MAQASIDI
Jurnal Hukum Pidana Islam, Perundang-undangan, dan Pranata Sosial

Vol. 5, No. 2 (2025), p 291-303
DOI: 10.47498/maqasidi.v5i2.5668
ISSN: p-2798-981X, e-2798-9801

Conceptual Developments in Environmental Law: An Interdisciplinary Approach

Joyo Santoso[1], Gabriella Selara[2], Dilly Hermanto[3], Zouvry Imam Tharsyah[4]
[1,2,3,4]Universitas Langlangbuana, Indonesia
Correspondence Email: dilly641@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines conceptual developments in environmental law through an interdisciplinary approach to address Indonesia's increasingly complex ecological and social challenges. It highlights the limitations of traditional normative and legalistic legal frameworks and emphasizes the significance of legal pluralism, ecological justice, and the integration of local knowledge systems. The primary objective of this research is to formulate a holistic conceptual framework that combines ecological sustainability, legal adaptability, and interdisciplinary insights to strengthen environmental governance. This study employs normative legal research supported by secondary data analysis, including statutory regulations, academic literature, and international legal documents. An interpretative and descriptive analytical method is used to synthesize perspectives from legal doctrine, environmental science, philosophy, and sociology in order to develop an innovative and responsive legal paradigm capable of addressing contemporary environmental complexities. The findings reveal that environmental law in Indonesia remains largely dominated by a fragmented and normative approach, which limits the effectiveness of environmental protection. Integrating interdisciplinary perspectives and recognizing local and customary legal systems can promote more inclusive, participatory, and sustainable environmental governance.

Keywords: Environmental Law Concepts, Ecological Justice, Legal Pluralism, Legal Adaptability.

Introduction

Increasingly complex global environmental changes—such as climate change, biodiversity loss, transboundary pollution, and natural resource degradation—have generated an urgent need for legal approaches that are not merely normative but also adaptive and interdisciplinary. In this context, environmental law, as a relatively recent branch of legal studies, continues to evolve conceptually, institutionally, and practically. In many countries, including Indonesia, environmental law has not yet fully responded to the complexity of ecological problems involving dynamic interactions among humans, nature, and technology. Accordingly, it is essential to re-examine the conceptual foundations of environmental law and to assess how interdisciplinary approaches can contribute to its renewal and effectiveness.

Historically, environmental law emerged from global awareness of environmental degradation following the Industrial Revolution. In Indonesia, the legal

foundation of environmental regulation can be traced to Law No. 4 of 1982 on Basic Provisions for Environmental Management, later replaced by Law No. 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management. Although this legal framework incorporates key principles such as sustainable development, the precautionary principle, and environmental justice, its practical implementation continues to face significant challenges. These include weak law enforcement, conflicts between economic and ecological interests, and limited integration of scientific knowledge and public participation in environmental policymaking.

A review of the literature indicates that various approaches have been proposed to strengthen the effectiveness of environmental law. Bosselmann's (2016) eco-legal approach advocates for a reconstruction of fundamental legal values toward a more ecological orientation, moving beyond anthropocentrism by positioning ecological integrity as a core legal principle rather than prioritizing human interests alone. Meanwhile, Scholz and Stiftel (2005), in their work on adaptive governance, emphasize the importance of integrating legal studies, social sciences, and environmental sciences in the formulation of evidence-based public policies to create regulatory frameworks that are responsive and adaptive to socio-ecological change. In the Indonesian context, Binawan and Soetopo (2022) highlight the need to harmonize national environmental law with international climate commitments and to strengthen the enforceability of the right to a good and healthy environment through legislative reform and enhanced judicial mechanisms. These three approaches—eco-legal theory, interdisciplinary integration, and normative harmonization—represent significant directions in the conceptual development of environmental law that seek not only normative legitimacy but also responsiveness to contemporary ecological challenges.

Nevertheless, substantial limitations remain within these approaches. First, many environmental law studies remain sectoral and fail to engage comprehensively with other disciplines. Second, normative legal approaches often overlook local social and political dynamics that critically influence the success of environmental policy implementation. Third, key concepts such as ecological justice, environmental citizenship, and eco-constitutionalism are still rarely incorporated into national legal frameworks, despite their growing prominence in international legal discourse. Moreover, legal responses to environmental problems tend to be reactive rather than preventive or transformative.

