

## **Legal Certainty of The Temporary Abolition of Rights**

### **Under Article 53 Paragraph (1) of Agrarian Law**

**Alivia Febriyanti<sup>1\*</sup>, M. Hamidi Masykur<sup>1</sup>, Bambang Eko Supriyadi<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Law, Brawijaya University Malang, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author Email: [aliviafebri@student.ub.ac.id](mailto:aliviafebri@student.ub.ac.id)

**Article History: Received: Oktober 18, 2025; Accepted: December 19, 2025**

#### **ABSTRACT**

This study discusses legal certainty in the elimination of temporary rights, namely mortgage rights, profit-sharing rights, right to ride, and agricultural land lease rights, based on Article 53 paragraph (1) of the Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA). These temporary rights are a legacy of the colonial and customary systems that still give rise to legal uncertainty and agrarian conflicts. This study uses a normative-juridical approach with a literature study of laws and regulations, legal doctrine, and literature related to the principle of legal certainty. The results of the study indicate that the elimination of temporary rights must be implemented with the principle of legal certainty that emphasizes clarity of norms, consistency of application, and procedural openness. Legal certainty, as explained by Jan Michiel Otto, refers not only to the existence of written rules, but also to the effectiveness of implementation and real benefits for the community. In the context of Article 53 of the UUPA, the elimination of temporary rights must be accompanied by the transfer of rights to more permanent and registered forms of rights, such as ownership rights or use rights, thereby providing legal guarantees for farmers and the beneficiary community. This study emphasizes that the principle of legal certainty plays a strategic role in preventing arbitrary practices, reducing agrarian conflicts, and realizing social justice. With clear and consistent regulations, the elimination of temporary rights can support equitable land ownership, strengthen legal legitimacy, and improve public welfare. These findings suggest that the successful implementation of Article 53 of the UUPA depends heavily on the harmonization of written regulations, administrative practices, and public understanding of agricultural rights.

**Keywords:** Legal certainty, temporary rights, elimination of rights, UUPA, agricultural rights.

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Land control and management policies during the colonial period were heavily influenced by imperialist economic interests, which emphasized the exploitation of agrarian resources for maximum profit. Within this system, land was viewed not as an integral part of social life, but merely as an economic commodity to be controlled by those with higher social status. As a result, indigenous people, particularly farmers and rural communities, experienced structural marginalization, placed at the bottom of the ladder without adequate access to land rights, which should have been their source of livelihood, thus giving rise to profound and ongoing social inequality. (Sutedi, 2010; Harsono, 2008; Parlindungan, 1998)

From an agrarian perspective, land has a very broad meaning, not only as part of the earth's surface, but also as an object of control and management by the state and the people, which plays a strategic role in national development and equitable prosperity. Land is a vital resource that supports various human needs, from housing and agriculture to other economic activities. More



than just a tangible object, land has complex social and economic dimensions, so its management must take into account the interests of the wider community and requires clear legal regulations to create certainty and justice for all entitled parties. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

Land rights represent the legal prerogative inherent in individuals and legal entities to utilize land in accordance with applicable normative provisions, while internalizing the social role inherent in the existence of land itself. In an alternative construction, land rights can be understood as a normative relationship between legal subjects and certain land plots, which necessitates the legitimacy of utilization both existentially and transcendently, while still considering the balance between personal interests and collective welfare. This shows that land control cannot be separated from social functions and the goals of community development as a whole. (Sutedi, 2010; Harsono, 2008; Parlindungan, 1998)

Agrarian legal policy in Indonesia represents the state's strategic policy direction in formulating, shaping, and implementing land policies based on the principles of social justice, legal certainty, and sustainable use of natural resources. This legal policy not only reflects the state's desire to create an orderly legal order but also serves as a means of correcting historical inequalities inherited from the colonial agrarian system. In this context, national agrarian legal policy serves as an instrument to eliminate injustice and establish a land management system that favors the interests of the people, particularly farmers and indigenous communities. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

The ratification of Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Agrarian Regulations (UUPA) marked a significant milestone in the shift from colonial agrarian policy to national agrarian policy. Colonial agrarian policy was exploitative, aimed at controlling land and maximizing profits without regard for the welfare of the people. In contrast, national agrarian policy was born to eliminate this injustice and organize the system of land control, ownership, and use in a manner that is socially just, in line with the values of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution. This transformation marked the state's efforts to ensure that land serves as a means of welfare for all its people. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

