Equality : Journal of Law and Justice
Vol. 2, No. 1, May, 2025, P. 103-117
e-ISSN: 3048-1252 (online)
https://jurnal.sinesia.id/index.php/Equality-JLJ

Environment Destruction in Indonesia: The Effectiveness of Indonesia's Environment Law (Legal Sociology Perspective)

Claudio Ricky Adhitya[1], Kezia Elvira Nainggolan[2], Ester Susanti[3], Emi Juliana Sinaga[4], Vincentia Cordialia Halan[5]
claudioricky188@gmail.com
[1]Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya

Info Article
|Submitted: 22 March 2025**|Revised**: 26 March 2025**|Accepted**: 8 April 2025
How to cite: Claudio Ricky Adhitya, etc., "Environment Destruction in Indonesia: The Effectiveness of Indonesian Environment Law (Legal Sociology Perspective)", *Equality : Journal of Law and Justice*, Vol. 2, No. 1, May, 2025, p. 103-117.

ABSTRACT

The enjoyment and utilization of the environment is the right of the people of Indonesia as guaranteed under the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Therefore, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia issued Law Number 32 of 2009 on the Protection and Management of Environment (Environment Law) as the embodiment of the rights of the people of Indonesia to enjoy and utilize the environment. As time flew by, the execution of the Environment Law encountered issues due to violations toward said law, such as environment destruction in the form of land clearing by means of burning. Since the issuance of the Environment Law, violations have been carried out by several parties, including but not limited to law enforcers, business owners, and the people of Indonesia themselves. This research focuses on the prohibition toward environment destruction in the form of land clearing by means of burning as well as the reasons and the sociological factors affecting the effectiveness of the implementation of the environmental laws. This research is aimed to identify the main factors affecting the failure of the enforcement of the Environment Law as well as other environmental laws and regulations. In addressing the said issues, this research utilizes the normative legal research methodology towards secondary data consisting of environmental laws, analyzed using the qualitative data analysis methodology. In conclusion, ineffectiveness of Indonesian environment laws are due to weakness in its enforcement, ambiguity in its norms, and failure of Indonesian legal culture to adhere to its legal principles.

Keyword: *Environment Destruction, Land Burning, Legal System.*

Introduction

Environment has become one of the many factors affecting the development of the national economy. Through the issuance of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 32 of 2009 (Environment Law), Indonesia provides a guarantee in the form of legal certainty and legal protection towards the rights of each and every citizen of Indonesia to enjoy a good and healthy environment. The quality of the Indonesian Environment has been encountering a decrease, that it caused threats toward the sustainability of humans and other beings lifes. Therefore, as the embodiment of legal certainty and legal protection, the issuance of the Environment Law constitutes a countermeasure carried out by the Government of the Republic of Indonesia from the perspective of law. The utilization of the Environment is deemed as an asset that may bolster the Indonesian citizens' welfare. This may be seen under Article 33 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of

Indonesia, stating that the land, waters, and natural resources within shall be under the powers of the State and be used to the greatest benefit of the people. In this context, Article 1 paragraph (1) of the Environment Law broadens the scope of the elements of "be used to the greatest benefit of the people" to become the land, waters, and natural resources within, including all the things, forces, resources, conditions, and living creatures, including humans and the behaviors thereof which affect the livelihood *per se*. Through the issuance of the Environment Law, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia is endeavoring the embodiment of Environment utilization to the greatest benefit of the citizens of Indonesia.

However, in practice, there are things hindering, even worsening, the livelihood of the Indonesian Environment. One of which is human misconducts in the form of land clearing by means of burning, whereby it became common to happen in businesses running in the forestry and plantation sectors. On the other hand, wildfires occurred due to the negligence of some interested parties, in maintaining and supervising their concessed lands. Cases of wildfires on forests and lands often occur in some areas in Indonesia, specifically Riau, Central Kalimantan, and South Sumatra. This causes negative impacts toward the State and the citizens, such as ecosystem damage, air pollution, and health issues.