The primary weakness of previous studies lies in the absence of a conceptual framework capable of bridging multiple disciplines—such as ecology, economics, politics, and sociology—in the formulation of environmental legal norms. Empirical realities demonstrate that environmental problems are not merely violations of written rules but are deeply embedded in power structures, consumption patterns, and exploitative production systems. Consequently, an interdisciplinary legal approach is

essential for developing new legal concepts that are responsive to contemporary environmental dynamics and societal change.

This study seeks to develop a conceptual analysis that enriches environmental law discourse through an interdisciplinary perspective. Rather than viewing law solely as a formal product of legislation, this research conceptualizes law as the outcome of complex interactions among values, knowledge systems, and social practices. It identifies and analyzes the development of environmental law concepts such as ecocentrism, resilience law, green constitutionalism, and legal pluralism within the context of natural resource governance and climate change. By engaging interdisciplinary theories—including political ecology, Luhmann's systems theory of law, and critical legal approaches—this study aims to establish a more robust conceptual foundation for formulating environmental policies that are just, participatory, and sustainable.

The scholarly contribution of this research lies in its integrative approach to developing a more holistic and reflective conceptual framework for environmental law. Unlike previous studies that focus narrowly on single dimensions—such as normative or administrative aspects—this research examines the interaction of social, ecological, and legal factors as a unified system. As such, it contributes not only to the advancement of environmental law theory but also provides an applicable conceptual basis for policymakers and civil society actors in designing environmental protection strategies at local, national, and global levels. In the context of globalization and the Anthropocene era, environmental law is challenged not only to prevent environmental degradation but also to shape new governance structures that prioritize intergenerational sustainability. Therefore, the development of environmental law must be inclusive, adaptive, and responsive to scientific advances and evolving social dynamics. An interdisciplinary approach is thus essential to constructing a legal system capable of addressing the complexity of contemporary environmental challenges. This study responds to the limitations of normative approaches and the lack of interdisciplinary integration in environmental law by proposing a reconceptualized paradigm oriented toward ecological justice, cross-disciplinary collaboration, and sustainable governance.

Research Methods

This study employs normative legal research, which focuses on the analysis of library materials and secondary data to examine applicable legal norms, particularly in the context of conceptual developments in environmental law. Normative legal research conceptualizes law as an autonomous and systematic system of norms. As explained by Soekanto and Mamudji (2009), normative legal research is conducted by examining legal literature and secondary legal materials. Accordingly, this study

analyzes not only statutory regulations but also legal doctrines and theoretical perspectives relevant to the conceptual evolution of environmental law.

The research adopts a statutory approach and a conceptual approach. The statutory approach is used to examine existing environmental legislation and international legal instruments, while the conceptual approach is employed to understand legal concepts derived from scholarly views and legal doctrines. As noted by Marzuki (2010), the conceptual approach enables researchers to explore legal concepts rooted in legal theory and doctrinal analysis. In this study, the conceptual approach is further enriched by interdisciplinary insights drawn from environmental science, legal philosophy, and sociology.

The sources of legal materials consist of primary legal materials, including statutory regulations and international legal documents; secondary legal materials, such as legal literature, peer-reviewed journal articles, and prior research findings; and tertiary legal materials, including legal dictionaries and encyclopedias. Data analysis is conducted using a qualitative method, involving descriptive, logical, and systematic content analysis of legal documents to interpret legal meanings and trace the development of key concepts in environmental law. This analytical process aims to synthesize legal ideas from diverse disciplinary sources and to formulate conceptual proposals for the renewal of environmental law. As emphasized by Ibrahim (2006), normative legal research requires logical, systematic, and critical analysis of legal materials in order to identify relevant legal principles capable of addressing specific legal issues. Accordingly, this methodological framework provides a strong theoretical foundation for developing an interdisciplinary understanding of the increasingly complex dynamics of environmental law.

Result and Discussion

The Dominance of Normative Approaches in Indonesian Environmental Law

The findings of this study indicate that environmental law in Indonesia remains predominantly normative and legalistic. This is evident in the central role of statutory regulations as the primary instruments of environmental governance, particularly Law No. 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management. This law incorporates key principles such as the precautionary principle, sustainable development, public participation, and state responsibility. However, despite its seemingly comprehensive regulatory framework, implementation at the practical level remains suboptimal due to weak institutional structures, limited supervisory capacity, and a legal culture that does not consistently support effective law enforcement.