Objective reasons for establishing a national agrarian policy include formal, material, ideal, modern agrarian, and ideological-political. From a formal perspective, agrarian law in 1949 was still temporary, scattered across various transitional regulations and different constitutions, thus creating the need for new legal arrangements more in line with societal developments. From a material perspective, the dualism and pluralism of agrarian law, both in terms of rights and subjects, reflect the imbalance between indigenous Indonesian customary law, Western law, and



the rights of foreigners. The ideal aspect relates to the application of Pancasila as the legal basis and the goals of the state, while the modern agrarian factor highlights the relationship between owners and non-owners and the function of land as a means of production. Ideological-political factors encompass Indonesia's position within global and domestic ideological dynamics. (Arba, 2015; Wiradi & Suhendar, 2011; Department of Information & DG Agrarian Affairs, 1982)

The UUPA emphasizes that land has an inherent social dimension, so that land rights are no longer solely individual for personal gain, but must be allocated with attention to social balance and collective benefit. This is in line with Article 33 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, which emphasizes that land, water, and natural resources are controlled by the state and used to the greatest extent possible for the prosperity of the people. From this provision, it can be concluded that the state is the primary manager, resources may not be monopolized by individuals, their use is directed towards the welfare of the people, and the principle of social justice is the basis of national economic and agrarian policy. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

In the context of land rights, Article 16 paragraph (1) of the UUPA regulates various types of rights, such as Ownership Rights, Cultivation Rights, Building Rights, Usage Rights, Lease Rights, as well as traditional rights such as Land Clearing Rights and Forest Product Collection Rights. In addition, there are temporary rights as regulated in Article 53 paragraph (1) of the UUPA, which include mortgage rights, profit-sharing business rights, easement rights, and agricultural land lease rights. These temporary rights arise from the social needs of indigenous communities, where relationships between community members are based on the principle of mutual assistance and flexibility in land management. (Sutedi, 2010; Harsono, 2008; Parlindungan, 1998)

Article 53 paragraph (1) of the UUPA emphasizes that temporary rights must be limited and efforts must be made to eliminate them as quickly as possible. This provision is a step towards eliminating exploitative colonial practices and establishing a modern national land law system. However, this article also raises legal challenges because deeply rooted customary law institutions continue to exist in society. The absence of clear implementing regulations creates uncertainty in implementing the elimination of temporary rights. (Perangin, 1989; Machmudin, 2000)

The absence of normative regulation in Article 53 paragraph (1) necessitates the persistence of traditional agrarian practices, such as mortgage rights, profit-sharing rights, the right to ride, and rental rights. The continuation of these practices has sparked legal debate regarding the validity of the article in contemporary positive law. Therefore, a substantial study is needed regarding the legislative rationality in classifying these temporary rights, as well as assessing the



extent to which legal certainty can be guaranteed, especially for agrarian communities that still rely heavily on traditional practices as an instrument for fulfilling their daily needs. (Perangin, 1989; Machmudin, 2000)

Based on the description, this research is entitled: "Legal Certainty of the Elimination of Temporary Rights (Pledge Rights, Profit-Sharing Business Rights, Right to Use, and Right to Rent Agricultural Land) Based on Article 53 Paragraph (1) of the UUPA". This research aims to examine how the principles of social justice, legal certainty, and the social function of land are realized through the elimination of temporary rights, as well as assessing the challenges of implementing this regulation in the context of a national legal order that still accommodates the pluralism of customary law and traditional agrarian practices. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

## **2. RESEARCH METHODS**

The research method used is normative legal research. The approach used in this research is carried out using the statutory approach method and the legal concept analysis approach. Types and Sources of Legal Materials are primary legal materials and secondary legal materials. Sources of legal materials use primary legal materials and secondary legal materials. After all legal materials are collected, they are then analyzed using Prescriptive, in this case using the method of grammatical interpretation and systematic interpretation. Grammatical interpretation is a method of interpretation or explanation that aims to know or understand the meaning of words in the law in accordance with the rules of language and the rules of grammatical law. (Amiruddin & Asikin, 2017)

