

The Urgency of Regulatory Synchronization For "Merah Putih" Village Cooperatives: A Critical Analysis Based On The Theory of The Unity of The Normative Order

Asyif Mahfudz^{1*}, Septi Nur Wijayanti²

^{1,2}Program Studi Hukum Program Magister, Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Corresponden author:

Email: asyif.mahfudz.law25@mail.umy.ac.id

Abstract.

The government, through the policy of the President of the Republic of Indonesia, instructed the establishment of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative with the aim of empowering the people's economy, empowering MSMEs, and strengthening food sovereignty. This study aims to determine whether there is normative disharmony in the policy of establishing the Merah Putih Village Cooperative. The study uses a juridical-normative method using secondary data, including laws and regulations that underlie the policy, Presidential Instructions, and Government Regulations. The theory of the unity of normative order is used to conduct a conceptual analysis of whether the Merah Putih Village Cooperative policy has the potential for normative disharmony. The results of this study indicate that the policy of establishing the Merah Putih Village Cooperative has normative disharmony, namely the lack of synchronization between policy norms and regulations of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative, namely the existence of overlapping norms that have implications for legal uncertainty in policy implementation. The importance of aligning regulations that underlie the implementation of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative so that they are in line with pre-existing normative order, so that the main objective of establishing the Merah Putih Village Cooperative can be realized by paying attention to the normative basis so as to create legal certainty and effectiveness in its implementation.

Keywords: Red and White Village Cooperative: Normative Disharmony and Normative System Unity.

I. INTRODUCTION

The existence of cooperatives is a key pillar in strengthening the people's economy in Indonesia. The mandate of Article 33 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia states that the economy is structured as a joint effort based on the principle of family. In village-level regional development, cooperatives function as financial institutions, providers of goods, and as a vehicle for community empowerment to achieve the goal of economic independence at the village level.

The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, under the leadership of President Prabowo Subianto, has taken a strategic step to strengthen the people's economy through the establishment of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative. This program was established through Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025 concerning the Acceleration of the Establishment of Merah Putih Village/Sub-district Cooperatives, with a target of establishing 80,000 cooperatives throughout Indonesia. The main objectives of establishing the Merah Putih Village Cooperative include: strengthening the village economy, improving community welfare, shortening the distribution chain, strengthening local micro, small, and medium enterprises, increasing financial inclusion, and creating new jobs.

Economic strengthening through the Red and White Village Cooperative program aims to build a people-based economy. This effort is a structured and strategic step in strengthening the people's economy.¹The urgency of establishing the Merah Putih cooperative is recognized as a fundamental strategy to collectively strengthen the foundations of the local economy.²Cooperatives provide opportunities for the community to access business capital financing, so that the community has the opportunity to improve the economy through the businesses they pioneer.

In Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025 concerning the Establishment of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative, in addition to having the main objective of building people-based economic independence, it also has the following objectives, namely; (i) empowering micro, small and medium

enterprises and villages, (ii) strengthening food sovereignty, (iii) increasing the number of area-based cooperatives, (iv) strengthening community participation in the productive economy, (v) supporting economic transformation. Although the objectives of establishing the Merah Putih Village Cooperative are very clear and in accordance with the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, its implementation in the field faces obstacles and various challenges.³

The success of the Red and White Village Cooperative program at the regional level, particularly in villages, depends heavily on the readiness of infrastructure and human resources. Low human resource capacity in cooperative management and financial literacy are key obstacles.⁴ The low capacity of human resources to manage cooperatives can lead to cooperative failure. The primary impact of cooperative failure due to low human resource capacity is a weak understanding of the principles of legal obligations. Cooperative administrators are drawn from community leaders deemed capable, rather than from members of the community who possess competencies screened through a series of tests. This results in cooperative managers having little or no understanding of the regulations and legal obligations related to cooperatives. This can potentially lead to administrative violations.