The heavy reliance on a normative approach has generated both conceptual and structural problems. This approach is grounded in a positivist view that treats law as a fixed, written, and universally applicable set of norms enforced through state institutions. As Rahardjo (2011) argues, such an approach tends to neglect complex and dynamic social realities. In the environmental context, rigid and hierarchical legal

frameworks often fail to capture local dynamics, indigenous ecological values, and the interconnections between ecosystems and surrounding social structures. In many cases, environmental legal norms function merely as formal documents without transformative power, largely because the command-and-control (CAC) regulatory model remains dominant. This model restricts meaningful participation by non-state actors such as indigenous communities, civil society organizations, and local stakeholders.

Wibisana (2017) observes that Indonesia's environmental regulation heavily relies on command-and-control mechanisms, which are frequently criticized for limited public participation and excessive dependence on administrative sanctions. Similarly, Rahman (2020) notes that within the PROPER program, voluntary compliance mechanisms have evolved into control instruments, where non-participating actors face minimal constraints while participants encounter sanction pressures. This paradox reduces participatory incentives and undermines regulatory legitimacy. Consequently, environmental law becomes less effective in addressing root causes and accommodating the voices of affected communities.

The limitations of normative approaches are further reflected in the inability of Indonesian environmental law to adapt adequately to global ecological crises such as climate change and ecosystem degradation. Kotzé and Du Plessis (2010) argue that legal systems excessively focused on legal formalism lack the reflexivity required to respond to complex ecological dynamics. This issue is particularly relevant in Indonesia, given its ecological diversity and socio-cultural heterogeneity, which demand context-sensitive and adaptive legal frameworks.

Moreover, policy orientation in environmental governance continues to prioritize administrative control over community empowerment. Kurniawan et al. (2019) demonstrate that most environmental policies still treat communities as policy objects rather than active legal subjects. This orientation contradicts the potential of local legal systems—such as customary law (living law)—which have proven more compatible with sustainability and conservation principles. From a theoretical standpoint, such legalism conflicts with Bosselmann's (2016) concept of ecological law, which posits ecological sustainability as the fundamental value of legal systems. Law, in this view, must move beyond state-centered authority and function as a guarantor of life-system continuity.

Institutionally, normative dominance has contributed to sectoral fragmentation and weakened inter-agency coordination. Regulations governing forestry, mining, marine affairs, and environmental protection frequently overlap or contradict one another. Apresian (2025) identifies strong sectoral ego among ministries such as Bappenas and the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, resulting in regulatory fragmentation and resistance to collaboration. This condition is reinforced by findings from *Berita Bumi* (2009), which identified at least twelve natural resource laws

containing substantial inconsistencies, leaving no single institution with clear authority over resource governance. Such fragmentation generates legal uncertainty, governance conflicts, and ineffective environmental protection due to the absence of integrated control mechanisms.

The dominance of normative approaches has also widened the gap between formal law and social reality. Numerous field studies reveal that local communities possess effective environmental management mechanisms, such as *lubuk larangan* in Sumatra and *awig-awig* in Bali. However, national legal frameworks often fail to adequately recognize these systems. According to Merry's (1988) theory of legal pluralism, acknowledging the coexistence of multiple legal systems is essential for understanding and addressing the limitations of formal law. An interdisciplinary approach is therefore indispensable. By integrating perspectives from ecology, sociology, anthropology, and legal philosophy, environmental law can become more holistic and reflective. Scholz and Stiftel (2005) demonstrate that interdisciplinary collaboration in environmental governance produces policies that are more inclusive, effective, and future-oriented.

Overall, this study confirms that the dominance of normative approaches in Indonesian environmental law has constrained its ability to respond to multidimensional environmental challenges. Overreliance on formal legal instruments—without sufficient consideration of local values, social dynamics, and environmental science—has weakened legal adaptability. Consequently, a paradigm shift toward more reflective, adaptive, and interdisciplinary approaches is urgently required.