In accordance with the research conducted by Auriga Nusantara, within the period of 2013 to 2023, there has occurred land fires as wide as 6,1 million hectares in Indonesia. From that number, as high as 55% occurred in Kalimantan and Sumatra. This number excludes forest and land fires (FLF) having occurred repeatedly in the same area, by which, if considering repeated FLF in the same area, the number increases to 10 million hectares. From the said research, suspicious indications were found in several areas in South Sumatra, where some hectares of lands have already been planted with oil palms no longer after FLF happened. This indicates that FLF was intentionally carried out for the purposes of clearing lands. Such suspicion is also backed by Pantau Gambut findings through data showing that 57% of peatland protected areas in the government restoration sites have been transformed into oil palm lands and 48% of corporate restoration sites have been transformed into lands with monocultural plants.

Apart from that, on June 28th, 2024, FLF occurred in 2 hectares of land in Bima Regency, East Nusa Tenggara. This event was alleged to have been caused intentionally by local residents planning to clear lands for agriculture. As a result, this event caused drought throughout summer, increasing the risks for the fire to spread widely. As a form of risk mitigation, the Bima Regional Disaster Management Agency has collaborated with relevant institutions to prevent the spread of the FLF. However, up to this time, there has not been any form of liability imposed on any party causing the said FLF.

Concrete examples of Environment Destruction may be found under the following rulings:

1. The Ruling of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2372 K/Pid.Sus/2015: PT Bumi Mekar Hijau, involved in a land burning case in South Sumatra, whereby the Defendants are found guilty of having conducted a criminal act of land burning, charged with imprisonment for 3 years and fine amounting to Rp 3 billion;
2. The Ruling of the District Court of Tembilahan Number 276/Pid.Sus/2018/PN.Tbh.: A Defendant (individual), found guilty of having conducted land clearing by means of burning, charged with imprisonment for 3 years and fine amounting to Rp 3 billion;
3. The Ruling of the High Court of Banjarmasin Number 88/Pid.B/LH/2020/PT.BJM: A Defendant (individual), found guilty of having conducted land clearing by means of burning, charged with imprisonment for 3 years and fine amounting to Rp 3 billion;
4. The Ruling of the District Court of Kandangan Number 205/Pid.B/LH/2023/PN.Kgn.: A Defendant (individual), found guilty of having conducted land clearing by means of burning, charged with imprisonment for 10 months and fine amounting to Rp 30 million; and
5. The Ruling of the District Court of Rengat Number 44/Pid.B/LH/2024/PN.Rgt.: A Defendant (individual), found guilty of having conducted land clearing by means of burning, charged with imprisonment for 5 years and fine amounting to Rp 3 billion.

In regards to Indonesian environment laws and regulations, cases on land clearing by means of burning are threatened with imprisonment for minimum 3 (three) years and maximum 15 (fifteen) years, and fine of at least Rp 3 billion and at most Rp 10 billion. From the said Court Rulings, it is shown that environment laws violators were only charged with minimum sentences, being 3 (three) years of imprisonment and Rp 3 billion of fines. This raises the questions as to the effectiveness of Indonesia's environment laws enforcement which fails to provide legal certainty in the field of environment in Indonesia, due to the fact that violators were often only charged with minimum sentences despite the existence of far more severe punishments. This also points out the fact that gap exists between the provisions set out under the environment laws and regulations with the mechanism of environment law enforcement which is affected by the quality of each and every party involved in the said violations, urging Indonesia's legal system in the field of environment to be reformed.

his research focuses on the discussion on the Environment Destruction caused by the act of "Person", which commonly encompasses individual persons, legal entities, or the institutions of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia. This research will also exhibit cases of Environment violations having been adjudicated by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia and the general courts thereunder, for the purposes of presenting the fact that Environment

Destruction is caused by many factors, including but not limited to the offenders, reasons, and impacts thereof. This research also focuses on the discussion of the discrepancies between the laws and regulations on Environment applicable in Indonesia - especially the ones concerning Environment Destruction - with its implementation as well as factors affecting the effectiveness of the laws and regulations *a quo*.

Considering the foregoing discussion, this research is aimed to identify various laws and regulations applicable in the Republic of Indonesia governing the prohibitions toward Environment Destruction in the form of land clearing by means of burning, as well as the sociological factors affecting the effectiveness of the implementation of the said laws and regulations. The main purpose of this research is to observe the main factors affecting the failure of enforcing the laws and regulations in the field of Environment applicable in Indonesia.

