


Jokowi's Agrarian Politics in the Agrarian Reform Program

Erlangga Hikmah Budhyatma ¹ 

¹ Ilmu Politik, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, erlanggahikmahbudhyatma@uny.ac.id

Corresponding Author: erlanggahikmahbudhyatma@uny.ac.id

Article Info

Keyword:

Agrarian;
Jokowi;
Politics.

Abstract: This research is intended to see how Jokowi's agrarian politics is in the agrarian reform program. Indonesia is a country with a very high level of inequality in land tenure. By using a qualitative descriptive research approach, this research takes data from online media, the Institute's website, stakeholder statements, and government documents. The results of this study indicate that the majority of land ownership in Indonesia, which is less than 2 hectares, is 50,508,676 parcels with a total land area of 9,921,994.28 hectares. Meanwhile, land ownership is more than 20 hectares, which is only 4,878 parcels with a land area of 4,508,366.46. If using the world bank criteria, the inequality value in the 6 main islands in Indonesia is at a high inequality value because it is at < 12% of the value of the inequality. Meanwhile, with the implementation of the agrarian reform program from 2015-to 2020, the Jokowi government is only able to distribute 1.46 million hectares of land. This study concludes that the Jokowi government's agrarian politics is the same as the feudalism-style land tenure pattern which relies on land monopoly control.

Article History : Received 01-07-2025, Revised 15-07-2025, Accepted: 30-07-2025

How to Cite :

Budhyatma, E. H. (2025). Jokowi's Agrarian Politics in the Agrarian Reform Program. *KEMUDI : Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 10(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.31629/kemudi.v10i1.7405>

INTRODUCTION

Agrarian reform in Indonesia emerged as a cornerstone program under the Sukarno regime. It was, however, more than a simple technical directive; it functioned as both a constitutional mandate and a historical imperative, deeply embedded in the foundational principles of the state. The formal legal grounding for this reform is derived from Article 33, paragraph 3 of the 1945 Constitution, which decrees that "The land, the waters, and the natural resources contained therein shall be controlled by the State and utilized for the greatest prosperity of the people." This constitutional article affirms that the stewardship of agrarian resources, particularly land, must be predicated upon social justice and collective prosperity, as opposed to the interests of individuals or corporations (Ginting, 2021).

This constitutional mandate was subsequently translated into the operational bedrock of Indonesian agrarian reform: the enactment of Law No. 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Regulations on Agrarian Principles (UUPA). This legislation constituted a watershed moment, fundamentally altering the character of the exploitative and dualistic colonial-inherited agrarian law. At its core, the law championed an agrarian revolution, aiming to dismantle the feudal landlord system, radically restructure land tenure relations, and ensure legal certainty over land

rights for the entire populace. Thus, the 1960 Basic Agrarian Law framed agrarian reform not as a mere administrative act, but as a politico-structural process intended to reconfigure power relations concerning land.

Though created and passed into law during the Orde Lama (Old Order), the execution of the agrarian reform mandate underwent significant upheaval and dynamic changes under the Orde Baru (New Order) regime. After a period of progressive implementation under Sukarno's leadership, the program was subjected to stagnation and a sharp policy reversal (Darmawan, Soetarto, Asnawi, Mahasari, & Sukmawati, 2023). The Orde Baru regime pursued a centralistic, growth-oriented development model that favored granting large-scale concessions to forestry and plantation corporations. This practice resulted in the widespread marginalization of peasants and indigenous peoples, which in turn ignited thousands of unresolved agrarian conflicts and left a legacy of profound structural inequality.

The post-1998 reformation wave, however, revived the discourse on implementing agrarian reform. Following the fall of the Orde Baru regime, propelled by societal demands, the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) issued Decree No. IX/MPR/2001 concerning Agrarian Reform and Natural Resource Management (Ginting, 2021). This regulation, however, was not in essence a technical, operational framework for reform. Instead, it functioned as a political guideline and constitutional affirmation, directing the state to fundamentally reshape its paradigm and policies on managing land and natural resources. While a progressive to become a core priority for succeeding governments in the Reformasi era.

Consequently, this situation created immense expectations for President Joko Widodo's administration to finally address these foundational problems. Research conducted by Darmawan et al. (2023) indicates a significant shift in the meaning of "Agrarian Reform" from its conception in the 1960 Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA) (Darmawan, Soetarto, Asnawi, Mahasari, & Sukmawati, 2023). This semantic shift is structural, effectively reducing the UUPA's original focus on transforming land-based power structures to a largely administrative procedure within contemporary policy. Explicitly, while the original spirit of the UUPA was to dismantle and restructure power over land, its modern application—despite retaining the same terminology—is predominantly focused on asset legalization via mass certification. This reinterpretation has enabled the Jokowi administration to claim success based on quantitative metrics, thereby circumventing the formidable political challenges at the heart of Indonesia's agrarian problem.