Still related to the capacity of human resources running cooperatives, there is a lack of understanding of professional ethics as cooperative managers. Abuse of authority can occur due to managers' lack of understanding of accountability reporting related to the cooperative audit system. Third, if cooperative managers lack digital literacy or are technologically illiterate, this can hinder financial reporting. This can jeopardize the accountability of cooperative reports, as they will rely on manual methods for bookkeeping and financial reporting.

In addition to human resource issues in the operational implementation of cooperatives, there are more complex challenges in a systematic institutional manner. There are no regulations at the central or regional levels regarding the implementation guidelines for the Red and White Village Cooperative. A fundamental issue related to the current implementation of cooperatives is the revocation of Law Number 17 of 2012 by the Constitutional Court through decision Number 28/PUU-XI/2013. With the revocation of this law, the basis of cooperatives returns to Law Number 25 of 1992 concerning cooperatives.

Furthermore, when linked to operational regulations at the village level, the Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) currently exist and are in operation. Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages and Government Regulation Number 11 of 2021, which hierarchically regulate the implementation, authority, and functions of Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes), can lead to overlapping authority and functions with the Merah Putih Village Cooperative. Therefore, legally, there are no boundaries of authority and division of duties regarding the distribution of business units and funding sources between the Merah Putih Village Cooperative and the Village-Owned Enterprises. This lack of authority creates disharmony and triggers legal uncertainty. The potential for this disharmony is disputes over authority at the village level, which can ultimately hinder the objectives of establishing the Merah Putih Village Cooperative itself.

Disharmony in legislation is a condition where there are two or more legislations that stipulate similar substance or context, but their technical implementation is inconsistent.⁵ Inconsistency in technical implementation will lead to horizontal and vertical conflicts. Through a normative approach and the application of the theory of the unity of normative order, this study seeks to examine the policy of establishing the Merah Putih Village Cooperative normatively and juridically to determine whether there is normative disharmony in the implementation of the policy from the central to the regional level. Previous research has focused on challenges and opportunities, implementation at the village level specifically in certain villages, institutional analysis, and disharmony related to cooperative principles.

Previous research conducted by Rixvan Afgani on the Merah Putih Village Cooperative focused on the policy of establishing cooperatives from a political economic perspective of development. Then, research

conducted by Syarifuddin Arief focused on the development strategy of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative with a literature review and global challenges. Furthermore, research by Yustina Giawa with the topic of legal analysis of the establishment of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative reviewed from Law Number 25 of 1992 concerning Cooperatives. Meanwhile, related to disharmony, research conducted by Yusni Fitri Mardina examined the disharmony of the policy of establishing the Merah Putih Village Cooperative according to the principles of cooperatives in Indonesia.

Therefore, this study focuses on normative disharmony in the implementation of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative policy, with a focus on in-depth analysis of the regulations underlying the implementation of the policy with existing regulations. Based on this, this study will present the problem formulation, first, Why does normative disharmony occur in the implementation of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative policy. Second, How can the normative disharmony of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative policy be resolved if viewed through the theory of the unity of normative order.

II. Methods

The legal research method used in this study is normative juridical legal research. This type of legal research examines the internal aspects of positive law to resolve problems within that law.⁶The research approach is carried out through the use of statutory regulations, which is often referred to as normative legal research or doctrinal research methods.⁷The research uses secondary data sources, consisting of laws and regulations, doctrines, legal theories, and journals. This research does not conduct a social fact study in the field or empirically. This research emphasizes the study of legal norms that form the basis of the policy for the establishment of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative, whether there is normative disharmony in the implementation of the policy. Furthermore, looking at the synchronization and interrelationships between several regulations or laws related to the implementation of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative when viewed within the framework of the theory of normative order unity, to see how the regulation for the establishment of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative, especially in Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025, in its implementation there is overlap with other regulations that have the same context. So this research produces conclusions regarding the disharmony of regulations that underlie the implementation policy of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative and suggestions for resolving the disharmony of these regulations.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Normative disharmony in the policies of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative

Cooperatives are a form of economic organization that plays a vital role in the social and economic development of Indonesian society. As a system based on the principles of family and mutual cooperation, cooperatives have long been an integral part of community life, particularly in empowering the lower classes economically. The concept of cooperatives has been present in Indonesia since the colonial era, although its initial emergence was limited and controlled by the Dutch colonial government. However, over time, cooperatives have continued to evolve, both in terms of form, function, and role within the national economic system.⁸

According to Law Number 25 of 1992, a cooperative is an association whose members consist of individuals or cooperative legal entities which provide freedom to enter and exit as members, by working together as a family to run a business to improve the welfare of members.⁹In its development in Indonesia to date, there are several regulations that form the basis for cooperative implementation policies, as follows:

1. Government Regulation (PP) Number 9 of 1995 concerning Development of Medium Enterprises and Cooperatives;
2. Government Regulation (PP) Number 4 of 1994 concerning Institutions;
3. Presidential Instruction (Inpres) Number 18 of 1998 concerning the Development of Cooperative Institutions;
4. Law Number 25 of 1992 concerning Cooperatives;
5. Law Number 17 of 2012 which was revoked by the Constitutional Court through decision Number 28/PUU-XI/2013.

In its efforts to improve economic stability, the Indonesian government under President Prabowo Subiyanto has focused on strengthening national independence (self-sufficiency) and implementing structural economic transformation through downstreaming programs. These two efforts focus on maintaining the purchasing power of the community, starting at the lowest level, namely the village level.

Establishment of Village Cooperatives Merah Putih has strategic goals and objectives to promote an inclusive and equitable economy, while simultaneously empowering rural communities and strengthening local economies. This cooperative is also directed to support the achievement of Asta Cita, specifically Goal 2, namely sustainable food self-sufficiency, Goal 3, namely the development of a cooperative-based agro-maritime industry, and Goal 6, namely village-based development for economic equality. Thus, this cooperative is expected to be a driving force for a people-oriented economy rooted in local potential.¹⁰

The establishment of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative, based on Presidential Instruction (Inpres) No. 9 of 2025, is urgent as a fundamental strategy to collectively strengthen the local economy. As an economic entity based on social solidarity, cooperatives provide a crucial opportunity for communities to access business financing through a collectively managed savings and loan system.¹¹ In implementing the Red and White Village Cooperative policy, it encountered normative challenges stemming from regulatory aspects. First, horizontal regulatory inconsistencies are found in the rules of Cooperatives and Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes). The basic foundation of cooperatives that is currently still in effect is Law Number 25 of 1992. If we look at the functions and authorities of cooperatives based on Law Number 25 of 1992, which are contained in Article 4. There are at least four main functions and roles of cooperatives. First, building and developing economic potential, this aims to improve the economic and social welfare of members in particular and in general impacts the community. Second, improving the quality of life of the community. Third, strengthening the people's economy, national economic resilience can be realized through the existence of cooperatives. Fourth, developing the economy is a joint effort based on the principles of family and economic democracy so as to realize the national economy.

On the other hand, an existing instrument at the village level that has almost the same function as a cooperative is the Village-Owned Enterprise (BUMDes). The regulatory basis for the establishment and implementation of Village-Owned Enterprises is Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages. The difference in legal status between Cooperatives and Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) is that cooperatives are private legal entities based on membership, while Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) are legal entities established by the Village/Sub-District Government. Having independent authority, Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) can directly carry out or create cooperation contracts. They can have assets in the name of the Village-Owned Enterprise (BUMDes) itself. These several things give Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) flexibility in terms of business development.

Article 87 of Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages states that Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) primarily serve as an instrument for driving the village economy. Furthermore, they have the following objectives: First, to manage and utilize village assets to become productive assets. Second, to provide goods and/or services that serve the local village community. Third, through the operation of the

Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes), they generate original village income, which becomes part of the village revenue and expenditure budget, ultimately supporting village development.