Research Methodology

In addressing the answers to the research issues as aforementioned, this research utilizes the normative legal research methodology, that is, research conducted by collecting data, followed by analyzing the relevant laws and legal norms. However, due to the fact that this research also studies the sociological factors affecting the discussion topic, this research will also utilize the empirical legal research methodology, that is, research conducted by collecting data, followed by attributing the said data to the social condition being idealized. Nonetheless, the empirical legal research methodology in this research will only be utilized as far as sociological factors are being concerned, while the analysis on the effectiveness of the laws and regulations will be conducted using the normative legal research methodology.

This research will utilize statute approach on the grounds that laws and regulations are the main object of this research, as well as case approach aiming to assess the applicability of legal norms in legal practices. Statute approach will be conducted by focusing on the laws and regulations in the field of Environment applicable in Indonesia. While case approach will be conducted toward the Rulings of Supreme Court and the general courts thereunder, concerning Environment Destruction.

Data being utilized in this research is secondary data, that is, data that has been priorly collected by the initial researcher. In using secondary data, this research will collect data from primary legal sources, that is, legal sources holding the legally-binding element, consisting of Law Number 32 of 2009 on the Protection and Management of Environment (Environment Law), Law Number 31 of 1999 on Forestry (Forestry Law), Government Regulation Number 4 of 2001 on the Control of Environmental Damages and/or Environment Pollution relating to Forest and/or Land Fire (GR 4/2001); and secondary legal sources, that is, legal sources that may elaborate primary legal sources, consisting of books and journals. In

regards to the said data, this research utilizes qualitative data analysis methodology, that is, analysis methodology towards non-numerical data.

Result and discussion

In essence, laws and regulations are intended to serve as a special rule aiming to enforce regularity and orderliness amidst the life of the society. Many factors affect the ineffectiveness of legal enforcement, amongst other, due to (1) the contradiction between the said rules with the principles upheld by the society; (2) the difficulty by the society and legal enforcers of understanding the said rules; and/or (3) the impossibility of the said rules to impose legal sanctions, on the grounds of the amount of the material and social cost of being too high for the offenders and the State (*e.g.* correctional facilities) to bear. Apart from that, the laws and regulations may not effectively be enforced due to poor socialization of the said laws into the society. In a broad sense, the ineffectiveness of the implementation of laws and regulations may be assessed through 2 perspectives, legal perspective and sociology perspective.

1.1 Prohibition toward Environment Destruction in the form of Land Clearing by means of Burning (Normative-Legal Analysis)

A number of laws and regulations applicable in Indonesia have governed the prohibition towards land clearing by means of burning. In addition to the prohibition, the said laws and regulations also set the sanctions for the violations thereof, either in the form of criminal punishment or administrative sanction. In connection to the criminal act of land clearing by means of burning, Article 108 of the Environment Law in conjunction with Article 69 paragraph (1) letter h of the Environment Law states that

> "*Any Person who clears the land area based on a slash-and-burn method as cited in Article 69 paragraph (1) letter h, shall be punished with imprisonment for minimum 3 (three) years and maximum 10 (ten) years and a fine of at least Rp 3.000.000.000,- (three billion rupiah) and at most Rp 10.000.000.000,- (ten billion rupiah).*"
>
> Article 69 paragraph (1) letter h
>
> "*Everyone shall be prohibited to conduct land clearing with a method of slashes and burns.*"

Apart from Article 108 of the Environment Law in conjunction with Article 69 paragraph (1) letter h of the Environment Law, prohibition and sanction toward the criminal act of land clearing by means of burning are also set out under Article 78 paragraph (3) of the Forestry Law in conjunction with Article 50 paragraph (3) letter d of the Forestry Law, stating that

> "*Any Person intentionally violates the provisions as set out under Article 50 paragraph (3) letter d, shall be subject to an imprisonment for maximum 15 (fifteen) years and a fine of maximum Rp 5.000.000.000,- (five billion rupiah).*"
>
> Article 50 paragraph (3) letter d
>
> "*No one shall be allowed to burn forests.*"

Apart from the said provision, the prohibition of setting fire is also set out under Article 187 of the Indonesian Penal Code, stating that