However, in contrast to the Joko Widodo administration, the preceding president, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, held a different perspective on the implementation of agrarian reform. During his leadership, President Yudhoyono faced strong pressure from various civil society elements to implement the mandate of MPR Decree No. IX/2001, which stands as a cornerstone of agrarian reform in the Reformasi era. In response to this pressure, the Yudhoyono administration enacted Presidential Regulation (Perpres) No. 10 of 2006 concerning the National Land Agency (Hardiyanto, 2021). Through this policy, President Yudhoyono explicitly designated the implementation of agrarian reform as one of the functions of the National Land Agency (BPN).

This decision was designed to be the formal foundation for President Yudhoyono's ambitious initiative, the National Agrarian Reform Program (PPAN). Institutionally, this represented a breakthrough, as it was the first time since the Orde Lama era that the agrarian reform agenda was reinstated as an official government program mandated to a state agency. The PPAN was initially conceived as a progressive and comprehensive framework, integrating the concepts of land reform and access reform (Hardiyanto, 2021). This dual approach defined agrarian renewal as not being limited to asset restructuring through land redistribution (land reform), but also encompassing the restructuring of access (access reform). The latter included economic empowerment, infrastructure provision, and access to capital for the land recipients. Broadly, the objective of the PPAN was to realize justice in the tenure, ownership, use, and utilization of land.

Beyond its progressive design, the PPAN also had ambitious targets, aiming to redistribute land from three primary sources with a vast total area approaching 16.25 million hectares. In detail, these three targets were: approximately 8.15 million hectares of convertible forest areas that could be released from the jurisdiction of the Department of Forestry; around 7 million hectares of neglected or abandoned land under the authority of the BPN; and about 1.1 million hectares of various other types of state land also under BPN's jurisdiction. This

massive target signified an awareness at the governmental level of the scale of agrarian inequality that needed to be addressed (Widodo, 2017).

However, notwithstanding its ambitious design and its status as a progressive breakthrough, the PPAN's implementation was profoundly unsuccessful. To some academics and activists, the program launched by President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono is even considered a "failed agrarian reform." This was not simply a technical failure in execution; it was a systemic failure rooted in the program's very structure. The conceptual blending of land reform and access reform inherently provided a loophole, allowing the government to prioritize the politically convenient and neoliberal-friendly component of asset legalization, while effectively sidelining the more difficult and politically transformative task of land redistribution (Mulyani, 2014).

To put it differently, the Joko Widodo administration was encumbered not only by the legacy of systemic failures from the Orde Baru but also by the collapse of the ambitious project of the Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono era. Moreover, a closer comparison reveals that the Jokowi administration's agrarian policy barely diverges from his predecessor's, with both ultimately being reduced to the narrow aspect of asset legalization.

Agrarian politics is a policy carried out by the State in maintaining, preserving, allocating, exploiting, taking advantage of, managing and dividing land and other natural resources including the results for the benefit of the welfare of the people and the state, following Pancasila and the Constitution (UUD) 1945 (McCarthy, McWilliam, & Nootebom, The paradox of agrarian change: Food security and the politics of social protection in Indonesia, 2023). In Indonesia, legally, agrarian issues have a fairly strong legal umbrella, namely the Basic Agrarian Law. In the law, the concept of "agrarian" also has a broader meaning than just agriculture. It is formulated that agrarian resources are "all the earth, water, and space, including the wealth contained therein (article 1 paragraph 2). In the sense of the earth, apart from the surface of the earth, it includes the body of the earth below it and what is under the sea" (Article 1 paragraph 4). "In terms of water, it includes both agriculture, inland and sea areas of Indonesia (Article 1 paragraph 5). What is meant by outer space is the space above the earth and water (article 1 paragraph 6). (Sitorus, 2004).

The agrarian concept following article 1 (paragraphs 2, 4, 5, 6) of the 1960 UUPA can be interpreted as referring to various agrarian objects or sources as follows: 1. Land, or the surface of the earth, which is the main natural capital in agricultural and livestock activities. . 2. Waters, both on land and in the oceans (rivers, lakes, seas), are the main natural capital of fishery activities 3. Forests, namely the unity of flora and fauna in a certain area, are the main natural capital in the economic activities of communities' forestry. 4. Mining materials, which include various mining materials/minerals contained in the "body of the earth" (below the earth's surface and the sea), among others; oil, gas, gold, iron ore, tin, precious stones (diamonds, diamonds, etc.) phosphates, stones, and sand. 5. Air, in the sense of "space above the earth and water" as well as the air material (O₂) itself (Rahman, 2019), (Sitorus, 2004), (Rachman, 2018), (Suartining & Djaja, 2023).

So it can be concluded that implicitly agrarian issues have covered the issue of natural resources because natural resources are an integral part of agrarian resources or objects.

Gunawan Wiradi explained agrarian reform as actions taken by both the government and the community in changing the structure of land tenure and use, which started with redistributing land followed by increased production through the provision of facilities in the form of credit, education for improving farming techniques, provision of irrigation facilities, and so forth (MP. Tjondronegoro & Wiradi, 2004).