The Contribution of Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Development of Environmental Law Concepts

This study finds that interdisciplinary approaches significantly contribute to the renewal of environmental law concepts. One key finding is the importance of integrating ecocentrism, an approach that positions nature as the central subject of law rather than merely an object of protection. Ecocentrism challenges the anthropocentric paradigm that dominates modern legal systems, where environmental protection is justified only insofar as it benefits human welfare. In contrast, ecocentric law recognizes nature's intrinsic value and existential rights (Cullinan, 2011).

A prominent example is the recognition of the Whanganui River in New Zealand as a legal entity through the *Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017*. This legislation acknowledges the river as a living being with legal rights and responsibilities. O'Donnell and Talbot-Jones (2018) argue that this approach facilitates transformative environmental governance grounded in spiritual and ecological relationships between humans and nature.

If adopted in Indonesia, ecocentrism could strengthen recognition of natural entities as legal subjects, particularly in the governance of customary forests, coastal

areas, and water resources. This aligns with indigenous ecological values such as *Tana Ulen* among the Dayak community and *awig-awig* in Bali. Interdisciplinary approaches thus enable the integration of state law, customary law, and ecological principles, consistent with ecological legal pluralism (Boyd, 2017).

Another key pillar is resilience law**,** which emphasizes flexibility and adaptability in responding to climate change, biodiversity loss, and natural disasters. Resilience law shifts legal paradigms from static prevention and correction toward dynamic and transformative governance (Arnold & Gunderson, 2013). Closely linked to this is polycentric governance**,** which rejects centralized environmental control in favor of collaborative networks involving communities, civil society, private actors, and international institutions. Ostrom (2017) demonstrates that community-based resource governance, when supported by inclusive legal frameworks, is more effective and sustainable.

Interdisciplinary perspectives also support Earth Jurisprudence**,** developed by Thomas Berry, which views law as emerging from Earth's natural order rather than human-centered authority. Yustitianingtyas (2025) argues that ecological crises result from the disjunction between human legal systems and ecological laws. Similarly, Critical Environmental Law (CEL) critiques normative positivism as a product of power structures that perpetuate ecological and social inequalities. Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos (2011) emphasizes that posthumanist and ecofeminist perspectives can reconnect law with ecological life systems.

In Indonesia, empirical studies increasingly support interdisciplinary integration. Putri Pertiwi et al. (2024) show that indigenous communities often prefer restorative, customary-based mechanisms for resolving environmental disputes, emphasizing communal justice over bureaucratic state processes. This reinforces the argument that integrating cultural and spiritual values enhances legal legitimacy and environmental protection.

Interdisciplinary approaches also promote preventive and restorative models of environmental justice, such as ecological restoration justice**,** which prioritizes ecosystem recovery through collective dialogue rather than purely punitive sanctions. Through concepts such as ecocentrism, resilience law, Earth jurisprudence, and polycentric governance, environmental law evolves from a control mechanism into an instrument of inclusive socio-ecological transformation.

Green Constitutionalism and the Reform of Environmental Law's Structural Foundations

A significant contribution of this research lies in strengthening the concept of green constitutionalism**,** which emphasizes the integration of ecological values into the constitutional structure of the state. Green constitutionalism extends beyond symbolic recognition of environmental rights, demanding their operationalization across legislation, public policy, and judicial practice.

Article 28H(1) of the 1945 Constitution of Indonesia guarantees the right to a good and healthy environment. However, this right remains largely declarative and insufficiently justiciable. There are no clear procedural mechanisms enabling citizens to effectively litigate environmental rights violations before constitutional or ordinary courts.

Comparative constitutional studies by Boyd (2011) demonstrate that countries such as Ecuador, Bolivia, and South Africa have embedded environmental rights substantively within their constitutions. Ecuador's 2008 Constitution recognizes the Rights of Nature, granting ecosystems standing before courts. South Africa's Constitution mandates state action to protect environmental well-being, with courts actively enforcing these provisions, as seen in *Fuel Retailers Association v. Director-General: Environmental Management* (2007).

In contrast, Indonesian judicial engagement remains limited and sporadic. Although landmark rulings—such as Supreme Court Decision No. 99 PK/TUN/2016 on Jakarta Bay reclamation—signal progress, they have yet to form a coherent doctrinal framework. Green constitutionalism thus calls for structural legal reform to operationalize environmental rights, aligning with Klare's (1998) theory of transformative constitutionalism.