## **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Legal Certainty on the Elimination of Temporary Rights (Pledge Rights, Profit-Sharing Business Rights, Right to Use, and Agricultural Land Lease Rights) for the Community**

#### **1. Legal Certainty Regarding Temporary Elimination of Rights**

The elimination of temporary rights such as mortgage rights, profit-sharing rights, easements, and agricultural land lease rights is an integral part of the agrarian law reform agenda in Indonesia, which aims to restructure land ownership to make it fairer and more equitable. These rights are a legacy of the colonial agrarian legal system, which placed landowners in a dominant position, while land cultivators were often trapped in exploitative relationships without adequate legal certainty. This inequality reflects land practices that are inconsistent with the principle of social justice as mandated in Article 33 paragraph (3) of the

1945 Constitution, which affirms that the land, water, and natural resources are controlled by the state for the greatest prosperity of the people. By eliminating these temporary rights, the state seeks to eliminate feudalistic practices and legal relationships that are detrimental to cultivators, while simultaneously emphasizing that land is not merely an economic commodity, but a social asset that must be used for the common good. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

The policy of eliminating temporary rights reflects the state's commitment to establishing more balanced agrarian legal relations and providing equal opportunities for every citizen to enjoy the economic benefits of land. By eliminating rights such as mortgages, leases, rides, and profit-sharing, the state seeks to strengthen the legal position of small communities so that they are no longer the object of injustice, and to ensure that land use supports the welfare of the people equally. This process also affirms the principle of the social function of land as stipulated in the Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA), namely that land must be used for the public interest, not merely for individual gain. Thus, the elimination of temporary rights serves as a strategic tool to correct historical inequalities, build a democratic land structure, and ensure equitable land tenure in accordance with the spirit of independence. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

The legal basis for the abolition of temporary rights is clearly stipulated in Article 53 of the UUPA, which states that rights such as mortgages, profit-sharing, freeholds, and agricultural land leases remain in effect temporarily until new regulations governing them are issued, but are directed to be abolished within a short period of time to align with the principle of social justice. This provision demonstrates that the state respects existing legal relationships while simultaneously affirming the direction of change towards a more equitable land system. The General Explanation of the UUPA emphasizes that the abolition of temporary rights is a step towards eliminating remnants of the feudal system and land exploitation relationships that are inconsistent with the principles of family and nationality. Based on this, the abolition of temporary rights is not an arbitrary act, but rather a legal transformation oriented towards justice and long-term legal certainty. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

In practice, the elimination of temporary rights provides legal certainty for all parties involved, including landowners and cultivators or tenants. The state regulates the transition mechanism from temporary rights to a form of right recognized by the Basic Agrarian Law, such as official lease rights, land use rights, or agricultural cooperation, so that land cultivators do not suddenly lose access and remain legally protected. This mechanism is also an important



instrument for minimizing agrarian conflicts at the local level by ensuring that changes in land rights are carried out legally, transparently, and fairly. Thus, this transition process is not only normative but also practical, ensuring that community rights are maintained during the transition and strengthening a sense of justice in rural areas, thereby effectively achieving the goals of agrarian reform. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

Implementing regulations, such as Government Regulation No. 224 of 1961 concerning Land Distribution and Compensation, are crucial instruments for translating the provisions of the Basic Agrarian Law into concrete actions. This regulation governs the mechanism for land redistribution and the provision of compensation to those who have lost their rights, allowing for the elimination of temporary rights based on the principle of justice. However, implementation in the field faces various challenges, including delays in the formulation of implementing regulations, a lack of legal outreach to village communities, and weak law enforcement, which often prolongs the validity of temporary rights. In this context, legal certainty is determined not only by the existence of written regulations, but also by the extent to which these regulations are implemented consistently, fairly, and are perceived as beneficial by the community, in line with Jan Michiel Otto's view that the law must provide a sense of security and justice in everyday practice. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

The elimination of temporary rights aims to create a more stable and equitable land ownership structure, particularly for smallholders and landowners, by converting temporary rights into more permanent rights, such as ownership rights or use rights. Temporary rights, which are time-limited, often create uncertainty and are vulnerable to ownership conflicts or unilateral termination. This conversion provides communities with strong legal protection against eviction or exploitation, as well as assurance that the land they cultivate has a clear legal status. This process is also part of a broader agrarian reform effort, which emphasizes land redistribution for the welfare of the people while restructuring the economic relationship between landowners and cultivators to be more equal and just. (Arba, 2015; Wiradi & Suhendar, 2011; Department of Information & DG Agrarian Affairs, 1982)