While Edriatmo Soetarto and Moh. Shohibuddin stated that agrarian reform is an effort to fundamentally change the structure of intra and inter-agrarian relations in terms of access (control and use) of agrarian objects. The changes referred to are carried out through reforming the structure of land tenure and improving the certainty of land tenure for the people who make use of the land and the natural wealth that accompanies it. (Ramadhani, 2020), (A. T. Hidayat, 2020).

With these understandings, it can be concluded that agrarian reform requires a strong political commitment from the government in power to carry out. (Nurdin, 2017).

Agrarian Reform is a restructuring (rearrangement of structure) of ownership, control, and use of agrarian resources (especially land). The goal is to change the structure of society inherited from feudalism and colonialism into a just and equitable society. In essence, the

concept of agrarian reform includes 3 (three) concepts, namely: 1. Land reform, namely the restructuring of land ownership control structures that are more equitable; 2. Access reform concept, namely the arrangement of the use or utilization of land that is more productive accompanied by the arrangement of supporting facilities and infrastructure that allows farmers to gain access to economic resources in rural areas. Such access includes access to agricultural facilities and infrastructure, irrigation, roads, farming, production marketing, farming cooperatives, and banking (people's business credit); 3. The concept of Policy/Regulation reform, namely the regulation of policies and laws that favour the people at large (MP. Tjondronegoro & Wiradi, 2004), (Arisaputra, 2015), (McCarthy, Dhialulhaq, Afiff, & Robinson, 2022), (Syahyuti, 2016).

According to Gunawan Wiradi, agrarian reform can only be implemented if it fulfils four prerequisites; 1. The political will of the ruling elite must exist 2. The government/bureaucracy elite must be separate from the business elite 3. Active participation of all social groups must exist. People's/Farmers' pro-reform organizations must exist. 4. Complete and thorough data on agrarian problems must be available (MP. Tjondronegoro & Wiradi, 2004).

Jokowi was elected as the President of the Republic of Indonesia who provided fresh air for the resolution of various agrarian problems in this country, especially the problem of inequality in land tenure. The fresh wind blew from the program that was carried out by Jokowi in his government which was later called Nawa Cita. One of the programs in the Nawacita was then implemented by Jokowi in a policy called agrarian reform. This policy was born to translate the nine development priorities.

The Jokowi administration issued a National Strategy for the Implementation of Agrarian Reform 2016-2019 in September 2016. This document is a directive for realizing national development and as a foundation for economic policy, reducing inequality in society, tackling poverty, and creating jobs in rural areas. There are 6 main priorities referred to by the text, which consist of: (1) strengthening the regulatory framework and resolving agrarian conflicts, (2) structuring the control and ownership of land objects for agrarian reform, (3) community empowerment in use, (4) utilization and production of land subject to agrarian reform, (5) allocation of forest resources to be managed by the community, and (6) central and regional agrarian reform institutions. (White, Graham, & Savitri, 2023), (Habibi M. , 2022). Community participation, both groups of civil society organizations, as well as representatives from the community who benefit from this agrarian reform program, will determine the success of the program.

The agrarian reform program carried out by the Jokowi government, which should provide hope for solving agrarian problems in this country, has also received a lot of criticism and rejection. Therefore, it is interesting to research and find out how the Jokowi government's agrarian politics is in the agrarian reform policy. So this research will focus on research on the Jokowi government's agrarian reform program policies.

Based on this background, the present study aims to critically analyze the agrarian politics of the Joko Widodo administration in the implementation of agrarian reform policies, particularly in the context of land distribution and asset legalization. The main focus of this research is to evaluate the extent to which these policies reflect the spirit of agrarian reform as mandated by the 1960 Basic Agrarian Law and the People's Consultative Assembly Decree No. IX/MPR/2001.

The novelty of this study lies in its comparative analysis between the government's narrative of agrarian reform success and empirical data on land distribution and ownership inequality. It also seeks to critically examine the dominant emphasis on asset legalization, which potentially perpetuates existing agrarian disparities. Through this approach, the study aims to contribute to the academic discourse on contemporary agrarian reform in Indonesia from the perspective of political public policy analysis.

RESEARCH METHOD

This paper uses a qualitative descriptive method with critical policy analysis approach to explain, understand and describe the implementation of the Jokowi government's agrarian reform policies. This study obtained data from online media, websites, stakeholder statements, and government documents. In other words, this study utilizes a literature review as its data collection method. Literature review is a method of data collection that focuses on gathering data from various literary sources such as books, journal articles, mass media articles, and

research reports in diverse forms (Van Lange Paul, 2015). In addition to using a literature review for data collection, this research also employs the technique of content analysis. In addition, content analysis is a data analysis method that focuses on analyzing the content of collected secondary data sources, such as books, dissertations, journals, and other similar materials (Stemler, 2015).

