasi Nasional. *Jurnal Tata Kelola dan Kebijakan Publik*, 10(1), 45-59.
- Trebilcock, M. J., & Iacobucci, E. M. (2010). *The design of regulatory regimes*. In M. J. Trebilcock (Ed.), *Advanced Introduction to Law and Development*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Wahyudi, T. (2020). BUMD sebagai Instrumen Intervensi Ekonomi Negara: Perspektif Hukum Administrasi. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan dan Hukum*, 15(1), 25-40.
- Yuliana, D., & Hidayat, A. (2023). Kartel dan Monopoli Harga dalam Sektor Komoditas Pertanian. *Jurnal Hukum dan Ekonomi*, 18(1), 77-90.

Acknowledgment

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of individuals who supported the completion of this article.

Funding Information

This research did not receive any funding.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval and Originality Statement

Ethical approval was obtained for this study. The manuscript represents original work and has not been previously published, nor is it under consideration by another journal.

Data Disclosure Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.

This work is licensed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).