Efforts to eliminate temporary rights require the state to eliminate forms of legal relations that are no longer relevant to the principles of social justice and the welfare of the people, and to strengthen the legal position of cultivators so that they do not become victims of historical inequality. The application of the principle of legal certainty in this case emphasizes the role of the state as a regulator and protector in agrarian relations, ensuring that any elimination of rights is carried out through legal, transparent, and accountable procedures.



Legal certainty not only protects individual rights but also maintains a balance between public and private interests, thereby preventing the emergence of new agrarian conflicts due to misunderstandings regarding changes in land rights status, while simultaneously building public trust in the national agrarian legal system. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

The process of converting temporary rights into rights recognized by the Basic Agrarian Law, such as ownership rights, land use rights, or building rights, is a concrete manifestation of the transformation of agrarian law, providing long-term legal certainty. This conversion not only confirms the legal status of land but also encourages increased productivity, social responsibility, and sustainable land use. However, in practice, challenges remain, including delays in the issuance of implementing regulations, weak inter-institutional coordination, and limited public understanding of the changing rights system. This issue creates a gap between written norms and reality on the ground, necessitating strengthening legal outreach, the capacity of land officials, and the oversight of land practices to ensure that the principle of legal certainty truly benefits the community. (Perangin, 1989; Machmudin, 2000)

Jan Michiel Otto's perspective on legal certainty provides a relevant theoretical foundation for assessing the effectiveness of the abolition of temporary rights in Indonesian agrarian law. According to Otto, legal certainty is not merely the existence of written regulations, but also the extent to which these regulations are understood, implemented, and perceived by the public as beneficial. In the context of the abolition of temporary rights, Otto's theory emphasizes the need for a balance between legal certainty and legal justice, where the conversion of old rights into new rights recognized by the UUPA serves as a means to ensure that every citizen obtains land rights fairly and is legally protected. Thus, legal certainty is not merely normative, but empirical and is felt in real terms in society. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

Overall, the relationship between the abolition of temporary rights and Otto's theory of legal certainty demonstrates that the law must work and provide real protection, not just exist on paper. The UUPA serves as a normative instrument that sets the direction for change, while Otto's theory serves as a guideline for assessing the extent to which the law is effectively implemented. When the abolition of temporary rights is implemented with attention to aspects of social justice, legal accessibility, and procedural clarity, communities gain real legal protection, a sense of security, and certainty of land ownership. Thus, agrarian reform not only produces normative changes in the legal system but also creates substantive justice directly

felt by communities as the primary subjects of land control and use in Indonesia. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

### **1. Regulation of Temporary Rights as *Ius Constituendum***

In the Indonesian legal system, *Ius Constituendum* is understood as a law that is envisioned or will be established in the future, in contrast to *Ius Constitutum*, which refers to positive law that is currently in effect. This concept is crucial in the development of national agrarian law because it reflects the direction of reforming the land law system from a colonial legacy to a system based on the principles of social justice and the benefit of all people. Temporary rights, such as mortgages, profit-sharing rights, easements, and agricultural land leases, are not merely a recognition of old legal practices, but also serve as the basis for a more orderly, modern, and transformative renewal of the land rights system, guiding society towards a just and sustainable land ownership system in accordance with the ideals of the Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA). (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

Although temporary rights are a legacy of customary and colonial law, their practice often leads to injustice, such as the exploitation of small farmers through land mortgages or imbalances in production-sharing agreements. Therefore, the Basic Agrarian Law does not abolish these rights outright to avoid social unrest, but rather emphasizes that the government is obliged to regulate the abolition or replacement of these mechanisms through new, fairer and more modern regulations. Temporary rights are not a permanent part of the national land system (*ius constitutum*), but rather a transitional instrument that facilitates agrarian reform so that farmer sovereignty and social justice in the agrarian sector can be gradually upheld. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