RESULT AND DICUSSION

a. Inequality of Land Tenure in Indonesia

Table 1: Structure of Ownership Area and Land in Indonesia

NO	CATEGORY OF LAND AREA (HA)	AREA (HA)	NUMBER OF FIELDS
1	<0.10	1,039,118,97	33,095,301
2	0.10-0.19	858,616,28	5,997,654
3	0.20-0.49	1,802,741.34	5,891,551
4	0.50-0.99	2,119,979,40	3.006.208
5	1-1.99	3,471,538.29	2,517,962
6	2-4.99	1,638,934.56	721.104
7	5-9.99	137,146.94	20,662
8	10-14.99	39,354.98	3.436
9	15-19,99	31,851.50	1,754
10	>20	4,508,366.46	4.878

Source: Research and Development Center of the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency (Final Report on Inequality of Land Tenure and Ownership Research)

Table 1. shows that the majority of land ownership in Indonesia, which is less than 2 hectares, is 50,508,676 parcels with a total land area of 9,921,994.28 hectares. Meanwhile, land ownership is more than 20 hectares, which is only 4,878 parcels with a land area of 4,508,366.46. This illustrates how unequal land tenure in Indonesia is. So that the need for implementing agrarian reform becomes relevant as a way to change the governance structure of agrarian control in Indonesia and provide a way for improving people's welfare.

(Rahman, 2019), (Rachman, 2018), (Suartining & Djaja, 2023), (Nurdin, 2017), (Arisaputra, 2015), (Syahyuti, 2016b).

The table reveals an extreme disparity in land tenure, with a massive number of landowners holding minuscule plots. There are 33,095,301 parcels of land under 0.10 hectares. Cumulatively, the bottom three categories (parcels under 0.50 hectares) account for 44,984,506 parcels—a staggering 88% of the total recorded. This situation fosters 'guremisasi', the severe fragmentation of peasant landholdings. The Joko Widodo administration has used this phenomenon to justify the mass implementation of its asset legalization program, the Complete Systematic Land Registration (PTSL) (Sumarja, Firmansyah, & Wijonugroho, 2020). This program, however, fails to tackle the root problem, PTSL does not alter the reality that farmers' plots remain economically unviable for sustaining their livelihoods, leading critics to label the policy as an exercise in "certifying poverty" (Rahman, 2024).

Beyond exposing land fragmentation, the table also underscores the persistent concentration of vast landholdings in the hands of a select few (McCarthy & Robinson, 2016). A mere 4,878 parcels in the >20-hectare category collectively control 4,508,366 hectares. In stark contrast, this area is four times greater than the total land held by 33 million parcels in the smallest category (<0.10 hectares), which combined total only 1,039,118 hectares. Such concentrated ownership clearly contradicts the spirit of land redistribution, a supposed cornerstone of President Joko Widodo's agrarian agenda (Meckelburg & Wardana, 2024). The reason for this is clear, the land redistribution program—particularly involving the release of forest areas and abandoned Right-to-Cultivate (HGU) lands—is proceeding at a glacial pace, falling far short of its targets (Fauziyah, Awang, Suryanto, & Achmad, 2025). This data justifies why redistribution should be the primary agenda, but in practice, the far more dominant and easily executed legalization agenda (PTSL) prevails (Fatem, et al., 2018).

This extreme land concentration also throws a spotlight on a core contradiction within the Jokowi administration's development policy. On one hand, the government professes to implement a pro-people agrarian reform. On the other, it aggressively pushes National Strategic Projects (PSN), such as food estates and other infrastructure developments that demand large-scale land acquisition and risk igniting agrarian conflicts with local communities and smallholders (Anugrah, 2024) (Habibi, 2025).

Ultimately, the data on large-scale holdings confirms the existence of an entrenched agrarian power structure. The government's reform initiatives frequently collide with the interests of large capital, often facilitated or even financed by the state itself. This dynamic offers an explanation for the increasing number of agrarian conflicts reported by the KPA (Agrarian Reform Consortium) during Jokowi's presidency. A fundamental contradiction persists between the stated goal of equity and the overriding agenda of accelerated, investment-driven economic growth. In this light, Jokowi's agrarian reform policy can be interpreted as a pragmatic maneuver designed to circumvent the very political confrontations that are necessary to fundamentally achieve agrarian justice (Habibi, 2025).