This approach also underscores the need for **green litigation mechanisms**, including specialized environmental courts. While Indonesia has introduced Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2023, institutional and epistemic gaps persist. Interdisciplinary participation—particularly from environmental scientists and social experts—is therefore essential.

Integrating Customary Law and Legal Pluralism in Environmental Governance

Interdisciplinary environmental law opens space for recognizing legal pluralism as a foundation for inclusive and sustainable governance. Indigenous legal systems in Indonesia—such as *Tana Ulen*, *sasi*, *awig-awig*, and *lubuk larangan*—embody ecological principles that ensure long-term sustainability (Elmakki, 2025). However, despite Constitutional Court Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012, implementation remains constrained by regulatory overlap and weak administrative recognition.

Ecological legal pluralism (Williams & Hardison, 2013) frames customary law as a repository of legitimate ecological knowledge. Empirical evidence from Nagari Simanau (Hamzah et al., 2016) demonstrates that customary forest governance effectively preserves biodiversity through socially legitimate institutions.

Legal pluralism aligns with international participation principles, including Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration and UNDRIP's FPIC framework. To operationalize this, interdisciplinary approaches advocate reforms such as dual-track adjudication systems and expanded legal standing based on cultural and ecological evidence (Anaya, 2004). Ultimately, integrating customary law strengthens both ecological

protection and social justice. Environmental law must evolve from a top-down system into a bottom-up, community-centered framework.

Toward a Reflective, Adaptive, and Inclusive Conceptual Framework

Building on the empirical and theoretical findings of this study, a future-oriented conceptual framework for environmental law is proposed, grounded in three interrelated pillars: ecological justice**,** legal adaptability**,** and interdisciplinary integration**.** These pillars respond to the structural limitations of normative and positivist legal approaches and offer a pathway toward a more responsive and transformative environmental legal system.

Ecological justice constitutes the normative foundation of this framework. Unlike conventional environmental justice, which primarily focuses on the equitable distribution of environmental benefits and burdens among human populations, ecological justice extends moral and legal consideration to non-human entities and ecological systems. It recognizes nature not merely as an object of regulation but as a subject possessing intrinsic value and deserving of legal protection. This perspective is closely linked to principles of intergenerational and intra-generational equity, emphasizing the responsibility of present generations to preserve ecological integrity for future generations while ensuring fairness within the current generation (Schlosberg, 2007). By adopting an ecological justice perspective, environmental law can move beyond anthropocentric assumptions and better address systemic ecological degradation, biodiversity loss, and climate change.

The second pillar, legal adaptability, highlights the need for environmental law to function as a dynamic and resilient system capable of responding to complex and uncertain socio-ecological conditions. Environmental challenges are characterized by scientific uncertainty, rapid environmental change, and cross-sectoral impacts, which rigid and static legal frameworks are often ill-equipped to manage. Legal adaptability therefore emphasizes flexibility, learning-oriented regulation, and the incorporation of scientific evidence into legal decision-making. This includes adaptive regulatory mechanisms, precautionary approaches, and periodic legal review processes that allow laws and policies to evolve in response to new ecological knowledge and social realities. In this sense, environmental law should not be confined to reactive enforcement but should serve as a proactive instrument for risk prevention, resilience-building, and long-term sustainability.

The third pillar, interdisciplinary integration, underscores the necessity of transcending disciplinary boundaries in the development and implementation of environmental law. Complex environmental problems cannot be adequately addressed through legal reasoning alone. Integrating insights from ecological science, sociology, anthropology, economics, and political ecology enables a more comprehensive understanding of environmental harm, governance failures, and

community-based solutions. Interdisciplinary integration also strengthens legal legitimacy by incorporating local knowledge systems, indigenous ecological wisdom, and empirical socio-legal research into regulatory and judicial processes. Through such integration, environmental law becomes more context-sensitive, inclusive, and capable of reflecting the lived realities of affected communities.