From the two regulatory reviews above, if linked to Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025 concerning the Establishment of the Red and White Village Cooperative, it causes disharmony in the regulations, namely due to overlapping (overlap) and legal/regulatory vacuums that can hinder the effective implementation of policies in the regions. There are at least six factors causing disharmony, namely:

1. Establishment by different institutions and often over different time periods;
2. The authorized officials change due to being limited by term of office, transfer of duties, or replacement;
3. The sectoral approach is more dominant than the systems approach in the formation of regulations.
4. Weak coordination in the process of formulating regulations involving various agencies and legal disciplines.
5. Limited public access to participate in the regulatory formation process.
6. The methods and methods are not yet stable, standard and standard for all institutions authorized to make laws and regulations.¹²

Visually, the normative disharmony regarding the policy basis of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative can be presented in the following table:

Table 1. Comparison of normative disharmony

Aspect Review	Cooperative Regulations	Village Regulations	Normative Analysis
Legal Foundation	Law No. 25/1992	Law No. 6/2014 & PP 11/2021	Horizontal Disharmony
Main Focus	Individual Membership	Village-Owned Enterprises	Dualism of Norms
Legal certainty	Hampered by Constitutional Court Decision	Strengthened by the Job Creation Law	Unsynchronized Hierarchy

From the review above, the normative disharmony arising from the policies of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative is two-way: vertical and horizontal. First, vertical disharmony, namely Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025, has a disconnection with the regulation above it (hierarchy conflict), namely Law Number 25 of 1992 concerning Cooperatives. Where the Cooperative Law is static, conventional, and does not require system digitization. Meanwhile, the Merah Putih Village Cooperative is dynamic and modern system digitization. Therefore, the point of disharmony lies in the implementation of the cooperative system mechanism, which when viewed in the cooperative regulations (Law Number 25 of 1992) does not have a basis for attribution. Therefore, this gives rise to a contradiction between the two regulations.

Table 2. visualization of normative disharmony

Types of Collisions	Dimensions	Conflicting Legal Basis	Legal Impact
Vertical	Hierarchy	Law No. 25/1992 vs Presidential Instruction No. 9/2025	The validity flaw is due to the absence of delegation of authority for digitalization of the system in the previous law.
Horizontal	Sectoral	Law No. 6/2014 (BUMDes) vs Presidential Instruction No. 9/2025	Antinomy of norms; dispute over authority to manage village assets.

Second, horizontal conflict, namely between cooperatives and Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes). Between Law Number 25 of 1992 concerning Cooperatives and Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages. This is due to Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025 as the basis for implementing the Red and White Village Cooperative policy, positioning cooperatives as actors in driving the village economy. Similarly, Law Number 6 of 2014 mandates Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) as economic support institutions at the village level. Thus, with the overlapping authority between the Red and White Village Cooperative and Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes), competition/struggle for the domain of business units being run. Until now, there has been no regulation that serves as a technical basis for implementation that provides clarity on the scope between the two. This creates legal uncertainty for policy implementers at the regional level, especially the Village/Sub-district Government.

3.2 Normative disharmony is reviewed using the analysis of normative order theory.

Guaranteeing legal justice is a logical consequence of the positivist view of law, where law is viewed as a written entity designed and approved by the state. From this perspective, legal justice is guaranteed by structured and firm legal provisions. Law, in essence, is created as an inclusive instrument that reaches all levels of society, regardless of ethnicity, gender, social status, or wealth. Everyone, without exception, will have their rights guaranteed by law, creating a level playing field for legal justice (juridical justice). This principle affirms that all individuals and citizens have equal rights before the law, and the law exists to ensure that justice is upheld fairly and equally for all. Thus, it does not attach privileges to certain groups, but rather a universal principle that recognizes and protects the rights of every individual in society.¹³

Nomocracy is a basic concept of a state based on law. Nomocracy consists of the words *nomos*, which means norm, and *cratos*, which means power. The concept of a state based on law is a concept of state governance that is based on law. Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia affirms that Indonesia is a state based on law (*rechtstaat*) with the understanding of recognition of the principles of the constitution and the supremacy of law, separation and limitation of powers, guarantee of human rights, an independent judiciary that guarantees equality of every citizen before the law, and guarantees justice for every citizen.¹⁴ According to Mochtar Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia is not merely a formal state of law, but rather a material state of law based on Pancasila, which utilizes law as a means of societal renewal. This means that law in Indonesia serves as a foundation that guides society in realizing the ideals of the Indonesian nation, as embodied in the principles of Pancasila.