Table 2: Inequality of Land Ownership with World Bank Criteria for 6 Main Islands

No	Region (6 Major Island Groups)	Land Ownership Area (HA)			Inequality Value	
		Bottom 40%	Middle 40%	Top 20%	(%)	Category
1.	Jawa	172.536,58	771.527,83	2.889.332,64	4,5	High
2.	Sumatera	92.875,00	1.195.140,46	5.147.096,06	1,44	High
3.	Kalimantan	32.425,26	519.011,92	1.980.792,45	1,28	High
4.	Sulawesi	39.861,84	414.045,77	1.194.141,69	2,42	High
5.	Bali Nusra	39.013,23	231.467,61	684.391,24	4,09	High
6.	Maluku & Papua	11.254,64	60.700,58	172.033,88	4,61	High

Source: Research and Development Center of the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency (Final Report on Inequality of Land Tenure and Ownership Research)

Table 2. shows that the inequality of land ownership rights when calculated using the criteria of the world bank, the 6 main islands in Indonesia have a high inequality. The world bank stipulates that if the inequality rate is <12% then it is in the high category, while if the inequality value is at 12-17% then the inequality level is considered in the medium category, and if the inequality value is more than 17% then the inequality value is included. in the low category (Nasional, 2018), (Mizero et al., 2018), (Professor Saturnino M., n.d.), (Pereira et al., 2016).

The data presented in the table visualizes land ownership inequality that occurs not only on the island of Java but also across all major islands of Indonesia. In all six regions, the top 20% group consistently controls the majority of the land; in Java, this group holds approximately 2.88 million hectares, while in Sumatra, their control extends to 5.14 million hectares. Meanwhile, the bottom 40% group owns a very small portion of the land (Putri, Setiawan, & Karlina, 2022). The "Inequality Value" column indicates that the land ownership percentage for the bottom 40% is consistently low; in Kalimantan and Sumatra, the land held by this group

amounts to only 1.28% and 1.44%, respectively. In other words, 40% of landowners in these two regions share little more than 1% of the total land, demonstrating a uniformly high level of inequality across Indonesia's main territories (Wardani, 2020).

Beyond being data that indicates extreme land ownership inequality in Indonesia, the table also clearly demonstrates the failure of the Joko Widodo administration to implement agrarian reform in accordance with the spirit of Law No. 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Regulations on Agrarian Principles (UUPA) (Ambuwaru, Saragih, & Sumanto, 2023). The imbalanced ownership structure, where the top 20% controls the majority of land while the bottom 40% is marginalized, represents an antithesis to the goals and spirit of the UUPA. Furthermore, the data presented in the table serves as a historical justification for why strong policy intervention is necessary.

The inequality depicted in the table is the primary reason behind the implementation of the land redistribution program within the Land Objects for Agrarian Reform (TORA) framework. This program aims to take land from specific sources—such as abandoned land, state land, and released forest areas—and grant it to landless farmers or those with very small plots, namely those in the bottom 40% group (Wicaksono, Handayani, & Karjoko, 2019). The data presented indicates that redistribution should be a priority program in Sumatra and Kalimantan, where inequality exists at an extreme level. In these two regions, the dominance of large-scale plantations and natural resource concessions is a primary cause of the small ownership share held by the lower groups.

In addition to land redistribution as the first pillar of the Jokowi administration's agrarian reform, the second pillar is Asset Legalization, which has been massively executed through the Complete Systematic Land Registration (PTSL) program (Aksinuddin, 2023). Ideally, this program targets landowners in the bottom 40% and middle 40% categories who already have physical control of their land but lack formal ownership certificates. Although important in principle, PTSL does not directly alter the inequality figures in the table (Natadireja, Ningrum, & Pancasilawan, 2024). The program only legalizes existing land ownership statuses without increasing the land area for smallholder farmers or the bottom 40% group. In other words, the massive execution of PTSL during the Joko Widodo administration only serves to "secure" the position of the lower groups within a skewed structure, but it does not change the structure itself (Roswandi, Masrudohatun, & Wahyuningsih, 2023).

Furthermore, the failure of agrarian reform policy under President Joko Widodo is also caused by the weak realization of land redistribution, which is the core spirit of the program as mandated by the 1960 Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA). To address the extreme inequality shown in the data, the Land Redistribution program is, in fact, the most relevant intervention. Ultimately, the success of Jokowi's agrarian policy, as claimed by his administration, should not be measured solely by the number of certificates issued (Natadireja, Ningrum, & Pancasilawan, 2024). Instead, it should be measured by its ability to significantly change the figures in this table—in other words, by increasing the land ownership percentage of the bottom 40% and reducing the dominance of the top 20%. Without this fundamental change, agrarian inequality will remain a latent problem for social justice in Indonesia.

b. Jokowi's Agrarian Reform Policy

Table 3: Distribution of Land Areas for Jokowi's Agrarian Reform Policy

Program	Scheme	Land Area (Ha)
Land Object of Agrarian Reform		
Asset Legalization	Uncertified Transmigration Land	0.6 Million
	Complete Systematic Land Registration	3.9 Million

	Results of Land Conflict Resolution	Inventory Process
Land Redistribution	Former HGU/Abandoned/Abandoned Land	0.4 Million
	Forest Area Release	4.1 Million
Social Forestry		
Access Legalization	Granting of Access to Forest Enterprises in Specific Period	12.7 Million