"*Any Person who with deliberate intent sets fire, causes an explosion or flood, shall be punished:*

1. *by a maximum imprisonment of twelve years, if thereby general danger to property is feared;*
2. *by a maximum imprisonment of fifteen years, if thereby danger of life for another is feared;*
3. *by life imprisonment or a maximum temporary imprisonment of twenty years, if thereby danger of life for another is feared and the act results in the death of a person.*"

Generally, not only is every Person prohibited to clear land by means of burning, but also is every Person obliged to conduct prevention, countermeasures, and restoration toward FLF. This is set under Article 49 paragraph (1) of GR 4/2001 in conjunction with Article 12, Article 17, and Article 20 of GR 4/2001, stating that

"*Every action violating the provisions under Article 11, Article 12, Article 13, Article 14, Article 15, Article 17, Article 18 paragraph (1), Article 20, and Article 20 paragraph (2) which causes destruction and/or pollution toward the environment in relation to forest and/or land fires inflicting damage toward another Person or the environment, shall compensate for damages and/or be injuncted to take specific measures.*"

Article 12

"*Every Person is obliged to prevent destruction and/or pollution toward the environment relating to forest and/or land fires from happening.*"

Article 17

"*Every Person is obliged to take countermeasures toward forests and/or land fires at their site.*"

Article 20

"*Every Person causing forest and/or land fires shall be liable to conduct environmental impact recovery.*"

Despite the existence of obligations, prohibitions, and sanctions as aforementioned, the criminal act of land clearing by means of burning in Indonesia has yet to cease. The increase in the said criminal act indicates the ineffectiveness of laws and regulations in the field of Environment applicable in Indonesia. The cases as provided previously were conducted by negligence and intentionally, by various forms of offenders, either individuals or legal entities. Additionally, such actions were also backed by collaborating with institutions of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia.

Referring to the applicable norms (*i.e.* Environment Law, Forestry Law, Indonesian Penal Code, and GR 4/2001), punishment for the land clearing by means of burning offenders shall be in the form of imprisonment for at least 3 years and for at most life sentence, and fine for at least Rp 3 billion and for at most Rp 10 billion. However, in practice, according to the mentioned Court Rulings, almost all

offenders of land clearing by means of burning were charged with the minimum punishment, being imprisonment of 3 years and fine of Rp 3 billion.

Apart from criminal punishment and administrative sanction, civil liability may also arise for the parties causing damage to the Environment. In 2015, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF) filed a claim for damages against PT Bumi Mekar Hijau (PT BMH) in the amount of Rp 7,9 trillion, consisting of Environmental damages amounting to Rp 2,6 trillion and the Environmental recovery costs amounting to Rp 5,3 trillion, on the grounds that PT BMH failed to prevent, take countermeasures, and conduct environmental impact recovery on FLF occurred in its concessed land in South Sumatra.

In pursuance of the Ruling of the District Court of Palembang Number 24/Pdt.G/2015/PN.Plg, the Judges rejected the claim on the grounds of absence of Environmental damage, due to the fact that the land being concerned was able to be planted with Acacia. The Judges found that the claim was filed under Article 1365 of the Indonesian Civil Code concerning Torts. Therefore, the element of "err" (*schuld*) and causal relationship containing the principle of liability based on err shall be proven. The MEF then filed an appeal, whereas according to the Ruling of the High Court of Palembang Number 51/PDT/2016/PT.PLG, the Panel of Judges imposes strict liability based on Article 88 of Environment Law, rendering PT BMH liable to compensate damage in the amount of Rp 78 billion for Environmental damages it has caused. Despite the ruling, the nominal value of damage rendered by the Judges are far from the nominal value of damage as claimed by the MEF, thus giving an impression to said Ruling of failing to enshrine the principles of legal certainty, justice, and utilization.

In regards to the principles of legal certainty, Hans Kelsen in *Pure Theory of Law* (1934) opined that the rationality or validity of a norm will only be meaningful if it is separated values other than those related to law, such as economical value and personal interest. Therefore, it is only safe to assume that a norm enshrined through a Judge's decision shall be separated from subjective consideration (*e.g.* the Judge's personal interest and the economic value of the violations) in order for it to give rise to the principle of legal certainty. Considering the impact caused by the violations, being severe environmental damages (*e.g.* health issues, spread of fire, air pollution, wildlife extinction), perpetrators of land clearing by means of burning should in nature be charged with punishments equivalent to the cause. This points out the fact that the Court Rulings as aforementioned failed to give rise to the principle of legal certainty due to the fact that it fails to impose equivalent legal consequences between the action with the impact.