Another perspective on the application of the rule of law is Hans Kelsen's theory, which separates law from morality and law from fact, based on normativity. This specific theory developed by Hans Kelsen is the result of a comparative analysis of various positive legal systems, thus forming a basic concept that can describe a legal community. The main issues (subject matter) in the general theory are legal norms, their elements, their relationships, the legal system as a whole, its structure, the relationship between different legal systems, and finally, the unity of law within a plural positive legal system. Pure legal theory emphasizes a clear distinction between empirical law and transcendental justice by removing them from the scope of legal studies. Law is not the embodiment of superhuman authority, but rather a specific social technique based on human experience.¹⁵

Furthermore, Hans Kelsen defined law as a system of norms with levels or a hierarchy. The validity of a norm is derived from a higher norm, and the highest peak of a norm is the *grundnorm*. Based on this concept, the theory of the unity of normative order emerged. In Indonesia, the application of this normative order concept is found in Law Number 12 of 2011 concerning the Formation of Legislation, which positions Pancasila as the source of all sources of law. Therefore, it can be interpreted that Pancasila is the *grundnorm* and serves as the foundation for the formation of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

Through this concept, the structure or hierarchy of legal regulations in Indonesia is tiered from top to bottom, namely the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Decrees of the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR), Laws or Government Regulations in Lieu of Laws, Government Regulations, Presidential Regulations, Provincial Regulations, Regency Regulations. With the existence of levels or hierarchies of these laws and regulations, lower laws and regulations may not conflict with higher regulations.¹⁶ So the concept of the hierarchy of legal regulations, especially the basic regulations which form the basis for the validity of other regulations, forms a closed system or can be said to be pure law.¹⁷

Then what is the position of Presidential Instruction (Inpres) Number 9 of 2025 which is the basis for the policy of establishing the Merah Putih Village Cooperative. First, the Presidential Instruction in this case Inpres Number 9 of 2025 is not included in the hierarchy of laws and regulations as regulated in Article 7

paragraph (1) of Law Number 12 of 2011. The Presidential Instruction, when viewed from the theory of normative unity, can be categorized as an administrative instrument or regulation containing policy. The distinction between norms or laws and regulations is of two kinds, namely generally binding regulations (regels) and regulations of an individual-concrete nature. The Presidential Instruction has a mandatory nature, namely from the President as the mandate giver addressed to elements under his coordination, namely Ministers, Heads of Institutions, and Regional Heads. So the Presidential Instruction is not a pure legal norm containing rights and obligations that are generally imposed on citizens if there are no implementing regulations for the Presidential Instruction.

In Law Number 12 of 2011, the position of the Presidential Instruction is not in the hierarchy of statutory regulations, however Article 8 paragraph (1) states that the regulation other matters stipulated by the President. In terms of the nomodynamic aspect, the validity of Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025 originates from the power of the government (executive), in this case the President as the holder of the highest governmental power as stipulated in Article 4 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. If compared with the normative order of laws and regulations, the position of the Presidential Instruction is below the Presidential Regulation (Perpres). Furthermore, if the Presidential Instruction is reviewed in terms of normative unity, it is related to the material contained in Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025 which is the basis for the policy of establishing the Merah Putih Village Cooperative, it must not conflict with existing laws and regulations that regulate in the same context, namely Law Number 25 of 1992 concerning Cooperatives and Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages.