Source: Office of the Presidential Staff, August 2017

Table 3. illustrates how President Jokowi interprets agrarian reform as a process of allocation and consolidation of ownership, control/access and use of land. The Jokowi government's agrarian reform policy is implemented through two channels, namely land for the agrarian reform object (TORA) and Social Forestry. In the agrarian reform scheme in the RPJM, 9 million hectares are divided into two, the first is the legalization of 4.5 million hectares of assets and the second is the redistribution of 4.5 million hectares of land. The implementation plan is the legalization of assets of 4.5 million hectares which is divided into two: firstly the legalization of uncertified transmigration land assets of 0.6 million hectares and secondly the legalization of assets of 3.9 million hectares, which is carried out through a complete systematic land registration scheme. (PTSL). While the redistribution of land allocated from the results of the conflict resolution to date, the total area has not been known because to this day the government is still in the inventory process. Meanwhile, the redistribution of 4.5 million hectares of the land whose implementation plan is also divided into two. First, the redistribution of land with the target of ex-HGU/abandoned land and other state lands covering an area of 0.4 million hectares and the release of forest areas of 4.1 million hectares.

In addition to 9 million hectares as TORA (land for Agrarian Reform Objects) in implementing the agrarian reform policies, the Jokowi government also runs a social forestry program covering an area of 12.7 million hectares, both of which have differences in the technicalities and institutions that implement them. The implementation of the agrarian reform program is 9 million hectares under the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/ATR, while social forestry is 12.7 million hectares under the Ministry of Environment and Forestry/KLHK.

There are three schemes in the process of establishing and implementing TORA, first, affirmation as State land and then granting TORA by stipulating the legalization of assets. Second, the release of state forest areas is then redistributed. the third is the release by the right holder and confirmed as state land then land consolidation is carried out.

The agrarian reform policy of the Jokowi government does not translate the concept of agrarian reform, where one the concept of agrarian reform is how to change or eliminate inequality in land tenure. (Suartining & Djaja, 2023), (MP. Tjondronegoro & Wiradi, 2004), (Ramadhani, 2020), (A. Hidayat, 2017), (Nurdin, 2017), (Arisaputra, 2015), (Syahyuti, 2016a). In the agrarian reform program, Jokowi provides asset legalization for 4.5 million, which in reality is not land redistribution but the administration of land that has been controlled by the people and this action cannot change the unequal land tenure structure in Indonesia. Likewise with ex-HGU lands or abandoned land, the amount of which is not very significant compared to the area of HGU controlled by both plantation and mining companies. In other words, the

redistribution of ex-HGU land and abandoned land does not change the monopolistic land ownership structure in Indonesia.

c. Implementation of the Jokowi Government's Agrarian Reform

Agrarian Reform												
Target			Realisation					%				
9 mil Ha			9,26 mil Ha					102,89%				
Asset Legalization						Land Redistribution						
Target			Realisation		%		Target		Realisation		%	
4,5 mil Ha			7,8 mil Ha		173,33%		4,5 mil Ha		1,46 mil Ha		32,62%	
Transmigration Land				Land Registration (PTSL)				Former HGU, Abandoned Land & Other State Land			Release of Forest Areas	
Target	Realisation	%	Target	Realisation	%	Target	Realisation	%	Target	Realisation	%	
0,6 mil Ha	0,126 mil Ha	21,15%	3,9 mil Ha	7,68 mil Ha	170,69%	0,4 mil Ha	1,77 mil Ha	286,76%	4,1 mil Ha	0,32 mil Ha	7,82%	

Figure. 1. Implementation of 2015-2024 Agrarian Reform

Source: SIGTORA ATR/BPN

Figure.1. Shows the achievements of the implementation of the agrarian reform program that has been carried out from 2015-2024. The implementation of agrarian reform has reached 102.89%, from the target of land redistribution of 9 million hectares, the Jokowi government has succeeded in redistributing an area of 9.26 million hectares. However, most of the area achieved is not through land redistribution, but through asset legalization, namely the certification of land owned by the people which has been controlled so far, both hereditary property rights and transmigration land, which is 7.8 million hectares. This means that the Jokowi government does not give land controlled by a handful of people with an area of more than 20 hectares to the people whose majority only controls <2 hectares of land. Meanwhile, in terms of land redistribution from the target 4, 5 million hectares, the Jokowi government is only able to redistribute 1.46 million hectares of land. This situation illustrates that Jokowi's agrarian reform is not agrarian reform because it does not aim to abolish land monopoly or change the structure of agrarian control in Indonesia.

The realization of the implementation of Jokowi's agrarian reform also does not have any plans related to 1. Land reform, namely the restructuring of land ownership control structures that are more equitable; 2. Access reform, namely the arrangement of the use or utilization of land that is more productive accompanied by the arrangement of supporting facilities and infrastructure that allows farmers to gain access to economic resources in rural areas. Such access includes access to agricultural facilities and infrastructure, irrigation, roads, farming, production marketing, farming cooperatives, and banking (people's business credit); 3. Policy/Regulation reform, namely the regulation of policies and laws that favour the people at large (Suartining & Djaja, 2023), (MP. Tjondronegoro & Wiradi, 2004), (Arisaputra, 2015), (Syahyuti, 2016b), (Syahyuti, 2016a).

CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that the agrarian reform policy implemented during the administration of Joko Widodo tends to emphasize asset legalization through the Complete Systematic Land Registration (PTSL) program, rather than pursuing substantive land redistribution efforts. This indicates that the policy orientation leans more towards an administrative approach rather than a structural transformation of land tenure inequality.

The relatively low realization of land redistribution (1.46 million hectares out of the targeted 4.5 million hectares) reflects the limited political and institutional capacity to significantly alter the agrarian structure. Although the asset legalization program provides legal certainty over land ownership for communities, this policy remains insufficient in addressing the deeply rooted agrarian inequality.

Therefore, a reformulation of the agrarian reform concept is necessary—one that not only prioritizes administrative aspects of land affairs but also includes efforts to restructure land ownership more equitably and strengthen community access to land-based economic resources. Through such an approach, agrarian reform is expected to make a meaningful contribution to inclusive and socially just development.

REFERENCE

- Aksinuddin, S. (2023). Complete Systematic Land Registration. *Best Journal of Administration and Management*, 2(2), 56-63.
- Ambuwaru, J., Saragih, B., & Sumanto, L. (2023). The Politics of Land Law and the Implementation of the Agrarian Reform Program in Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Review, Law and Social Sciences*, 3, 1443-50.
- Arisaputra, M. I. (2015). Reforma Agraria Untuk Mewujudkan Kedaulatan Pangan. *Rechtidee*, 10, 39–59.
- Anugrah, I. (2024). Rural social movements and popular struggles under Jokowi's presidency. *International Quarterly for Asian Studies*, 55(2), 219-243.
- Darmawan, D., Soetarto, E., Asnawi, Y., Mahasari, J., & Sukmawati, A. (2023). The History of Agrarian Reforms in Indonesia: A Sociological Perspective. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 11(11), e2196-e2196.
- Fauziyah, E., Awang, S., Suryanto, P., & Achmad, B. (2025). Inequality and Poverty of Privately Owned Forests Farmers in Rural Areas of Indonesia. *Forest Science and Technology*, 21(1), 1-14.
- Fatem, S., Awang, S., Pudyatmoko, S., Sahide, M., Pratama, A., & Maryudi, A. (2018). Camouflaging economic development agendas with forest conservation narratives: A strategy of lower governments for gaining authority in the recentralising Indonesia. *Land use policy*, 78, 699-710.
- Ginting, D. (2021). The Paradox of Land Ownership after the Era of Democratic Economy-Based Reform according to Agrarian Law in Indonesia. *J. Legal Ethical & Regul, Issues* 24, 1.
- Habibi, M. (2025). Challenging the orthodox policy analysis in Indonesia: a historical materialist policy analysis of Joko Widodo's agrarian reform and food sovereignty. *Critical Policy Studies*, 1-14.
- Habibi, M. (2022). Capitalism and agrarian change: Class, production, and reproduction in Indonesia. Routledge.
- Hardiyanto, B. (2021). Politics of land policies in Indonesia in the era of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. *Land Use Policy*, Volume 101.
- Hidayat, A. (2017). Konstruksi Gerakan Sosial : Efektivitas Gerakan Lingkungan Hidup Global. *Jurnal Administrative Reform*, 5(2), 56. <https://doi.org/10.52239/jar.v5i2.662>
- Hidayat, A. T. (2020). *Berasal Dari Tanah Cabutan Asing (Studi Kasus Kabupaten Bangli Provinsi Bali) Implementation of Agrarian Reform Comes From Confiscated Foreign Land (Case Study of Bangli Regency in Bali Province)*. 86, 2020–2024.
- McCarthy, J., McWilliam, A., & Nooteboom, G. (2023). The paradox of agrarian change: Food security and the politics of social protection in Indonesia. NUS Press.
- McCarthy, J., Dhiaulhaq, A., Afiff, S., & Robinson, K. (2022). Land reforms rationalities and their governance effects in Indonesia: Provoking land politics or addressing adverse formalisation? *Geoforum*, 132, 92-102.
- McCarthy, J. F., & Robinson, K. (2016). Land and development in Indonesia: Searching for the people's sovereignty. ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute.
- Meckelburg, R., & Wardana, A. (2024). The political economy of land acquisition for development in the public interest: The case of Indonesia. *Land Use Policy*, 137, 107017.
- Mizero, M., Karangwa, A., Burny, P., Michel, B., & Lebailly, P. (2018). Agrarian and land reforms in Rwanda: Situation and perspectives. *Agris On-Line Papers in Economics and Informatics*, 10(3), 79–92. <https://doi.org/10.7160/aol.2018.100307>
- Mulyani, L. (2014). THE UNBROKEN LEGACY: AGRARIAN REFORM OF YUDHOYONO'S ERA. *Masyarakat Indonesia*, 40(02), 131-144.