As for the principle of justice, H.L.A. Hart on *The Concept of Law* (1961) asserted that there must be a necessary relationship between law and morality in order for it to create justice. Therefore, if a conflict occurs between natural law and human-made law, natural law must take precedence, meaning that law shall be in line with the notion of "doing good", "avoiding evil", and "promoting the common good". In relation to the said Court Rulings, it failed to promote justice since there is an absence of a relationship between law and morality. The norms set out under environment laws governing the prohibition of land clearing by means of burning

as well as the punishment thereof existed. However, in its enforcement, there has yet to exist the element of morality. The intentional action of burning in itself fails to reflect the principle of "doing good", "avoiding evil", and "promoting the common good". Instead, it reflects the existence of the element of personal interest of unjustly enriching themselves for the purposes of their personal interests (*i.e.* economic value) by injuring other people's right to use and utilize the environment to the greatest benefits (*i.e.* by causing health issues, spread of fire, pollution, and wildlife extinction).

On the other hand, Jeremy Bentham on *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1781) found that the main purpose of law, is to generally increase the happiness of the society in whole, by diminishing "evil". All crime is evil, even punishment is deemed as evil if it fails to get rid of evil (in this context, crime) itself. Thus, in order for a set of norms to create the principle of utilization, the norm should be able to erase crime. Considering the said theory, therefore, the said Court Rulings failed to create the principle of utilization on the grounds that it fails to reduce the number of violation of environment law in the form of land clearing by means of burning, let alone erase.

Based on the said theories, it is apparent that legal principles play a crucial factor in determining the effectiveness of a legal system in a jurisdiction. It is evident that Indonesia, with its environment legal system, failed to promote the principles of legal certainty, justice, and utilization, due to the fact that the norms as enshrined in the Court Rulings failed to fulfill the said elements. On one hand, it lacks legal certainty due to an unbalanced legal consequence considering the impact of the violation. On the other hand, it fails to create justice due to absence of the element of morality. Additionally, it also fails to promote utilization due to its inability to generally increase the happiness of the society in whole, which is also caused by the inability to reduce and abolish the violation at hand.

1.2 Sociological Factors Affecting the Ineffectiveness of the Implementation of Laws and Regulations in the Field of Environment (Socio-Legal Analysis)

Violations toward laws and regulations are caused by many factors. Generally, violations toward laws and regulations are caused by:

1. Legitimacy of Law, that is, a general perception or assumption that people underestimating the legitimacy of law are prone to show the attitude of resistance and rebellious against the laws and regulations as well as decisions issued by authorized parties;
2. Legal Cynicism, that is, a skeptical gesture against the law and authorized parties giving rise to the perception that the law and the authorized parties are not concerned with the security of the society. Therefore, the society deems that they have to take their own measures in order to protect themselves;
3. Moral Detachment, that is, the behavior of setting aside morality, causing damages to other parties;

4. Procedural Justice, that is, a concept that each individual has their own perception toward justice, affected by their own evaluation; and
5. Psychological Theories, that is, theories that human development only happens cognitively and intellectually, while moral and social development does not go along with the development of cognitive and intellectual.

In regards to that, Lawrence M. Friedman opined that research on the legal system shall be conducted in order to find out and overcome the factors affecting the violations toward laws and regulations. From said research, one may find that a legal system shall consist of legal structure, legal substance, and legal culture, interacting with one and another. Legal structure refers to a rigid and firm framework of a legal system, constituting the permanent form of the said legal system and the institutions thereof. Legal substance refers to the substantial rules concerning how the said institutional bodies shall behave. On the other hand, legal culture refers to the social perceptions and values in a society, which affect the law in its own ways.