IV. CONCLUSION

That The policy of establishing the Merah Putih Village Cooperative, based on Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025, within the legal framework in Indonesia faces fundamental issues, namely the normative validity and consistency of the legal system. Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025 is normatively a Presidential policy instrument with the primary objective of strengthening the people-based national economy. The Presidential Instruction should serve as a guideline or instruction for the implementation of higher regulations or as a *lex specialist* for pre-existing regulations. However, in its implementation, there is a vertical inconsistency with the previous regulation, namely Law Number 25 of 1995 concerning Cooperatives, which serves as the basic rule for implementing current cooperative activities. More specifically, the inconsistency lies in Articles 22 to 24 of Law Number 25 of 1992, which stipulate that member meetings are a form of accountability and decision-making, while the Merah Putih Village Cooperative encourages the implementation of authority systematically/digitally. Therefore, there is a legal vacuum because Law Number 25 of 1992 does not regulate system digitization.

In Article 41 to Article 42 which regulates cooperative capital, the Cooperatives Law states that the main capital comes from member contributions/savings, the amount of which has been determined according to an agreement with members. Meanwhile, the Merah Putih Village Cooperative's capital comes from both central and regional government budgets. Therefore, the point of disharmony lies in the capital aspect, where the Merah Putih Village Cooperative is flexible, while the Cooperative Law is still closed and does not regulate flexible capital.

Furthermore, the disharmony that occurs between Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025 and Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, which underlies the function and authority of Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes), lies in Article 87 of the Village Law, which regulates the position of BUMDes. Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025 provides authority and duties as the main instrument for driving the village community economy, but on the other hand, Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) have been given the same authority. This results in a legal conflict because the two regulations provide overlapping authority in the objectives of village-based community economic development. Then, Article 72 of the Village Law regulates village income (village funds). In the Village Law, the results or profits from businesses carried out by Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) are prioritized for village development. Meanwhile, in Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025, the operation of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative is fully handed over to the Village, both operationally and resource-wise as the manager. This

has not been clearly regulated regarding the operational mechanism, resulting in violations of Village financial management as stipulated in the Village Law.

This disharmony disrupts legal certainty (*rechtssicherheit*), disrupting the principle of legal certainty. The absence of a clear separation of authorities outlined in implementing regulations at both the central and regional levels can lead to conflicts of interest and obstacles to accountability to the public in the implementation of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative. To resolve this disharmony, policy makers, in this case the Government, need to conduct internal consistency checks on regulations that are mandatory policies and harmonize them with previous or existing regulations and those governing the same context, in this case Cooperatives and Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes).

Furthermore, the resolution of normative disharmony in the concept of normative unity can be tested for validity through a legislative review mechanism or if it is deemed that there are serious obstacles in its implementation, the President can revoke the Presidential Instruction on the basis of inconsistency with previously applicable regulations. Another step that can be taken is to revise Law Number 25 of 1992 concerning Cooperatives, by aligning the functions, authorities, and objectives of Cooperatives in general with the Red and White Village Cooperative. Then, it is necessary to apply the principle of consistency in the formation of regulations. In this case, if a regional regulation already exists that regulates the implementation of community-based economic authority by granting authority to the Village, then the position of the Regional Regulation has a more binding legal standing. Therefore, the Regional Government cannot force the implementation of the Red and White Village Cooperative policy if it conflicts with the Regional Regulation.

In the end, the researcher provides a real solution that can be implemented by policy makers at both the central and/or regional levels to resolve the issue of regulatory disharmony related to the implementation of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative policy. First, a short-term solution that can be done is to harmonize regulations, namely by issuing joint regulations that can be initiated by the Ministry of Cooperatives and Small and Medium Enterprises (UKM) and the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration (PDTT). The regulation can contain the division of authority and functions between the Merah Putih Village Cooperative and the Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes). The position of BUMDes is as the manager of Village infrastructure while the Merah Putih Village Cooperative is as the manager of marketing of community production.