Taken together, these three pillars reposition environmental law as a reflective, adaptive, and inclusive socio-ecological instrument rather than a narrowly technical or coercive regulatory tool. This framework envisions environmental law as a transformative mechanism that not only controls environmental harm but also fosters ecological restoration, social participation, and long-term sustainability. By embedding ecological justice, adaptability, and interdisciplinarity at its core, environmental law can more effectively respond to contemporary environmental crises while remaining responsive to future socio-ecological challenges.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the conceptual development of environmental law and the challenges faced in Indonesia, this study concludes that purely normative and legalistic approaches are insufficient to address the complexity of contemporary socio-ecological dynamics. The integration of principles such as legal pluralism, ecocentrism, and interdisciplinary approaches demonstrates significant potential for constructing a legal framework that is more reflective, adaptive, and inclusive. Such an approach necessitates legal system reform capable of accommodating normative diversity, local knowledge systems, and the rights of Indigenous peoples and local communities as central actors in natural resource management and environmental protection.

Achieving this objective requires the strengthening of institutional capacity at both governmental and community levels, as well as the development of regulatory frameworks that enable multilateral and community-based dispute resolution mechanisms grounded in customary law. Furthermore, the adoption of more contextual and participatory approaches must be encouraged to ensure that environmental law remains responsive to ongoing social and ecological change. From a practical perspective, this study recommends regulatory and institutional reforms that enhance recognition of customary legal systems and local values, alongside capacity-building initiatives for legal actors and communities to support documentation and dialogue across legal systems. In this way, Indonesia's environmental legal system can function not merely as a mechanism of control, but as a catalyst for socio-ecological transformation, ensuring equitable, sustainable, and participatory natural resource governance in line with the principles of ecological justice and global sustainability.

Bibliography

Anaya, S. J. (2004). *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. Oxford University Press.

Angstadt, J. M. (2023). Can domestic environmental courts implement international environmental law? A framework for institutional analysis. *Transnational Environmental Law, 12*(2), 318-342. https://doi.org/10.1017/S2047102523000092

Apresian, S. R. (2025). The contestation of national adaptation policies in Indonesia. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, *44*(1), 72-101. https://doi.org/10.1177/18681034241290815

Arnold, C. A., & Gunderson, L. H. (2013). Adaptive law and resilience. *Envtl. L. Rep. News & Analysis, 43*, 10426.

Assembly, U. G. (2007). United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. *Un Wash*, *12*, 1-18. https://www.converge.org.nz/pma/DRIPGA.pdf

Berita Bumi. (2023). *12 UU Terkait SDA Tumpang Tindih dan Tidak Konsisten*. Diakses dari https://beritabumi.or.id/12-uu-terkait-sda-tumpang-tindih-dan-tidak-konsisten

Binawan, A., & Soetopo, M. G. S. (2022). Implementasi Hak Atas Lingkungan Hidup Yang Bersih, Sehat, Dan Berkelanjutan Dalam Konteks Hukum Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Lingkungan Indonesia*, *9*(1), 121-156. https://doi.org/10.38011/jhli.v9i1.499

Boyd, D. R. (2011). The environmental rights revolution: a global study of constitutions, human rights, and the environment. In *The Environmental Rights Revolution*. University of British Columbia Press.

Boyd, D. R. (2017). *The rights of nature: A legal revolution that could save the world*. ECW press.

Bosselmann, K. (2016). *The principle of sustainability: transforming law and governance*. Routledge

Cullinan, C. (2011). *Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice* (2nd ed.). Green Books.

Elmakki, O. (2025). From Competition to Cooperation: Environmental Governance and Natural Resource Management as Foundations for Reconciliation in Post-Conflict Sudan. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 10*(6), 974-993.

HamzahH., SuharjitoD., & IstomoI. (2016). Efektifitas Kelembagaan Lokal dalam Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Hutan Pada Masyarakat Nagari Simanau, Kabupaten Solok. *Risalah Kebijakan Pertanian dan Lingkungan Rumusan Kajian Strategis Bidang Pertanian dan Lingkungan*, *2*(2), 116-128. Retrieved from https://journal.ipb.ac.id/index.php/jkebijakan/article/view/10979

Hariri, A., & Babussalam, B. (2024). Legal Pluralism: Concept, Theoretical Dialectics, and Its Existence in Indonesia. *Walisongo Law Review (Walrev), 6*(2). https://journal.walisongo.ac.id/index.php/walrev/article/view/25566

Ibrahim, J. (2006). *Teori dan Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Normatif*. Malang: Bayumedia Publishing.