In the context of land clearing by means of burning, in the Indonesian Environment legal system, legal structure consists of the central government, regional government, ministries related to Environment, investigators, prosecutors, Judges, and other components that function as legal enforcers relating to Environment Destruction and/or Environmental Damages. The legal substance consists of the Environment Law, Forestry Law, Indonesian Penal Code, GR 4/2001, and other laws and regulations governing matters in relation to Environment Destruction and/or Environmental Damages. While legal culture consists of general tradition, traditional culture, customary practices, opinions, ways of working, and the mindset of the society, business actors, and the institutions of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, which affect the occurrence of Environment Destruction and/or Environmental Damages.

Based on the foregoing discussions, it is to say that there are many factors affecting the ineffectiveness and inefficiency of Environmental law enforcement in Indonesia. On one hand, said factor was affected by the weakness in Indonesia's legal structure, namely conflict of interest between one law enforcer or agency with another. On the other hand, ineffectiveness and inefficiency may also be caused by the weakness in Indonesia's legal substance, namely, ambiguous laws and regulations, absence of technology in law enforcement, and contradiction between one law and regulation with another. However, it is inevitable to assume that legal culture plays a crucial factor in affecting the ineffectiveness and inefficiency of law enforcement in Indonesia. Custom practices, ways of working, and mindsets that are often indifferent to the law are also major factors behind the failure to enforce laws and regulations. Apart from that, minimum socialization as well as low awareness and understanding of the society toward the laws and regulations may also be one of the many factors affecting the law enforcement in Indonesia, due to the fact that each and every Indonesian citizen may or may not have their own perception as to the system of law enforcement.

As an exemplification, in the MEF vs. PT BMH case, the Judges' consideration - stating that the claim may not be proven due to an absence of permanent damage

and that it may still be planted with Acacia - indicates defects in the legal structure of the Indonesian Environment legal system. This occurred due to the existence of conflict of interest between the stakeholders (*e.g.* big corporations as significant taxpayers) with the law enforcement officers. This causes law enforcement to become unassertive and to give rise to impunity toward the offenders of land clearing by means of burning. On the other hand, rulings that are not hand in hand with the actual damage indicates imbalance in the law enforcement processes. The limited facilities and infrastructure to extinguish fires, as well as the limited number of human resources also worsen the situation of FLF. The lack of coordination between the MEF, local governments, and law enforcement officers makes supervision ineffective. The limited equipment and personnel to respond to FLF also become a major problem when the supervision system tends to be reactive rather than preventive. As a result, fires often cannot be handled quickly, and spread before extinguishing efforts are carried out. These limitations create opportunities for FLF to continue occurring which have an impact on ecosystem damage, loss of biodiversity, air pollution, health issues, and economic losses.

From the perspective of legal substance, due to the ambiguity or legal vacuum in defining the limitations of an action - in the sense of which actions may or may not be categorized as criminal acts of land clearing by means of burning - is also a factor that influences the weakness of legal substance in the Environmental legal system in Indonesia. In addition, laws and regulations in the Environmental field also do not emphasize consideration of the element of utilization, causing a legal vacuum that is ultimately misused to avoid legal consequences for the offenders of criminal acts of land clearing by means of burning. Meanwhile, there are also defects in the legal culture in the Environmental legal system in Indonesia. The sentiments of Indonesian society - in this case, the views and social values adopted by business actors, individuals, and institutions of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia - also show a tendency to be indifferent to Environmental Destruction and/or Environmental Damage.

Conclusion

Cases of Environmental Destruction in the form of criminal acts of land clearing by means of burning and cases of Environmental Damage in the form of FLF, which have become a threat to Indonesia due to losses, indicate that there is ineffectiveness and inefficiency of the laws and regulations in the Environmental sector applicable in Indonesia. This is due to the implementation that is not directly proportional to the principles and rules of law that apply, despite the existence of laws and regulations governing obligations, prohibitions, and sanctions. The factor of ineffectiveness and inefficiency of laws and regulations in the Environmental sector in Indonesia is the failure of the norms as enshrined under the laws and regulations in the field of environment as well as Court Rulings to be in line with the principle of legal certainty, justice, and utilization. Sociologic factors also came to be the factors behind the ineffectiveness and inefficiency of environment laws and regulations in Indonesia, one of which is in the form of weak legal structure in the Indonesian Environmental legal system in enforcing laws and regulations. In

addition, there are weaknesses in the legal substance in the Indonesian Environmental legal system, where there are legal regulations that are not firm and clear, and there are many conflicts between one law and regulation with another. Weaknesses also exist in the legal culture of Indonesian society which is often not in line with the legal principles that apply in Indonesia. In other words, the failure to enforce Indonesian Environment Law indicates a systemic problem in the supervision and prosecution of cases of violations of environmental laws and regulations in Indonesia.