REFERENCES

- [1] Amellyah, Fidia, Moh Maulana Firmansyah, JL Raya Telang, Perumahan Telang Inda, Kec Kamal, Kabupaten Bangkalan, and Jawa Timur. "PT. Media Akademik Publisher Sejarah Perkembangan Koperasi Di Indonesia: Dari Masa Kolonial Hingga Era Modern." *JMA* 3, no. 6 (2025): 3031–5220. <https://doi.org/10.62281>.
- [2] Aprianti, Kartini, Aliah Pratiwi, Citra Damayanti, Putri Nia Rinsih, Eni Mulyani, Ainun Zaaria, and Ikko Apriyan. "Sosialisasi Urgensi Koperasi Merah Putih Guna Mewujudkan Masyarakat Mandiri Dan Sejahtera Yang Berkelanjutan Di Kelurahan Kolo Kota Bima." *Jurnal Implementasi Riset* 5, no. 2 (October 2025): 1–7.
- [3] Arief, Syarifuddin, and Haeruddin Haeruddin. "Strategi Pengembangan Koperasi Desa Merah Putih: Tinjauan Literatur atas Praktik Terbaik dan Tantangan Global." *Al-Buhuts* 21, no. 1 (June 2025): 284–99. <https://doi.org/10.30603/ab.v21i1.6469>.
- [4] Arzewiniga, Febianriza, and Zulkarnain. "Tantangan Dan Peluang Kelembagaan Koperasi Desa Merah Putih." *Jurnal Manajemen dan Inovasi* 6, no. 2 (June 2025). <https://ejournals.com/ojs/index.php/jmi/article/view/2188>.
- [5] Benuf, Kornelius, and Muhamad Azhar. "Metodologi Penelitian Hukum sebagai Instrumen Mengurai Permasalahan Hukum Kontemporer." *Gema Keadilan* 7, no. 1 (April 2020): 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.14710/gk.2020.7504>.
- [6] Fanggi, Prandy A. L. "Analisis Konseptual Stufenbau Theory Terhadap Tata Peraturan Perundang Undangan Di Indonesia." *Jurnal Rekomendasi Hukum* 1, no. 2 (June 2025): 308–16.
- [7] Irawan, Anang Dony, Levina Yustitiantingtyas, and Bahri Nur Setiawan. "Membangun Ketahanan Demokrasi: Peran Pendidikan Politik Dalam Mendorong Keterlibatan Pemilih." *Media of Law and Sharia* 6, no. 4 (August 2025): 322–40. <https://doi.org/10.18196/mls.v6i4.387>.

- [8] M.H, Dr Selfianus Laritmas, S. H., and Dr Ahmad Rosidi M.H S. H. Teori-teori Negara Hukum. Prenada Media, 2024.
- [9] M.H, Endrik Safudin, S. H. I. Harmonisasi Hukum dalam Antinomi Hukum: Telaah Kritis atas Penerapannya oleh Mahkamah Agung. Q Media, 2021.
- [10] M.Si, Prof Dr Josef Papilaya, M. Si Fioletta Papilaya, S. P. EKONOMI KOPERASI. Cv. Azka Pustaka, 2025.
- [11] Putri, Nur Kemala, Alex Simeulu, Fikriya Anika Fitri, Irdia Trilia, Mulitalia, and M. Febryan Adisma. "Disharmonisasi Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Di Indonesia Antara Bentuk Penyebab Dan Solusi." Wathan: *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora* 1, no. 1 (May 2024): 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.71153/wathan.v1i1.17>.
- [13] Putri, Nur Talita Prapta, and Ananda Aulia. "Penerapan Teori Positivisme Hans Kelsen Di Indonesia." Das Sollen: *Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat* 2, no. 01 (January 2024). <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/dassollen/article/view/543>.
- [14] Syafi'i, Imam, and Sofia Tri Septiawati. "Dampak Kebijakan Pemerintah Dalam Mendirikan Koperasi Desa Merah Putih Di Kecamatan Sukodadi, Lamongan." *Madani Jurnal Politik Dan Sosial Kemasyarakatan* 17, no. 02 (August 2025): 275–87.
- [15] Widodo, Zandra Dwanita, Jayanti Putri Purwaningrum, and Imaniar Purbasari. Manajemen Koperasi Dan Umkm Cetak. Pertama. Widina Bhakti Persada Bandung, 2022.