- MP. Tjondronegoro, S., & Wiradi, G. (2004). Menelusuri Pengertian Istilah "Agraria." *Jurnal Analisis Sosial*, 9(1), 1–8.
- Nasional, P. P. dan P. K. A. dan T. R. P. (2018). *Laporan Akhir Penelitian Internal* (Issue 8). https://digilib.esaunggul.ac.id/public/UEU-Research-11986-16_0243.pdf
- Natadireja, R., Ningrum, S., & Pancasilawan, R. (2024). Dynamics of Indonesian Agricultural Policy From 1945-2022. *Eduvest-Journal of Universal Studies*, 4(7), 5642-5664.
- Nurdin, I. (2017). Mewujudkan Desa Maju Reforma Agraria. *BHUMI: Jurnal Agraria Dan Pertanahan*, 3(1), 82. <https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v3i1.92>
- Pereira, R., Simmons, C. S., & Walker, R. (2016). Smallholders, agrarian reform, and globalization in the Brazilian amazon: Cattle versus the environment. *Land*, 5(3), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land5030024>
- Professor Saturnino M., J. ('Jun') B. (n.d.). *Land politics, agrarian movements and sholar-activism*. 0–53.
- Putri, S., Setiawan, T., & Karlina, N. (2022). Developing policy instruments to reduce inequality of land ownership. *Int. J. Curr. Sci. Res. Rev*, 5(12), 4739-4751.
- Rachman, N. F. (2018). Memahami Reorganisasi Ruang Melalui Perspektif Politik Agraria. *BHUMI: Jurnal Agraria Dan Pertanahan*, 1(1), 33–44. <https://jurnalbhumi.stpn.ac.id/index.php/JB/article/view/39/51>
- Rahman, R. (2024). Problems of Complete Systematic Land Registration (PTSL) In The Process of Land Registration in Indonesia. *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities*, 4(5), 1446-1458.
- Rahman, A. (2019). *Politik Agraria*. https://ilmupolitik.unja.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Buku-ajar-polAG_bab-11.pdf
- Ramadhani, : (2020). Peran Poltik Terhadap Pembangunan Hukum Agraria Nasional. *Sosek:Jurnal Sosial Dan Ekonomi*, 1(1), 1–6.
- Roswandi, R., Masrudohatun, A., & Wahyuningsih, S. (2023). Legal Reconstruction of Absentee Land Registration Arrangements through Complete Systematic I. Scholars International Journal of Law, Crime, and Justice, 6(2), 108-114.
- Sitorus, M. F. (2004). Kerangka Dan Metode Kajian Agraria. *Jurnal Analisis Sosial*, 9(1), 111–124.
- Stemler, S. (2015). Content Analysis. Emerging Trends in the social and behavioral sciences: An Interdisciplinary, Searchable, and Linkable Resource, 1-14.
- Suartining, N., & Djaja, B. (2023). Land Rights in the Land Law System in Indonesia According to the Basic Agrarian Law Number 5 of 1960. *Journal of Social Research*, 2(6), 1775-1785.
- Sumarja, F., Firmansyah, A. A., & Wijonugroho, P. (2020). Agrarian Reforms in Indonesia: A Pleasure. In T. Suryanto, Hamzah, S. Wahab, Y. Chemysheva, A. Juhary, & J. Ferry, The International Conference on Environmental and Technology of Law, Business and Education (pp. 1-8). Bandar Lampung: European Alliance for Innovation.
- Syahyuti, N. (2016). Pengaruh Politik Agraria Terhadap Perubahan Pola Penguasaan Tanah dan Struktur Pedesaan di Indonesia. *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, 19(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.21082/fae.v19n1.2001.21-32>
- Van Lange Paul, A. M. (2015). Introduction and literature review. *Social Dilemmas*, 3-28.
- Wardani, W. (2020). Ownership Limitation to the Land Right Based on the Social Justice in Accordance to the Renewal of National Agrarian Rights Act. *International Conference on Law, Economics and Health* (pp. 442-449). Atlantis Press.
- White, B., Graham, C., & Savitri, L. (2023). Agrarian movements and rural populism in Indonesia. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 23(1), 68-84.
- Wicaksono, M., Handayani, I., & Karjoko, L. (2019). State Policy's Analysis in the Redistribution of Reformed Agrarian Lands From Forest Areas in Indonesia (Study of Presidential Regulation Number 86 Year 2018 Regarding Agrarian Reform). 3rd International Conference on Globalization of Law and Local Wisdom (pp. 174-178). Atlantis Press.
- Widodo, S. (2017). A critical review of Indonesia's agrarian reform policy. *Journal of Regional and City Planning*, 28(3), 204-218.