As a *ius constituendum*, the provision of temporary rights in the UUPA serves as a bridge towards a more egalitarian national land system. Article 53 emphasizes the government's obligation to gradually abolish or replace these rights with new legal instruments that guarantee certainty and justice, such as use rights, building rights, or ownership rights through a land redistribution program. This step aligns with the vision of Pancasila, particularly the fifth principle on social justice for all Indonesians, and emphasizes that land should not be concentrated in the hands of a few. The social function of land demands regulations that prioritize equal access for lower-income communities and prevent the domination of large landowners, whether stemming from the 1870 Agrarian Ordinance or exploitative customs. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)



The UUPA emphasizes that land law must not conflict with national and state interests, but must serve the goal of establishing a just and prosperous society or an Indonesian Socialist Society. In practice, several regulations such as Law No. 2 of 1960 concerning the return of agricultural land and Law No. 56 Prp of 1960 have expressly amended customary law principles that contain elements of extortion. This provision emphasizes that every citizen has an equal opportunity to obtain land rights, without gender discrimination (Article 9 paragraph 2 of the UUPA), while also providing a legal basis for the elimination of exploitative temporary rights and replacing them with fair and transparent legal mechanisms. (Perangin, 1989; Machmudin, 2000)

The elimination of temporary rights, as explained in General Explanation II, number 7 of the UUPA, aims to create social justice in the agrarian sector and simplify the land legal system, making land a means of equalizing people's welfare, not a tool of exploitation. The absence of clear legal regulations has resulted in legal relations between landowners and cultivators often being conducted verbally or based on customary practices, creating uncertainty for cultivators and increasing the risk of agrarian conflict. Unwritten agreements complicate legal evidence, reduce agricultural productivity, and hinder farmers' access to government programs, such as subsidies, land certification, or agrarian redistribution. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

Regulatory reforms are aimed at transforming temporary rights into a permanent and officially registered land rights system, such as ownership rights, cultivation rights, building rights, and use rights. This step reflects the spirit of the UUPA legal conversion in establishing a national land law system with Indonesian characteristics, providing legal certainty to communities in controlling, using, and sustainably utilizing land. However, the implementation of the reforms faces significant challenges, such as delays in the formulation of implementing regulations, weak legal socialization, and the persistence of customary systems in some regions. Temporary rights often persist despite normatively stated abolition, making the conversion of rights into state-recognized rights a crucial strategy to ensure communities do not lose access to the land that is their source of livelihood. (Arba, 2015; Wiradi & Suhendar, 2011; Department of Information & DG Agrarian Affairs, 1982)

The concept of *Ius Constituendum* plays a strategic role in developing agrarian law oriented towards social justice. The elimination of temporary rights and their replacement with permanent rights is an implementation of distributive justice, where land is viewed as a source of prosperity for the people, not a tool for economic exploitation. This principle aligns with



Article 6 of the UUPA, which affirms that every land right has a social function. Legal certainty in this context, as emphasized by Jan Michiel Otto, is measured not only by the existence of written regulations, but also by the extent to which the law provides benefits and a sense of security for the community. By implementing this principle, Indonesian agrarian law is directed towards creating a balance between legal certainty, social justice, and protection for all citizens. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

## **2. The Meaning of the Principle of Legal Certainty in Legislation**

The principle of legal certainty in legislation is a fundamental principle that ensures that laws are formulated clearly, firmly, and predictably. This principle enables the public to understand their rights and obligations without hesitation, uses clear legal language, avoids subjective interpretations, and maintains the consistency and stability of norms. Philosophically, this principle is rooted in the concept of *rechtsstaat*, or the rule of law, where law serves as the primary reference for the government, state institutions, and citizens, thereby preventing arbitrary discretion and fostering socio-economic stability. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

Jan Michiel Otto emphasized that legal certainty refers not only to the existence of written rules, but also to the extent to which the law can be understood, implemented, and provides tangible benefits to society. Otto emphasized six elements of legal certainty: clear and accessible rules, credible law enforcement agencies, a supportive legal culture in society, and consistency in its application. This concept is relevant in Indonesia because many regulations still lack predictability and tangible protection for citizens. (Sutedi, 2010; Harsono, 2008; Parlindungan, 1998)