Suggestion

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is advisable to make deep improvements to the Indonesian Environmental legal system. Improvements to the legal structure may be made by supervising and providing training to environmental law enforcement officers, as well as taking firm action against law enforcement officers who commit violations. Meanwhile, improvements to the legal substance may be made by amending unclear, ambiguous, and conflicting laws and regulations, so as to produce new, clear, firm, comprehensive, and consistent Environment Law. On the other hand, the legal culture of Indonesian society may be improved by conducting socialization and seminars to increase public awareness and concern for the condition of the Indonesian Environment and its laws and regulations.

Expression of Gratitude

Praise be to God Almighty, for allowing the Authors to conduct this research. The Authors hereby would also express their gratitudes to Prof. Dr. Rianto Adi, S.H., M.A. as the lecturer for Legal Sociology, for having guided the Authors in the making of this research. With all due respect and honor, the Authors would also express their gratitudes to Yayasan Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat Sisi Indonesia (SINESIA), Ahmad Rayhan, S.H., M.H., C.L.A., C.P.M. as the Editor in Chief, each and every member of the Editorial Board, and each and every member of the Reviewers, who have given the opportunity to the Authors to publish this research through Equality: Journal of Law and Justice. May all parties whose names have been mentioned be given abundant blessings from God Almighty for their kindness that has been shared with the Authors.

Bibliography

Ab. Halim, Mustafa 'Afifi, and Shabrina Zata Amni. 2023. "Legal System in the Perspectives of H.L.A Hart and Lawrence M. Friedman." *Peradaban Journal of Law and Society* 2 (1): 51–61. DOI: https://doi.org/10.59001/pjls.v2i1.83.

Acharya, Suman. 2019. "Legitimacy vs. Autonomy of Law." *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3339237.

Adi, Rianto. 2021. *Sosiologi Hukum: Kajian Hukum Secara Sosiologis*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.

Ajayi, Victor Oluwatosin. 2023. "A Review on Primary Sources of Data and Secondary Sources of Data." *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy* 2 (3): 1–3. DOI: 19810.21091/ejedu.

Ameri, Taylor, Kyle A. Burgason, Matt DeLisi, Mark H. Heirigs, Andy Hochstetler, and Michael G. Vaughn. 2019. "Legal Cynicism: Independent Construct or Downstream Manifestation of Antisocial Constructs? New Evidence." *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry* 64 (May): 211–18. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2019.04.008.

Awang, Zainuddin. 2012. *Research Methodology and Data Analysis*. Selangor: Universiti Teknologi MARA.

Concha-Salgado, Andrés, Angélica Ramírez, Beatriz Pérez, Ricardo Pérez-Luco, and Eduardo García-Cueto. 2022. "Moral Disengagement as a Self-Regulatory Cognitive Process of Transgressions: Psychometric Evidence of the Bandura Scale in Chilean Adolescents." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19 (19). DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191912249.

Friedman, Lawrence M. 1975. *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hariandja, Richaldo. 2024. "Kebakaran Hutan Banyak Untuk Pembukaan Lahan?" Mongabay. August 21, 2024. https://www.mongabay.co.id/2024/08/21/kebakaran-hutan-dan-lahan-karena-pembukaan-lahan/.

Indonesia. Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata. JDIH Mahkamah Agung RI. Jakarta.

Indonesia. Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana. Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia. Jakarta.

Indonesia. Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 4 Tahun 2001 tentang Pengendalian Kerusakan dan/atau Pencemaran Lingkungan Hidup yang berkaitan dengan Kebakaran Hutan dan/atau Lahan. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2001 Number 10, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4076. Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia. Jakarta.

Indonesia. Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945. Mahkamah Konstitusi Republik Indonesia. Jakarta.

Indonesia. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 32 Tahun 2009 tentang Perlindungan dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2009 Number 130, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5059. Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia. Jakarta.