Kurniawan, M. A., Soemarno, S., & Purnomo, M. (2015). Partisipasi masyarakat dalam pengelolaan lingkungan hidup di Desa Mojokrapak, Kecamatan Tembelang, Jombang. *Jurnal Pembangunan dan Alam Lestari*, *6*(2). https://jpal.ub.ac.id/index.php/jpal/article/view/194

Klare, K. E. (1998). Legal Culture and Transformative Constitutionalism. *South African Journal on Human Rights*, *14*(1), 146–188. https://doi.org/10.1080/02587203.1998.11834974

Kurniawan, J. A. (2015). Contested land, contesting laws. A context of legal pluralism and industrialization in Indonesia. *Sortuz: Oñati Journal of Emergent Socio-Legal Studies*, *6*(2), 93–106. Retrieved from https://opo.iisj.net/index.php/sortuz/article/view/541

Kotzé, L. J., & Du Plessis, A. (2010). Some brief observations on fifteen years of environmental rights jurisprudence in South Africa. *J. Ct. Innovation*, *3*, 157.

Marzuki, Peter Mahmud. (2010). *Penelitian Hukum*. Cetakan Keenam. Jakarta: Kencana.

Merry, S. E. (1988). Legal pluralism. *Law & society review*, *22*(5), 869-896. https://doi.org/10.2307/3053638

O'donnell, E. L., & Talbot-Jones, J. (2018). Creating legal rights for rivers. *Ecology and Society*, *23*(1). https://www.jstor.org/stable/26799037

Ostrom, E. (2017). Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental change. In *Global justice* (pp. 423-430). Routledge.

Pertiwi, P., Sakdiyah, F., & Rian, F. A. (2024). Implementasi Hukum Adat dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Lingkungan: Studi Etnografis di Kawasan Hutan Adat. *Perkara: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Politik*, *2*(4), 589-602.

Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, A. (2011). Towards a critical environmental law. In *Law and Ecology* (pp. 18-38). Routledge.

Rahardjo, S. (2011). Hukum Progresif: Hukum yang Membebaskan. *Jurnal Hukum Progresif, 1*(1), 1-24. https://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/hukum_progresif/article/view/1009

Rahman, F. (2020). Dualisme Konteks Proper sebagai Instrumen Penaatan Sukarela dan Command and Control. *Jurnal Hukum Lingkungan Indonesia, 6*(2), 235–265. https://doi.org/10.38011/jhli.v6i2.160

Schlosberg, D. (2007). *Defining environmental justice: Theories, movements, and nature*. OUP Oxford.

Scholz, J. T., & Stiftel, B. (Eds.). (2005). *Adaptive Governance and Water Conflict: New Institutions for Collaborative Planning*. Resources for the Future.

Soekanto, Soerjono dan Mamadji, Sri. (2009). *Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat*. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.

United Nations. (1992). *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*. UN Conference on Environment and Development.

United Nations. Economic Commission for Europe. (1999). *Convention on access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice in environmental matters*. UN.

Viñals, E., Maneja, R., Rufí-Salís, M., Martí, M., & Puy, N. (2023). Reviewing social-ecological resilience for agroforestry systems under climate change conditions. *Science of the total environment, 869*, 161763. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.161763

Vogel, D. (2000). Environmental regulation and economic integration. *Journal of International Economic Law, 3*(2), 265-279. https://doi.org/10.1093/jiel/3.2.265

Wibisana, A. G. (2024). Instrumen Ekonomi, Command and Control, dan Instrumen Lainnya: Kawan atau Lawan? Suatu Tinjauan Berdasarkan Smart Regulation. *Bina Hukum Lingkungan*, *4*(1), 172–197. Retrieved from https://bhl-jurnal.or.id/index.php/bhl/article/view/110

Williams, T., & Hardison, P. (2013). Culture, law, risk and governance: contexts of traditional knowledge in climate change adaptation. In *Climate change and indigenous peoples in the United States: Impacts, experiences and actions* (pp. 23-36). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Yustitianingtyas, L., Pratiwi, L. Y. E., Irawan, A. D., Stansyah, D., & Arifin, S. (2025, March). Environmental Law Policy in Indonesia: Challenges and Sustainable Justice. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 1473, No. 1, p. 012046). IOP Publishing.