The principle of legal certainty also influences the entire process of creating and enforcing laws and regulations. Draft laws must undergo public consultation to avoid ambiguity, while judges are required to interpret norms literally. This creates a stable legal and investment climate, while also fulfilling the principles of justice and utility. Certain but unjust laws feel rigid, while fair but uncertain laws have the potential to create conflict. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

In Indonesia, the principle of legal certainty is regulated by Law Number 12 of 2011 and amended by Law Number 13 of 2022. Article 5 outlines the principle of legal certainty as part of the principles for establishing sound legislation, including clarity of purpose, transparency, appropriateness of material, and clarity of formulation. This principle is not

merely procedural but also reflects philosophical values that guarantee order, justice, and legal legitimacy in national life. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

In the agrarian sector, the principle of legal certainty plays a crucial role in upholding land rights, replacing the colonial system with a national system that favors the people. Legal certainty requires that laws are not only written but also implemented consistently, transparently, and provide real protection for the community. This creates a balance between the interests of individuals, society, and the state and supports the social function of land as mandated by the Basic Agrarian Law. (Sutedi, 2010; Harsono, 2008; Parlindungan, 1998)

The principle of legal certainty is also linked to social and economic stability. Stable legal norms enable businesses and governments to plan activities with predictability, while sudden regulatory changes can create uncertainty, reduce investment, and disrupt national development. Therefore, legal certainty is the foundation for effective, equitable, and sustainable public policy. (Arba, 2015; Wiradi & Suhendar, 2011; Department of Information & DG Agrarian Affairs, 1982)

Overall, the principle of legal certainty is a key pillar of the national legal system. Law serves not only as a formal text, but also as a means of protecting people's rights, preventing arbitrary actions, and enhancing public trust in state institutions. In the context of national legal development, maintaining legal certainty means ensuring that the law functions effectively, fairly, and provides tangible benefits to all Indonesian citizens. (Sutedi, 2010; Harsono, 2008; Parlindungan, 1998)

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

Legal certainty regarding the elimination of temporary land rights such as mortgage rights, profit-sharing rights, easements, and agricultural land lease rights is an important part of the reconstruction of agrarian law towards a just and sovereign system. The provisions in Article 53 of the Basic Agrarian Law are not merely administrative measures, but ideological steps to reorganize the relationship between the people and the land in line with the principle of social justice as stipulated in Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution. The principle of legal certainty plays a role in preventing inequality between capital owners and sharecroppers who are often caught in the practice of extortion through mortgages and unfair profit-sharing. With clarity on the status of land rights, the community obtains legal protection and economic certainty that promote social stability. Thus, the elimination of temporary rights not only confirms normative change, but also serves as a



form of justice, protection, and certainty for the common people from the practice of legal uncertainty and agrarian exploitation. (Ujan, 2009; Aristotle, 2009)

## REFERENCES

- Amiruddin, & Asikin, Z. (2017). Introduction to legal research methods. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Arba, H. M. (2015). Indonesian agrarian law. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Aristotle. (2009). Nicomachean ethics (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Department of Information & Directorate General of Agrarian Affairs. (1982). Land in the era of Indonesian development. Jakarta: Ministry of Home Affairs.
- Harsono, B. (2008). Indonesian agrarian law: History of the formation of the basic agrarian law, its contents, and implementation. Jakarta: Djambatan.
- Harsono, B. (2019). Indonesian agrarian law: History of the formation of the basic agrarian law, its contents and implementation (Vol. 1). Jakarta: Trisakti University.
- Harsono, B. (2008). Indonesian agrarian law: History of the formation of the basic agrarian law, its contents, and implementation. Jakarta: Djambatan.
- Machmudin, D. D. (2000). Introduction to legal science: A sketch. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Otto, J. M. (2000). Rule of law, legal certainty and development. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Parlindungan, A. P. (1998). Commentary on the basic agrarian law. Bandung: Mandar Maju.
- Perangin, E. (1989). Agrarian law in Indonesia: A study from the perspective of a legal practitioner. Jakarta: Rajawali.
- Sutedi, A. (2010). Agrarian law. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Sutedi, A. (2010). Agrarian law. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Ujan, A. A. (2009). Philosophy of law: Building law and defending justice. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Wiradi, G., & Suhendar, E. (2011). Agrarian reform: An unfinished journey. Jakarta: Kompas.