Indonesia. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 41 Tahun 1999 tentang Kehutanan. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 1999 Number 167, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3888. Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia. Jakarta.

Jamaludin, Nurul Nadia, and Muslihah Hasbullah. 2020. "WHY PEOPLE VIOLATE THE LAW? A REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON LEGAL SOCIALIZATION." *Asian Journal of Law and Governance* 1 (2): 15–23.

https://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ajlg/article/view/8166/3446.
Pratiwi, Endang, Theo Negoro, and Hassanain Haykal. 2022. "Teori Utilitarianisme Jeremy Bentham: Tujuan Hukum Atau Metode Pengujian Produk Hukum?" *Jurnal Konstitusi* 19 (2): 268. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1922.
Rochman, Saepul, Kelik Wardiono, and Khudzaifah Dimyati. 2019. "The Ontology of Legal Science: Hans Kelsen's Proposal of the 'Pure Theory of Law.'" *PADJADJARAN Jurnal Ilmu Hukum (Journal of Law)* 5 (3): 543–57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22304/pjih.v5n3.a8.
Starr, William C. 1984. "Law and Morality in H.L.A Hart's Legal Philosophy." *Marquette Law Review* 67 (3): 673–89. https://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/mulr/vol67/iss4/8/.
SuaraNTB. 2024. "BPBD Sebut Kebakaran Hutan Di Kabupaten Bima Telah Padam." Suara NTB. July 30, 2024. https://suarantb.com/2024/07/30/bpbd-sebut-kebakaran-hutan-di-kabupaten-bima-telah-padam/.
Suhaimi. 2018. "PROBLEM HUKUM DAN PENDEKATAN DALAM PENELITIAN HUKUM NORMATIF." *Jurnal YUSTITIA* 19 (2): 202–10. DOI: 10.53712/yustitia.v19i2.477.
Sumarna, Dadang, and Ayyub Kadriah. 2023. "Penelitian Kualitatif Terhadap Hukum Empiris." *Jurnal Serambi Hukum* 16 (02): 101–13. DOI: https://doi.org/10.59582/sh.v16i02.730.
Supriadi. 2010. *Hukum Lingkungan Di Indonesia: Sebuah Pengantar*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
Zainuddin, Muhammad, and Aisyah Dinda Karina. 2023. "PENGGUNAAN METODE YURIDIS NORMATIF DALAM MEMBUKTIKAN KEBENARAN PADA PENELITIAN HUKUM." *Smart Law Journal* 2 (2): 114–23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.34310/slj.v2i2.26.

About the Authors

Claudio Ricky Adhitya
e-mail: claudioricky188@gmail.com
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0986-6162
Junior Lawyer in a prominent law firm based in Jakarta and a Certified Contract Drafter. Having an educational background in law and expertise in the field of business law, corporate law, contract drafting, and criminal defense.

Kezia Elvira Nainggolan
Legal Officer at RDTX Group. Having an educational background in law and currently pursuing a Master of Laws degree in Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya. Experienced in human resources, recruitment, industrial relations, and HR generalist roles from past experience of working for APAC Tokopedia and ByteDance. Having expertise in labor law, internal investigations, and policy development.

Ester Susanti
Vice President at PT Digital Kreasi Investama Group and Human Resources Business Partner Manager at PT Smartfren Telecom, with an educational background in the field of Political and Social Science. Having expertise in the field of human resources, sales, marketing, management, industrial relations, and manpower, from past experience working for Hilton Group and ACCOR Group.

Emi Juliana Sinaga

e-mail: emijulianasinaga@gmail.com

Industrial Relation Assistant Manager at Eurokars Group Indonesia, with an educational background in the field of law. Currently pursuing a Master of Laws degree in Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya.

Vincentia Cordialia Halim

Head of Commercial (Business Controller & Supply Chain) at Bosch Rexroth Indonesia, with an educational background in Accounting. Holding a Master of Management degree in International Business, is a Certified Public Accountant, Chartered Management Accountant, Certified Financial Modeller, and Certified Meta Coach. Currently pursuing a Master of Legal Studies for deepening expertise in legal frameworks and regulatory compliance, integrating financial strategies with ethical and sustainable business principles.